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[R] - ITEM IS RESTRICTED

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE. MARYLAND 20755
Serial: GC/305/81
13 May 1981

Mr. Stanley Brand
General Counsel
Office of the Clerk
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515
Dear Mr. Brand:
Pursuant to our conversation of 11 May, enclosed please find a copy of our response to an FOIA appeal requesting correspondence or records of communications between NSA and the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The documents were released as the result of an initial request and prior to our knowledge of congressional intent that this information be maintained in confidentiality.

Future requests of this nature will be handled in accordance with expressed congressional intent; we would appreciate receiving, however, a letter addressed to this Agency specifying current congressional views with respect to the information maintained by NSA.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to call me or Robin Ullman on 688-6054.

Sincerely,
fatucia Thurpkey
PATRICIA A. MURPHY FOIA Appeals Coordinator

Encl:
a/s

Released on 11-01-2017 under the John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 USC 2017 Note)

cc: D/DIR
ExReg (less encl.)
QC
Q4
$\longrightarrow \mathrm{Dl}$
L22211 (less encl.)
Stanley Brand, General Counsel, Clerk of the House of Representatives

M/R: This response was coordinated with Q4 (Dinwoodie) on classification and with Stan Brand, General Counsel to the Clerk of the House of Representatives in determining whether correspondence originating with the House Select Committee on Assassinations are NSA records. Mr. Brand informed us of correspondence from Louis Stokes to Executive Agencies that congressional material and related information in a form connected to the Committee should not be disclosed without the written concurrence of the House of Representatives. A subsequent letter from the Clerk of the House affirmed this decision. He told us that he believes the Committee inadvertently neglected to send the Stokes letter to NSA. Copies of both letters are attached for your information, and, for LAO, your file.

As Q4 had already released the NSA-originated records (not knowing about the Stokes request), we decided to uphold their findings. Future requests of this nature should be handled in accordance with the Stokes and Henshaw letters. If any documents covered by these letters are to be released they must first be coordinated with and approved by Stan Brand, General Counsel to the Clerk of the House of Representatives. His phone number is 225-7000.

Mark Allen has sued CIA under the FOIA for withholding information responsive to a similar request. The D.C. Circuit in November 1980 remanded that case to the District Court, but made some rulings on the (b) (l) and (b)(3) exemptions which we have tried to comply with in this letter - inter Ilia, showing procedural conformity with E.O. l2065, demonstrating which exemptions the deleted information fall under and why, and releasing classification markings.
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Wa＝hincton．D．C． 20315
March 26． 1979

The Honorable Griffin B．Bell
Attorney General of the U．S．
Department of Justice
Washington，D．C． 20530
Dear Mr．Attorney General：
As you are aware，H．Res．222，as passed by the House of Representatives on February 2，1977，authorized the Select Conmittee on Assassinations to investigate the deaths of Dr．Hartin Luther King，Jr．and President John F．Kennedy． The Committee＇s work is now drawing to an end．I write this letter to draw to your attention a matter that l recognize will inevitably come up in the future．

A great deal of material has been generated by jour Department in response to specific requests or concerns of the Select Committee．In addition，your Department is in physical custody of a variety of materials originating from the Select Committee．It can be anticipated that your Depart－ ment will receive requests under the Freedom of Information Act for access to these materials．The purpose of this letter is to request specifically that this Congressional material and related information in a form connected to the Committee not be disclosed outside your Department without the written concurrence of the House of Representatives．

LS：dm

cc：Robert L．Keuch

# (Bffire of $1 \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{c}} \mathfrak{C}$ Clerk  <br>  

March 2, 1981

Honorable William H. Webster Federal Bureau of Investigation
J. Edgar Hoover Building

Washington, D.C. 20535
Dear lir. Vebster:
I am writing to you concerning a subject of considerable concern to me as the legislative branch officer charged with maintaining and preserving non-current House documents and records under the rules and precedents of the House of Representatives. Specifically, I call your attention to requests filed with the Bureau under the Freedom of Information Act for correspondence, records or any communications between the Bureau and the former House Select Committee on Assassinations ("HSCA").

By letter dated March 26, 1979 to the Honorable Griffin Bell, former Chairman Stokes specifically identified the problem which would result from requests under the Freedom of Information Act for material generated by the Bureau in response to specific requests by HSCA during its investigation. That letter requested that "this congressional material and related information in form connected to the Committee not be disclosed outside your Department."

My purpose in writing is to reaffirm the congressional intent expressed by Chairman Stokes at the conclusion of HSCA's work in my capacity as archival and custodial agent for the House of HSCA's records. In this connection, my General Counsel has generally reviewed the congressional materials and has determined that none of the congressional materials can be released consistent with the letter from Chairman Stokes asserting the exemption for Congress under 5 U.S.C. §55l(1)(A)(1976). This is our position notwithstanding the recent decision of a panel of the United States

Court of Appeals in lloly Spirit Association For The Unification of World Christianity v. Central Intelligence heqency, Nos. 79-2143, 2202 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 23, 1980), petition for rehearing filed, (Jan. 21, 1981). We strongly believe that Chairman Stokers letter, together with our reaffirmation by this letter, comes squarely within the standards articulated in the Holy Spirit case, because they predate both the request and any litigation which might arise therefrom, two factors cited by the panel in Holy Spirit as absent.

As constitutional officer of the House charged with preservation of llouse records, I cannot overemphasize the importance of maintaining the strictest confidentiality over records generated by the Bureau, as well as copies of congressional materials retained by the Bureau, in connection with HSCA. While I believe that these letters adequately serve to support the withholding of any of these documents under FOIA, I would appreciate being informed of any such requests. In this regard, please have appropriate personnel in the processing sections contact my General Counsel concerning requests for HSCA materials.


Mr. Mark Allen
P.O. Box 9032

Washington, D.C. 20003
Dear Mr. Allen:
This replies to your letter of 8 April 1981 in which you appeal the National Security Agency's (NSA) denial of information responsive to your Freedom of Information Act request. I have reviewed your initial request of 12 January l981, the nine records located in response to that request, NSA's letter of 16 March 1981 which forwarded one record in its entirety and portions of eight other records, and your letter of appeal. As the result of this review, I am again sending you the releasable portions of eight documents and $I$ am referencing herein the laws that preclude disclosure of certain segments of these documents. I have also decided to release additional portions of three records that were released to you by the Chief, Office of Policy, and amended copies of those records are attached. However, I affirm the determination of the Chief, Office of Policy, that the remaining portions of the attached records must be withheld. The ninth document, an unclassified letter from Eugene Yeates to Robert Blakey dated 14 July 1978 was released to you in its entirety and therefore does not need to be addressed.

Set forth below are descriptions of the eight records which were withheld in part and the reasons for withholding those portions of them. The reasons for withholding are as responsive as possible without disclosing classified information. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has recognized that information disclosed by an agency about withheld documents does not have to contain facts that if made public would compromise the secret nature of the information. Vaughn v. Rosen, 157 U.S. App. D.C. 340,484 F. $2 \mathrm{~d} 820,826$ (1973), cert. denied, $415 \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. 977 (1974).

Document No./

Description
Attachment 1

Attachment 2
7 Jul 78

Attachment $3 \quad 9$ Aug 78

- Exemption(s)

5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(\mathrm{~b})(3):$ applicable statute Public Law 86-36, (50 U.S.C. $\$ 402$ note)

5 U.S.C. §552(b)(l); 5 U.S.C. §552 (b) (3): applicable statute Public Law 86-36 (50 U.S.C. $\$ 402$ note)

5 U.S.C. §552(b)(l); 5 U.S.C. §552 (b) (3): applicable statutes public Law 86-36, (50 U.S.C. §402 note) and 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ or 18 U.S.C. $\$ 798$

Attachment $4 \quad 10$ Nov $78 \quad 5$ U.S.C. $\$ 552(b)(1) ; 5$ U.S.C. $\S 552$ (b) (3): applicable statutes Public Law 86-36 (50 U.S.C. §402 note) and 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ or 18 U.S.C. §798; 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(\mathrm{~b})(6)$

5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(b)(1) ; 5$ U.S.C. $\$ 552$ (b) (3): applicable statutes Public Law 86-36 (50 U.S.C. $\$ 402$ note) and 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ or 18 U.S.C. §798; 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(\mathrm{~b})(6)$

5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(\mathrm{~b})(\mathrm{l}) ; 5$ U.S.C. $\$ 552$ (b) (3): applicable statutes Public Law 86-36 (50 U.S.C. §402 note) and 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ or 18 U.S.C. §798; 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(b)(6)$

5 U.S.C. §552(b)(l); 5 U.S.C. §552 (b) (3): applicable statutes Public Law 86-36, (50 U.S.C. $\$ 402$ note) and 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ or 18 U.S.C. \$798

5 U.S.C. §552(b)(1); 5 U.S.C. §552 (b) (3): applicable statutes Public Law 86-36 (50 U.S.C. §402 note) and 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ or 18 U.S.C. §798; 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(\mathrm{~b})(6)$

A more detailed explanation of the rationale for each exemption follows:
With respect to the classifications assigned to the portions of documents 2 through 8 being withheld, I have concluded that they meet the criteria for classification in Section l-3 of Executive Order 12065 and in paragraph 2-202 of DoD Regulation 5200.1-R and that the withheld portions are properly classified in their entirety within the categories provided in Section l-l of Executive Order 12065 and in Chapter I, Section 5 of DoD Regulation 5200.1-R. The records have been reviewed for possible declassification or downgrading according to the provisions of sections 3-1 and 3-3 of Executive Order 12065 and of Chapter III of DoD Regulation 5200.1-R. Portions that were declassified are enclosed; the remaining portions were found to be properly classified and therefore excluded from declassification or downgrading despite the length of time which has elapsed since their origin. In conducting this review, I have weighed the significant need for openness in government against the likelihood of damage to our national security at this time. I have specifically taken into account Section 3-303 of Executive Order 12065 and have determined that the records, except for the portions released, should continue to be classified. Thus, I find
that the Chief, office of Policy, properly found these portions to be exempt from release pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §552(b)(l), and I affirm his denial of your request for release of these portions on those grounds.

Portions of each of the eight documents are exempt from disclosure pursuant to 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(b)(3)$. Section 6 of Public Law $86-36$ provides that no law shall be construed to require the disclosure of the organization, personnel, functions or activities of the National Security Agency. Each of the records contains information falling into this description. The National Security Agency is precluded by 18 U.S.C. $\$ 798$ from providing information concerning classified communications intelligence activities except to those persons authorized to receive such information. 50 U.S.C. $\$ 403(\mathrm{~d})(3)$ protects information pertaining to intelligence sources and methods. Withheld portions of documents 3 through 8 contain information protected by these statutes. Enclosure 6 of DoD Directive 5400.7 (32 C.F.R. $\$ 286$ (1980)) specifically recognizes 18 U.S.C. $\$ 798$ and Public Law $86-36$ as exemption 3 statutes. Thus, I also find that the Chief, Office of Policy, properly concluded that portions of the documents were exempt from release pursuant to 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552$ (b) (3), since each of the statutes and the directive cited above provides adequate grounds upon which to base such an exemption.

In addition, portions of documents $4,5,6$ and 8 relating to one individual are exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(b)(6)$ due to certain unique circumstances involved. I have determined that disclosure would constitute a "clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy," for this individual.

With the exception of the one document released in its entirety and the portions of the other documents that were released, $I$ found the matter covered by your request clearly within the statutory protection and exemptions cited above, and proper protection of classified information and intelligence sources and methods requires a denial of the remaining portions of the documents.

Finally four documents originated by Congress, one of which was a Memorandum of Understanding between the House Select Committee on Assassinations and the Office of the Secretary of Defense and attached to document 5, were found not to be agency records and are therefore not subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Possession of a document does not

- dictate that it is an "agency record" but rather whether control of the document has passed from Congress and become property of the agency within which it resides. See Goland v. CIA, 607 F .2 d 339 (D.C. Cir. 1978), cert. denied, 445 U.S. 927 (1980). As you already know, when the House Select Committee on Assassinations disbanded, Chairman Stokes informed former Attorney General Griffin Bell that the Congressional materials and related information connected to the Committee should be held in confidentiality. That assertion of Congressional privilege has been recently reaffirmed by the Congress.

As your appeal is denied in part, you are hereby advised of your rights under 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552$ to seek judicial review. You may seek an order from a United States Court in the district in which you reside, in which you have your principal place of business, or in which this Agency's records are situated (U.S. District Court, District of Maryland), or in the District of Columbia, for the production of any Agency records which you consider to have been improperly withheld by this Agency. 5 U.S.C. $\$ 552(\mathrm{a})(4)(\mathrm{B})$ sets out your rights in this matter with respect to such judicial action.

Sincerely,<br><br>ANN CARACRISTI<br>Freedom of Information Act/Privacy Act Appeals Authority

## Encls:

$a / s$

Legislative Affairs

To: DIR
Thru: D/Dir
SIBJECT: Corragindence form Hrue Assasinations Cominitue.

1. The Deguity Chiof Counal of the Assasinndins Comintse, Mr. J. Woef calaed ob sang he is sending a liteer do $Q \mid R$. Leteres, ob be chifad Montay, will request cortain infoimation (uns-i infed) I NSA.
2. Comsinter is mivestigation asosinntions $\therefore$ I Posidat Kommily $\sigma$ ter. King.

SUBJECT: Phone Call from House Select Committee on Assassinations

This office received a phone call this date from a staffer of the House Select Committee on Assassinations who said the . Committee is "doing research on a personality and needs some information from and wanted to know how to address a letter to NSA. She was given LAO's address and said the letter would be on its way shortly.

Legislative Affairs
$\mathrm{cc}:$
DIR


D/DIR
GS


## SECRETIGO

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE :ECRETARY AND DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

ATTN: Ms. Judith A. Miller
SUBJECT: House Select Committee on Assassinations 20 July 1978 Request

1. NSA has made a thorough search of all records that might contain information relevant to the Select Committee on Assassinations' request for "telegrams or other communications, sent from Cobo cleaners in Detroit, Michigan, by Earl Ruby or any other individuals to Cuba in March and April 1962." component of DOD has located information pursuant to the Comaittee's request, propose you use the attached draft. as your response to the Committee. If, however, there is any reason why the attached draft cannot be used, please consult with Mr. Silver before releasing information in any other form.
2. The attached draft response is classified CONFIDENTIAL. A direct response from the National Security Agency to the Comittee's request would be classified because the availability or nonavailability of the type of information requested by the Committee is in itself classified and protected in 2

Incl:
a/s
Copy Furnished:
DoD General Counsel

lir. G. Robert Blakey
Cinief-Counsel and Director
Select Committee on Assassinations
U. S. House of Representatives

331 House Office Building, Annex 2
Washington, DC 20515
Dear Mr. Blakey:
This is in reply to your recent letter which requested from the Department of Defense certain information relating to Cobo "cleaners and Mr. Earl Ruby in March and April 1962.

The Department of Defense has conducted a thorough search of
its records and 2 -


F F


 Len aiancorn

The above information is classified CONFIDENTTAL because it relates to Department of Defense intelligence operations and must not be disclosed to unauthorized individuals. In addition, you must not reveal the Department of Defense or any Defense Agency as the source of this information.

Sincerely,

John Gं. Kester
The Special Assistant

## EBEAS

Consenod by DIRNSAICHCSS (NSAICSE4 inh 7
Exuope from GDS, EO 11052 , Calmary 2


CC: DIR
Serial: LAO-025-78


M/R: 1. Mr. Blakey, Chief Counsel and Staff Director of the NSA on 10 July. On 14 July, he was informed that, in accordance with the MOU between DoD and the Committee, requests must go to DoD not NSA. Ms. Judy Miller forwarded the Committee request to NSA.

3. This memo has been coordinated with GC and EXEC/DDO. The classification was reviewed by fer man and approved by DIR.


## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

## SUBJECT: 8 November Meeting with Mr. Blakey

1. On 8 November, Chief Counsel and Staff Director for the House Select. Committee on Assassinations, to receive questions concerning as and information linking an assassination plot against President Kennedy with a figure in organized crime. Mr. Blakey had been referred to NSA (GC; Dan Silver) by Ms. Judy Miller, Special Assistant to John Kester, OSD.
2. Mr. Blakey indicated.that had communicated with a friend of his named Sgt Michael B. Stevensen at "Corry" Field, Florida. F

3. Mr. Blakey stated that NSA had already acknowledged the existence of such a facility during this period, but he didn't indicate to whom such a statement had been made.
4. Mr. Blakey posed the following questions for NSA:
(a) What is NSA's capability for retrieving communications from this time and place?
(b) How quickly can we make this retrieval? (His Committee completes its work in December. If NSA can easily provide the answers to a number of questions, he will do some preliminary investigation before formally requesting the information, but if we indicate that much time will be required, he will task us now.)
(c) What additional information does NSA need from Mr. Blakey to speed the retrieval process?
(d) Is the data still available for retrieval?
 working for Prater (Prater), and actually doing this kind of work at that location during. that period? "
5. He asked for the responses, or at least, a status of what can be provided and how soon, by Monday, 13 November.
6. On 7 September, the General Counsel sent a copy of 5 (GC/335/78), along with a letter from AF Security Service (to which Sgt Stevensen had sent the letter). In the General Counsel's letter he noted that Security service was
7. On 9 November, I met with Dan Silver and decided Dan should respond initially to Mr. Blakey's questions by phone. After coordinating with EXEC/DDO, asked to provide input for a response.
8. Ser an initial review of the availability of data from
 z an

## et em

on den ens
10: I notified cinder Mr. Blake with the news,

 EUGENE F. FEATES

Chief
Legislative Affairs

## SUBJECT: House Assassination Committee Inquiry

1. On 17 November 1978, GC, and I attended an interview conducted by staff members of the House Select committee on Assassinations in regard to the allegations of concerning the involvement of certain individuals in the assassination of President Kennedy.
2. The interview was conducted by Messes Kenneth Klein and Gary Cornwell and was held in secure spaces prövided by Mr. George. Murphy, Director of the Senate National Security office, Both individuals are
3. The interview was conducted under terms of a Memorandum of Understanding executed between the Committee and OSD on 15 November, 1978 (copy attached).
4. For purposes of the interview, DoD made available Sgt. Nicholas B. Stevenson, USAF,
 was accompanied by LTC Jeffrey Graham, USAF, Air Force Legislative Liaison.
5. The Committee staffers were interested primarily in Sgt. Stevenson's recollections in regard to events described by in a letter to Stevenson written in May 1978:
6. Sgt. Stevenson briefly described fimbermand

Regarding the specific allegations made by relating to the President's assassination, Sgt. Stevenson emphatically stated that he had no knowledge of such an event, though. in all likelihood, if it had occurred, it would have been widely known within and the probable subject of a- and
7. fond mole in the interview was concentrated largely on interpreting twin
8. The staffers made no notes and agreed to let us review their report, for purposes of classification, on or after 20 November 1978.

9. The staffers remain pärticularly interested in detcrmining the name of the individual whom

- the assassination. They will explore means of determining this information to include the possibility of having Sgt. Stevenson call his extreme unwillingness to do this. LTC Graham stated that this request would have to be examined at policy level within DoD).

10. If the Committee is able to determine a specific name, the staffers indicated that they would probably initiate a specific inquiry to NSA to again search our materials.

Encl:
a/s
CC: DIR
D/DIR
ADPL
--GC
5
DDO
EXEC/DDO
.$:$


## CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE

FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755"...
Serial: Dl/LnO-047M-78
21 November 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY AND DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

ATTN: MS. Judith A. Miller

1. The National Security Agency has made a thorough search of all records that might contain information pertaining to the select Comittee on Assassinations' request for information relevant to an allegation by为 nation plot against President Kennedy with a figure in organized crime. nation plot against President
draft as your response. If, however, there is any reason why the attached
draft cannot be used, please consult with us before releasing the infor-
mation in any other form.
2. The attached draft response is unclassified.


Encl:
$a / s$
cc:

- DIR D/DIR ADPL

$\therefore$
EXEC, DDO
$\cdots$


M/R: $\because$ On 8 November, Mr. Robert G. Blakey, Chief Counsel and Staff Director for the House Select Committee on Assassinations, posed a number of questions to
 information linking an assassination plot egainst president Kennedy with a figure in organized crime. Mr. Blakey subsequently submitted a written request (ċated 15 November) to support his verbal one.
A.-... In essense, the questions probed NSA's ability to quickly and thorotgnly probe for records from the wisermen

## 

The actual traffic from this period was ninimal and no other records are extant. The Director has approved.


28 November 1978
TO: Judy Miller

1. . Enclosed is a request made directly to us by Mr. Blakey and a reply which we propose be provided to Mr. Blakey by Mir. Kester.
2. If you have any questions concerning this please give me a call.

Encl: $a / s$


## MESCRTM

Mr. G. Robert Blakey
Chief Counsel and Director
Select Cominittee on Assassinations
U.S. House of Representatives

3331 House Office Building, Annex 2
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Blakey:
This responds to your letter of November 13, 1978, directed to a component of the Department of Defense.

With respect to the subject of the $F B I$ file to which the requested information relates,年势



Sincerely,

JOHN G. KESTER
Special Assistant to
The Secretary

COHLNR-CHSNDELSE

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD
28 November 1978

## SUBJECT: Visit to House Select Committee on Assassinations

1. On 21 November I visited House Select Committee on Assassinations spaces to review for classification purposes the report Messrs Cornwell and Klein wrote following the $1{ }^{\circ}$ November interview with Sgt Nicholas B. Stevenson, USAF.
2. The report, about one and a half pages long, listed the participants in the interview and described generally the substance of the discussions: Although it did not mention the specific site to which Sgt Stevenson and Rewere assigned, it did say that the facility was able to and "NSA": in several places.
3. I told Mr. Cornwell that as written, portions of the report should be classified "CONFIDENTIAL, HANDLE VIA COMINT CHANNELS ONLY." He agreed to classify it and asked me to mark it which I did. I suggested that with a few changes we could make it unclassified. Mr. Cornwell stated that he would prefer to retain the original language of the report at this time but that if it was to be used in any unclassified report by the committee, he would then ask us to review the wording so that classified information would not be disclosed.
4. Mr. Cornwell asked if NSA had determined whether the conversation anceferenced had been published and disseminated in product channels. I told him that we had not yet determined the answer to that question and that we would be back in touch.

