

## Identification Form

## Agency Information

AGENCY : HSCA  
RECORD NUMBER : 180-10131-10338  
RECORD SERIES : SECURITY CLASSIFIED TESTIMONY  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 014737

## Document Information

ORIGINATOR : HSCA  
FROM : [Restricted]  
TO :

TITLE :

DATE : 05/19/1978  
PAGES : 71

SUBJECTS :  
CIA, FILES  
CIA, METHODOLOGY  
[Restricted]  
OSWALD, LEE, POST RUSSIAN PERIOD, TRAVEL, TRIP TO  
MEXICO  
OSWALD, LEE, RUSSIAN PERIOD, RETURN TO US

DOCUMENT TYPE : TRANSCRIPT  
CLASSIFICATION : Unclassified  
RESTRICTIONS : 1A  
CURRENT STATUS : Redact  
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 06/13/1997

OPENING CRITERIA :

COMMENTS : Box 8

Stenographic Transcript Of

HEARINGS

Before The

John F. Kennedy Subcommittee  
of the

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEPOSITION OF ELSIE I. SCALETTI

Washington, D.C.

May 19, 1978

Alderson Reporting Company, Inc.

*Official Reporters*

300 Seventh St., S. W. Washington, D. C.

554-2345

C O N T E N T S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TESTIMONY OF:

PAGE

Elsie I. Scaletti

2

001709

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEY

---

Friday, May 19, 1978

---

U. S. House of Representatives,  
John F. Kennedy Subcommittee of  
Select Committee on Assassinations,  
Washington, D. C.

Deposition of:

ELSIE I. SCALETTI

called for examination bt staff counsel for the subcommittee,  
pursuant to notice, in the offices of House Annex II, Room 3370,  
Second and D Streets, S. W., Washington, D. C., beginning at  
1:15 o'clock p.m., before Albert Joseph LaFrance, a Notary  
Public in and for the District of Columbia, when were present  
on behalf of the respective parties:

For the Subcommittee:

MICHAEL GOLDSMITH, ESQ., Staff Counsel

For the Deponent:

(There was no representation by counsel)

001710

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 Whereupon,

3 ELSIE I. SCALETTI,

4 having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as  
5 follows:

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you please state your name and  
7 occupation for the record?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. My name is Elsie I. Scaletti and I am  
9 presently a housewife.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. Is the name Scaletti your true name?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. No, it is not. It is a registered  
12 pseudonym.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. With whom is it registered?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. With the Central Intelligence Agency.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. In what state do you live?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Virginia.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Are you here testifying today voluntarily?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. You are testifying without subpoena?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Have you received a copy of the Committee  
22 Rules and the supporting resolution?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes, I have.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Have you had an opportunity to read Rule  
25 Number 4?

001711

1 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand Rule Number 4?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand you have a right to  
5 counsel?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you waive that right?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. At this meeting I waive that right.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. If at any time you decide you should like  
10 to have counsel, please indicate that.

11 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. Under the Committee Rules you have a right  
13 to receive a copy of the transcript of the deposition statement  
14 that you are going to be giving today. However, by virtue of  
15 the agreement that has been worked out between the Committee and  
16 the Central Intelligence Agency, the Agency has asked us to  
17 request witnesses who were formerly employed with the Agency  
18 or presently employed with the Agency to waive the right  
19 actually to receive the transcript.

20 We would naturally be willing to give you an opportunity  
21 to review the transcript for accuracy. However, in terms of  
22 actually giving you the transcript to keep we would like to ask  
23 you to waive that right.

24 Mrs. Scaletti. I waive my right to keep t acopy. I would  
25 like to review a final transcript.

001712

1 Mr. Goldsmith. No problem and you will be notified when  
2 the transcript has been prepared. Have you had a chance to  
3 review the letter dated March 25, 1978 from the Acting Director  
4 of Central Intelligence Carlucci to the Chairman of this  
5 Committee?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. I have.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand that letter?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I do.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. For the record that correspondence with  
10 JFK Exhibit 94 at the JFK hearings.

11 My name is Michael Goldsmith. I am staff counsel with  
12 the Committee and I am authorized by the Committee to take your  
13 statement for this deposition. For backgroun purposes I would  
14 like to tell you what the mandate of the Committee is and that  
15 is to investigate the assassination of President Kennedy,  
16 specifically who did it, was there a conspiracy, and also to  
17 evaluate the performance of the investigative agencies includ-  
18 ing the FBI and the CIA.

19 Finally, another aspect of the mandate of the Committee  
20 is to evaluate the work done by the Warren Commission. Do you  
21 understand that?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. I do.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. Prior to coming here today have you had  
24 any discussion with any present or former employee of the CIA  
25 concerning your testimony that you are about to give today?

1 Mrs. Scaletti. I went to the Agency, to the office of  
2 General Counsel to find out what my rights were, what restric-  
3 tions were placed on me. They told me I had no restrictions  
4 placed on me and I could have counsel with me today if I  
5 wanted to.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Did anyone in the Agency discuss the  
7 substance of the testimony with you?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. No. I discussed with him only -- they  
9 did not discuss with me what I should say or in any way I could  
10 say it.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. Have you spoken to ant present or former  
12 Agency employee about testimony or statements which those  
13 persons have given to the Committee in the past?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. No, I have not.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. Is it fair to say that other than the  
16 interview you had previously with staff members of this Commit-  
17 tee you have not discussed the substance of this case with any-  
18 one?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. No. Just OGC and OLC about my rights  
20 and procedures, et cetera.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Mrs. Scaletti, for how many years were  
22 you employed by the CIA?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. Twenty-six plus.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. What years were you working for the  
25 Agency?

001714



1 Mrs. Scaletti. 1951 to -- I retired December 1977.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you give us a brief summary of the  
3 positions that you held during that 26 years?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. I started as a typist and I retired as a  
5 Branch Chief. I went all the positions in between, reports,  
6 IA.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. IA stands for what? ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

8 Mrs. Scaletti. Intelligence Assistant officer, Chief of  
9 Station, Branch Chief, Deputy Branch Chief.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. Where were you Chief of Station?

11 Mrs. Scaletti.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. When you retired you were Chief of which  
13 branch?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. It was over

15 Mr. Goldsmith. One of the branches in the Western  
16 Hemisphere?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. A Western Hemisphere Branch.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever have any experience as a case  
19 officer dealing with agents in the field?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. In 1963 where were you assigned?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. Washington.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. What was your responsibility at that time?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. I was on the Mexican desk or branch.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. My understanding is that a desk would be

001715

1 a subunit of a branch, is that correct?

2 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. So if you were assigned to the Mexican  
4 desk that would be one of the desks in the Western Hemisphere,  
5 in a particular Western Hemisphere Branch?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. Right, unless it became a branch all by  
7 itself. This is just internal organization, reo-ganization.  
8 It does not mean anything.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. In 1963 how many years had you been work-  
10 ing on the Mexican Desk?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't remember unless I get my chron-  
12 ology but I would say at least, to be honest, I don't remember  
13 but I think it is at least three or four. I just don't remember.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. How many years did you stay at the Mexican  
15 Desk before going on to your next assignment?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. From there I went to Mexico in 1967.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. In 1967 you actually went to Mexico?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. As a case officer?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. No, as an IA.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. During that time did you work under Win  
22 Scott?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. In Mexico?

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

25 Mrs. Scaletti. In Mexico, yes.

001716

1 Mr. Goldsmith. While in Mexico did you ever work with  
2 Ann Goodpasture?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. We worked with everybody in the station.  
4 So, indirectly but not directly under her.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know what her responsibilities  
6 were at the station?

7 Mrs. Scaletti. Broadly. She assisted Mr. Scott and  
8 handled some of his cases. I really don't know what she had full  
9 responsibility for. I know she assisted him on some of the  
10 things that he handled.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. Is it fair to say she was his right hand  
12 person?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. Not exactly because his right hand person  
14 would have been the Deputy Chief of Station.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. As a formal matter that would certainly  
16 have been the case. Informally did he rely on her a great deal?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes, but I wouldn't say that she was his  
18 really right hand person. He did depend upon her but not for  
19 everything.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether she had any responsi-  
21 bility for the surveillance operations in Mexico City?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. That I can't remember. There was a lot  
23 of coordination. She would do some of the work but I don't  
24 think she ran them and I don't remember she had the responsi-  
25 bility for them.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. Turning back to 1963 again, what were  
2 the general responsibilities of the Mexican Desk?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. To support the Mexico City station and  
4 to handle things at headquarters concerning Mexico and the  
5 Mexico City station.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Were the responsibilities of the Mexican  
7 Desk solely administrative and procedural in nature?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. The Mexican Desk was handled like any  
9 other desk. If you say administrative and procedural includes  
10 budget work, name traces, handling requests from Congress and  
11 that is administrative and procedural. But in my terminology  
12 administrative can mean support and administration, which is  
13 a completely different thing, like personnel or logistics, no.

14 Procedural, if you mean day to day answering of cables,  
15 yes. If you would like to elaborate on administrative or  
16 procedural I might be able to --

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Could you give me a brief laundry list  
18 of the types of work that the Mexican Desk did when it gave  
19 support to the Mexico City station?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. In intelligence reporting it would  
21 process the report, positive intelligence reports. It would  
22 do the counterintelligence dissemination, if it were required,  
23 to the FBI, et cetera. It would handle budget and submit  
24 projects requesting money in support of the station's opera=  
25 tions. It would do name traces. It would handle requests from

1 Congress, requests from other government agencies. We would  
2 write any memo that was required in response to a request from  
3 anybody, from the next echelon all the way up to the Director.  
4 We would be responsible for replying to matters having to do  
5 with Mexico per se or operations in Mexico. Does that clarify  
6 it?

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes, that is helpful.

8 Did the work involve at any time substantive analytical  
9 work? In other words, you would get information from the  
10 Mexico City station and you would then have to analyze that  
11 information and perhaps make a policy decision on it?

12 Mrs. Scaletti. No. At that time we are not analysts,  
13 we only process raw material. Occasionally they might ask you  
14 for a memo, like if there is an election, but we do not do  
15 analytical work. We only put down facts that have been  
16 reported. We do not do analysis. We do correlation. That is  
17 a much better word.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. What about actualy decisions? If Mexico  
19 City station communicated with the Mexican Desk and asked for  
20 a decision to be made, would the Mexican Desk make the decision  
21 or would someone else in the Branch make the decision?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. I think we misunderstood each other. When  
23 you say policy, analytical, or intelligence, no, we did not  
24 analyze intelligence. We only correlated. By policy you mean  
25 operational policy?

001719

TOP SECRET

1 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

2 Mrs. Scaletti. On operations a lot is left to the  
3 station to have a certain amount of autonomy. We had almost  
4 no authority to make final decisions.

5 We could prepare a message with a recommendation and  
6 then it would go for release or signature and at the time it  
7 was released or the message signed, that person would be making  
8 the policy. Is that clear?

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes. That person would be someone higher  
10 up above the Mexican Desk?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. How many people worked on the Mexican  
13 Desk?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. I cannot remember. I have been trying  
15 to think. I cannot recall. I cannot remember where we were  
16 sitting.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. It was not just you?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. I would say two or more, between two and  
19 15.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. When you say two or more are you thinking  
21 in terms of case officers only or are you thinking in terms of  
22 case officers, secretarial help, administrative help?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. I know where were at least two of  
24 us because if I wasn't there, there had to be somebody else  
25 there.

001720

TOP SECRET

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Mr. Goldsmith. You say two or more, you are not making any distinction between case officer and other --

Mrs. Scaletti. Don't stick me with the two. I know I was there and somebody else must have been there. But how many people were there -- there are tables of organization available. Honestly, I cannot remember. If I could visualize what room I was sitting in then maybe I could try to think who sat where but I cannot visualize where I was sitting at that time.

Mr. Goldsmith. How many years did you work at the Mexican Desk?

Mrs. Scaletti. We worked all over. Your table of organization changes every four months or six months. Do you understand? You said at that time? You said 1963?

Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

Mrs. Scaletti. I can remember at times temporarily when there were 15 and I can remember times when I was practically alone.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who would have been your immediate supervisor in 1963?

Mrs. Scaletti. I cannot remember who the Desk Chief was.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would the Desk Chief have been someone different from the Branch Chief?

Mrs. Scaletti. Yes, unless there was no Desk Chief. I mean, if there was a vacancy.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever work with Hack Whitten?

2 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall when you worked with him?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. The Years I don't remember. It was a  
5 matter of a couple of years I believe.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you think that you worked with Whitten  
7 in 1963?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I know I did because I saw a message.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. In other words, you saw a cable of some  
10 kind that had his name on it?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. It was mine.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. As a case officer working on the Mexican  
13 Desk would you have been aware in 1963 of the various surveil-  
14 lance operations that were in effect in Mexico City, being  
15 conducted by the Mexico City station?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Not the surveillances but the team.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Could you elaborate a bit on that?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. I mean from the budget standpoint and from  
19 the clearance of agents, I knew that there were so many teams  
20 with about so many people, or basically what they did. But we  
21 were not privy necessarily to what those people did every day.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you know that there was a wire tap  
23 operation against the Cuban and Soviet Embassies and Consulates?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you also know there was a photo



1 surveillance operation against the Cuban Embassy and Consulate  
2 and Soviet Embassy and Consulate?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. If we can just clarify your last answer,  
5 you were aware of the fact of these surveillance operations.  
6 Could you explain to me again what you were not aware of?

7 Mrs. Scaletti. You know from your budget preparations  
8 and from your handling of veryday traffic that you have certain  
9 operations. Like, you know you have a surveillance team. That  
10 is a project. You need so much money. You have so many people.  
11 You have so many cars because they come in and request permis-  
12 sion to buy a car or to sell a car. Or you know you have a  
13 clearance fro so many people or this man quit, you know,  
14 personnel. You

15 You know basically from the quarterly reporting or the  
16 reporting that is required under the regulations, the general  
17 target, because you have to get higher approval to hire a team  
18 to do such and such.

19 But I do not know that on Monday, June 2nd, two cars went  
20 to this house and looked at this window and Thursday -- do you  
21 understand?

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes. You would not be aware of the  
23 operational information being picked up by the surveillance  
24 operation?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. Unless the field bothered to tell you,

TOP SECRET

001723

1 because they wanted to find something out or check something  
2 out.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. How often would the field contact you  
4 with regard to this types of situation?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. You could go a month or two without  
6 having any, or longer.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Would your answer to that question be  
8 that you did not frequently get information from the Mexico  
9 City station pertaining to the operational aspects of the  
10 surveillance teams' work?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. Correct.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. When you did get this kind of information  
13 would it come to headquarters from the Mexico City station by  
14 means of a dispatch or cable?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. Either one.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. How would it be determined which form  
17 of communication would be used to contact headquarters?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. The priority and if a reply was requested,  
19 because if you need an answer in order to do some more investi-  
20 gation you had better send a cable or you are never going to  
21 hear. If it is a dispatch it could take maybe a month by the  
22 time you got to the desk and by the time you answer it it would  
23 take a month.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. During the summer months, and I am talking  
25 generally not just 1963, but during the summer months, at least

1 of the years you were at the Mexico Desk, do you recall  
2 whether there were frequent communications from the Mexico  
3 City station reporting the fact of Americans visiting the  
4 Embassy or Consulate of a communist country?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't recall any difference between  
6 summer months and any other months.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. When did Lee Harvey Oswald first come  
8 to your attention?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. When the station sent a cable asking  
10 for a name trace, a routine name trace.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. At that time how important was the fact  
12 of Oswald's contract considered?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. It was a routine name trace.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. So at that time it was not considered at  
15 all unusual. Is that what you are saying?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. We handled it as any normal --  
17 because we would have gotten similar name traces on other  
18 Americans who might have been identified as going to the Soviets.  
19 It was a routine way of handling that for the Bureau.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. So even though the fact that Americans  
21 did not frequently contact the Soviet Embassy or the Cuban  
22 Embassy, when they did and Mexico City station communicated with  
23 headquarters the fact of that contact, was supposed to be  
24 considered routine?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. Right. It was still handled in a routine

1 manner.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. Would the fact that a cable had been used  
3 to communicate with headquarters indicate that the contact was  
4 considered to be important?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. No. As I told you previously, and I will  
6 repeat, you generally would use a cable for a name trace for  
7 the expediency so that you could get a reply back within a  
8 reasonable working period.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Let us take a look at that cable now. I  
10 would like to show you what has been marked CIA Number 177,  
11 and when I refer to these numbers, I am referring to the  
12 red numbers at the bottom of the page. The Agency has been  
13 kind enough to make these documents available to the Committee  
14 at our offices. For purposes of allowing the Agency to make  
15 sure that each document is properly returned to it, the Agency  
16 has numbered each piece of paper. I use those numbers for  
17 the purpose of the deposition for our record. Would you  
18 please examine CIA Number 177?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. Is that the cable that first brought Lee  
20 Oswald to your attention?

21 Mrs. Scaletti. I presume so. I can't remember that far  
22 back.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. What is the date of that cable?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. 19 October 1963.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. Is it 19 or 9?

1 Mrs. Scaletti. 19 October 1963. That is the way I read  
2 it.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. Let us take a look at CIA Number 178.

4 Mrs. Scaletti. It could be 9. That is not really that  
5 pertinent, is it? Here it is 9 because here is the zulu time.  
6 So that is 9.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. What time?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. Zulu time.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. What is zulu time?

10 Mrs. Scaletti. Greenwich. I believe that is what it is.  
11 Zero nine zero four three would be the 9th of 043 zed.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. What is zed?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. Z.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. That refers to Greenwich time?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. I believe. But you can check the date  
16 with that.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. I was going to say if we take a look at  
18 CIA Number 178, that is the Mexico City station copy of that  
19 telegram --

20 Mrs. Scaletti. I am sorry, what number?

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Number 178. That indicates that the  
22 cable was sent on 8 October, so it is likely that headquarters  
23 would have received it by the 9th.

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Right. What am I supposed to do with  
25 this one?

001727

TOP SECRET

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Mr. Goldsmith. Just wait for me to ask you a question.  
Would you please read that cable?

Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. My first question is does that cable  
contain a request for a name trace?

Mrs. Scaletti. No, unless I really goofed reading.

Mr. Goldsmith. Please reread it.

Mrs. Scaletti. No, it requests no specific name trace.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, in the basence of a name trace hwat  
significance would you attach to the cable in light of the fact  
that it was sent by means of cable instead of dispatch?

Mrs. Scaletti. That they were informing headquarters of  
a possible American, because even though it says American male,  
when you check them out it is not an American male. They  
alerted headquarters to the fact that a possible American had  
contacted the Soviet Embassy.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that is what they are inform-  
ing headquarters about. My question is, does the fact that  
they used the cable suggest that Mexico City station considered  
this to be a priority item?

Mrs. Scaletti. I really cannot read into their thinking.  
As a spot thing like this I probably would have reported it  
by cable. I can't really comment on that.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand. The reason I asked the  
question is because earlier, my recollection of the statement

1 was that you said a cable would be used for something that was  
2 priority item or if there was a request for a name trace.  
3 There was no request for a name trace there. I am wondering if  
4 this fits into the other category, a priority item?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. Not necessarily. We did an awful lot  
6 of cabling out of Mexico of these spot things instead of writing  
7 full dispatches. This is a lot quicker and really less expen-  
8 sive to do than in a cable. A lot of this is just how you react  
9 and how you handle things.

10 There is no regulation which says what has to be done  
11 by cable and what has to be done by dispatch. It is up to the  
12 CO or the individual.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Are there no written regulations govern-  
14 ing when dispatches are to be used as opposed to cable?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. Sometimes.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. So there are regulations governing the  
17 instances?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. Does this cable contain a description of  
20 Lee Harvey Oswald?

21 Mrs. Scaletti. It provides a description of a male that  
22 looked to be an American who entered the Soviet Embassy.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. Is the answer yes or no.

24 Mrs. Scaletti. I can't tell.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. Read the description contained in the

1 second paragraph.

2 Mrs. Scaletti. Correct.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. The first paragraph mentions Oswald?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. The first paragraph mentions Oswald.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. The second paragraph also refers to a  
6 photograph and then it describes the person who appears in the  
7 photograph, is that correct?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. That is correct.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Is this photograph linked to Oswald?

10 Mrs. Scaletti. In this cable it is not directly linked  
11 to Oswald.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. Is it indirectly linked to Oswald?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. In this cable it is not indirectly linked  
14 either. I might say, to clarify, that in many instances we  
15 would receive cables like this and it would be the same person.  
16 Rather than put a lot of wordage in they put this down, what  
17 they heard and this is what they have seen, and maybe without  
18 putting all the language there may be or may not be indentifiable  
19 or this could possible be the same person.

20 We were very careful to do this when we go out to third  
21 agencies.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Certainly the Mexico City station would  
23 not send up a cable containing simply the information reflected  
24 in paragraph number 2?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. No, because it was worth nothing.



1 Mr. Goldsmith. So you are saying you believe, and you  
2 may correct me if I am wrong, that the cable would not put in  
3 all of the extra verbage such as saying "this may be Oswald".  
4 Instead they would give you the information on Oswald in  
5 paragraph 1. In paragraph 2 they report the fact of a photo-  
6 graph and the fact that they report the particular photograph  
7 simply means this may or may not be Oswald?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. What they have done is obvious to  
9 me now and I would assume this might have been the way I  
10 interpreted it at the time, that they got the phone call. The  
11 station went and said "now, look, can we identify him" and  
12 they went to the photograph.

13 The only photographs they saw which could have been --  
14 you know, in case this man had walked in around that time, may-  
15 be this is the one they think it is, so let us give them the  
16 description, it might help Washington.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. So, the significance of that second  
18 paragraph is that this might be Oswald?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. This is the way I interpret it now. I  
20 probably interpreted it at the time but I can't remember my  
21 exact though processes so many years ago. I would not now  
22 have gone back to the station and said "why did you send me  
23 paragraph 2?"

24 Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that paragraph 2 does not  
25 say "Have photograph of Oswald."

1 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. I just wanted to clarify that your answer  
3 was that paragraph 2 meant this may be Oswald even though that  
4 language was not expressly used.

5 Mrs. Scaletti. Right.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know, and I realize you just gave  
7 an opinion as to what may have happened, do you know how the  
8 people in Mexico City station went about the process of obtain-  
9 ing that photograph and suggesting that that photograph may  
10 be Oswald?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. I have no knowledge of how the station  
12 did this. I could only guess what the process of a person in  
13 the station would be.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. You never talked to anyone from the  
15 station about this?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. No. I never have talked to Mrs. Minelli.  
17 I only talked to Annie Goodpasture when she was doing some  
18 research on where she could find some photos, you know, that  
19 might have been retired in Washington. That is all.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. Did she give you any indication of what  
21 she did, if anything, to pick out this particular photograph?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. It is my understanding she didn't have  
23 anything to do with picking out the photograph.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. I am not suggesting she did.

25 Mr. Scaletti. No, she did not mention anything about

1 that.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever see the photograph that is  
3 referred to in paragraph number 2?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. I think I might have seen it. I don't  
5 remember. I could have seen it when Ann was up here about a  
6 year ago trying to find the photographs but I don't think she  
7 ev er showed it to me. But I can't swear one way or the other  
8 because I was not involved in the case.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Now, the first paragraph of that cable  
10 refers, I believe, to a statement by the person who identified  
11 himself as Osald, to the effect that Oswald had been in contact  
12 with Kostikov, does it not?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. Whom he believed to be Kostikov.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes. Do you recall whether the fact of  
15 the reference to Kostikov may have enhanced the importance of  
16 this particular cable? In other words, not only do we have  
17 an American who contacted the Soviet Embassy but he also was  
18 in contact with Kostikov?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. I sort of doubt it. I don't remember  
20 that it did but I don't think it did.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Even though Kostikov was known by the  
22 KGB?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. Almost 50 percent are KGB or GRU.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. What is GRU?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. Military Intelligence.

001733

TOP SECRET

1 Mr. Goldsmith. Kostikov in particular, however, was  
2 working out of this unit of the KGB that was involved in  
3 sabotage and assassination operations?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. I probably didn't even know that because  
5 all the matters on the Soviets would be kept up in the Soviet  
6 Branch. I would have known possibly if I had looked hard  
7 enough that he was KGB but that would not really have made  
8 any difference in my name tracing.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Now, CIA Number 177 has some numbers  
10 written on the left hand side of the page.

11 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. Can you identify what those numbers refer  
13 to?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. This is a file number.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. 200-5-41?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. The 200 is always the general series and  
17 I believe that 200 stands for something international. The  
18 second number is the more specific category and I believe 5  
19 has something to do with politics. 41 is just the title of  
20 the folder that is next in line. It starts out with "D"  
21 colon. I don't know what that means but I guess it means cross  
22 filing or something or duplicate maybe.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you now refer to CIA Number 179  
24 and read that document in full?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. Okay.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. Before we discuss this document in  
2 detail, after receiving the cable from Mexico City station,  
3 the cable dated October 9, what action, if any, did you take  
4 in response?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. I took the normal procedure for a name  
6 trace. You would submit a form and you would get a reply from  
7 the main registry and what documents and things might be  
8 available in the Agency on the person whom you are searching.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you receive a reference to a 201  
10 number?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. I believe so. Unless I see my name trace  
12 reply I couldn't tell what I got.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Why would you make a name trace if the  
14 cable didn't request one?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. I was over eager, I guess. You are not  
16 limited to a name trace only if somebody asks for it. But if  
17 you feel it is appropriate you can do it. I was being a little  
18 facetious. Actually it would be the normal thing to do.

19 If you found an American in touch with the Soviets you  
20 normally see if there was any problem there.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. After doing the name trace did you  
22 receive access to Lee Oswald's 201 file?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. I received access to a file. I don't  
24 know whether it was the 201 file or not.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. What other files would there have been?

001735

TOP SECRET

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Mrs. Scaletti. I just don't know. Sometimes you have a document that references a document or soft folder or something. I am trying to be honest. I don't want to say I saw a 201 file if it were not a 201 file which is a very specific type folder.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us take a look at CIA Number 179. Did you send this cable to Mexico City station?

Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Turning to CIA Number 179, that document in the first paragraph refers to Oswald's 201 file.

Mrs. Scaletti. Oh, then there would have been a 201 file probably.

Mr. Goldsmith. Then you were the author of that cable?

Mrs. Scaletti. Right. I am not trying to be difficult. It is just that I am trying to be accurate.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that. I should indicate to you at the same time that we have been told by other witnesses before the Committee that you were known for having an excellent memory. Your reputation before this Committee is a very good one.

Mrs. Scaletti. Thank you very much.

Mr. Goldsmith. The description contained in the second paragraph of that cable, where would that have been obtained?

Mrs. Scaletti. From the 201 probably. As much as I can recall it would have been in the 201 file.

001736

1 Mr. Goldsmith. I said the second paragraph. I really  
2 meant --

3 Mrs. Scaletti. The remainder. All paragraph 2. Para-  
4 graph 3 could have been in the 201. It could have been in  
5 other miscellaneous documents. Under the current system and  
6 ever since the early sixties not all materials is necessarily  
7 in a 201 because it is just too time consuming. You find an  
8 occasional documents which are not in the 201 which could have  
9 been the source. It is up to you to get it in the 201.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. What about the information in the first  
11 paragraph, the description of Oswald?

12 Mrs. Scaletti. That would have come from the 201. We  
13 sanitized that. That is fairly sterile thing that could be  
14 passed out to government agencies.

15 The third rule precluded the rest of it from being passed.  
16 That is why it is separate.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. What do you mean by the third agency rule  
18 precludes other information --

19 Mrs. Scaletti. Because the last paragraph, paragraph  
20 4, says station should pass the info in paragraph 1 to the  
21 Embassy, to the Navy, to the FBI and to I&NS locally.

22 The info in paragraphs 2 and 3 originated with the State  
23 Department. Since it originated with the State Department you  
24 cannot give it to the other government agencies. You have to  
25 refer them to the Department of State to get it themselves.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. What about the information in paragraph  
2 1?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. That was just a very basic sentence so  
4 that we could identify them. We took the liberty of passing  
5 that but not the sensitive information from the State Department.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Now, once the information in paragraph 2  
7 had been obtained by you did that in any way increase the  
8 significance of Oswald's contact with the Soviet Embassy?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. As I recall that is what I thought made  
10 it very significant.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. Can you explain why?

12 Mrs. Scaletti. Any American who had tried to renounce  
13 his US citizenship in the Soviet Union, now having again a  
14 relationship with the Soviet Embassy would lead one to wonder  
15 why he had tried to renounce his citizenship in the first  
16 place, and why he was still in contact with the Soviets,  
17 whether there was a possibility he really was working for the  
18 Soviets or what.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. Paragraph 5 I believe requests Mexico  
20 City station to send any additional information either relevant  
21 to further contact by the individual or positive identification.  
22 Is that true?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes, it is.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Did Mexico City station prior to the  
25 assassination send any additional information about Oswald

001738

TOP SECRET



1 to headquarters?

2 Mrs. Scaletti. Not that I recall but I could not swear  
3 to that.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. Does Karamessines appear anywhere on that  
5 cable?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. His signature appears as the ADDP  
7 releasing officer.

8 Mr. Goldsmith. What is the function of a releasing  
9 officer?

10 Mrs. Scaletti. He takes full responsibility for the  
11 cable.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. Why would someone as high up in the organ-  
13 ization as Karamessines ask to be the releasing officer of this  
14 particular cable?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. I can only surmise now what I might have  
16 thought or what several of us might have thought at the time,  
17 that since it involved somebody of this nature who had tried  
18 to renounce his citizenship, who was in the Soviet Union,  
19 married to a Soviet, got out with a Soviet wife presumably,  
20 which is very strange, and now the contact with the Soviets,  
21 we could have a security, a major security problem.

22 This was one way of informing him and getting attention  
23 at the higher level.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. I am asking you now to speculate a bit.  
25 Had the 201 file not contained the information about --

001739

TOP SECRET

1 Mrs. Scaletti. Not in paragraph 2?

2 Mr. Goldsmith. Had not the information contained in  
3 paragraph 2, would you have gone to Karamessines?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. Proably not.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Would Karamessines be apprised of every  
6 situation where the CIA was taking action with regard to an  
7 American abroad?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. No, probably not.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. It would not be standard operating  
10 procedure to notify someone such as Karamessines in cases where  
11 the Agency was going to take further action in regard to an  
12 American abroad?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. In 1963?

14 Mr. Goldsmith. 1963?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. In 1963 I don't believe so.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. How many people actually worked on the  
17 cable that appears in CIA Number 179? In other words, you  
18 wrote it but how many people were actually involved?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. One in what is now "SB" Division, Soviet  
20 Branch. One in CIA Staff, two in CIA Staff and a Branch Chief.  
21 These people have the right to change a cable.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. By "these people" you are referring to  
23 the initiating officer?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes, and authenticating officer. If  
25 they had changed the message they would have changed it and

001740

TOP SECRET

1 they initial on the side. If there is a major revision at  
2 either of these levels it can be sent back for a complete  
3 retyping.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. How many of these people were actually  
5 involved in the substance of writing the cable?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. Probably myself and Mrs. Egeter and  
7 possibly Rowe in SB Division. Since there is very little to  
8 do about the Soviets here, there is not a lot of bio on the  
9 Soviet, my feeling is that SR, this is counterintelligence  
10 section, they probably had some role in assessing whether this  
11 could possibly be a serious matter or not.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. Was it common for that many people to be  
13 involved in the writing and reviewing of a cable?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. Sometimes you have many more. The  
15 rule of thumb is anybody who has any interest in any cable  
16 gets their name on it.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you now please read CIA Number  
18 785?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. All right.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you identify that document?

21 Mrs. Scaletti. I have just read Directive 7467 --  
22 I can't read it. It is 3 I believe. Your code is Number 785.  
23 Your document.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. When I asked you to identify it, what is  
25 that cable?

1 Mrs. Scaletti. This is nto a cable. This is an out  
2 teletype to the Department of State, the FBI, and Navy which  
3 sends electrically to those three other government agencies  
4 basic information received from Mexico in our name trace on  
5 Oswald..

6 Mr. Goldsmith. What was the purpose of sending the  
7 teletype?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. The purpose of the teletype was to notify  
9 basically the FBI because it is an American, it is a CI case.  
10 The Navy and State Department because here you have an ex-Navy  
11 man I believe and soembody whom the Department has reported.  
12 This man is of interest to the Navy and State Department and  
13 the FBI just for the security of the United States it is  
14 important to notify all those government agencies.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. Who wrote this particular teletype?

16 Mrs. Scarletti. I did.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. This was done after having reviewed Oswald's  
18 201 file, is that correct?

19 Mrs. Scarletti. It would have been written at the same  
20 time the cable to Mexico was written in all likelihood.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. In light of the fact that the cable to  
22 Mexico City and this dissemination teletype to the other  
23 government agencies were both written at the same time, I think  
24 if we refer to the time on these documents it would indicate  
25 that they were moreorless simultaneous, can you explain why

001742

TOP SECRET

1 the cable to Mexico City contained a relatively accurate  
2 description of Oswald whereas the teletype to the government  
3 agencies does not contain an accurate description of Oswald?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. What do you mean by accurate?

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Let us go over it.

6 Mr. Scaletti. It is just a synopsis. Number one, you  
7 are not going to send the Department of State information to  
8 the FBI and the Navy. That is number one. So all that detailed  
9 information we sent to Mexico City station we did not tell  
10 them to pass it locally and we are not going to pass it locally.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. I am not talking now about the detailed  
12 information regarding Oswald's background. I am talking now  
13 about the description of his physical characteristics.

14 Paragraph 1 of the cable to Mexico City contains a  
15 general description of Oswald that is more or less accurate.

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Paragraph 1 of the cable to Mexico City  
17 gives the physical description of Lee Henry Oswald who is the  
18 subject of 201, 289, 248. Paragraph 1 of the teletype did  
19 not include -- gave the bio but not physical description,  
20 which is more important really, and what we gave the Navy was  
21 the information from our sources on the person we thought could  
22 have been Oswald, but we did not repeat for them what would be  
23 a physical description. It would not have been normal unless  
24 the Navy had come back and said "look, we have a file on  
25 Oswald. Now, do you have such and such a description?"

1 This is strictly for the investigative use of the  
2 station.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. When you say this you are now referring  
4 to paragraph 1 of CIA number 179?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. Right. Let us start over again. The  
6 actual physical description on Lee Henry Oswald from your cable  
7 numbered 179 was sent to the station to assist them in further  
8 investigation to see if they knew of anybody or had anybody  
9 down there that really fitted what we thought was an accurate  
10 physical description of the Oswald that we had a file on.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that.

12 Mrs. Scaletti. When we came to document number 785,  
13 the teletype to State, FBI and Navy, we did not, and I would  
14 not normally even today, provide those investigative agencies  
15 with the physical description of Lee Henry Oswald as we thought  
16 it to be then.

17 We provided them only with our intelligence, not with  
18 State Department intelligence which gave the stuff out of the  
19 audio and the possible physical description. The wording here  
20 in paragraph 1 on our teletype shown in document 785 is worded  
21 that the American was described.

22 As I told your man from your Committee earlier, it  
23 possibly would have been better, although it did not occur to  
24 me at the time and this is the way those things were written in  
25 those times, to say that an American described as this could

1 possibly be identifiable and qualified but the normal procedure  
2 in 1963 was to provide to the other government agencies infor-  
3 mation and intelligence from our sources.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. Whereas the information contained in  
5 paragraph 1 of CIA document number 179 was not from your source?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. Was not our source, was not our informa-  
7 tion.

8 Mr. Goldsmith. Now, paragraph 1 of CIA number 785 does  
9 not contain any language or qualification indicating that?

10 Mrs. Scaletti. I agree with that.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. It is only an indication that it was  
12 possibly Oswald or this was possibly his description?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. Or possibly not. I agree with that.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. Why wouldn't the teletype indicate that  
15 the description that you gave was not consistent with the  
16 description that you had in your files from these other  
17 agencies?

18 Mrs. Scarlett. I don't know why.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. Were you aware when you sent out the  
20 cable and the teletype that you were giving different descrip-  
21 tions?

22 Mrs. Scarlett. Yes. I assume I was. I don't remember  
23 now. This is some time.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. By the manner in which the language is  
25 displayed in the first paragraph in document 785 does that

1 suggest to you that in fact when you received the cable from  
2 Mexico City you did link the photograph referred to in that  
3 cable to Lee Harvey Oswald?

4 Mrs. Scarlett. It would appear that I did.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Was there any intention on your part to  
6 deceive any other agencies by giving a description contained  
7 in that paragraph in the teletype?

8 Mrs. Scarlett. None at all. The point is that we  
9 considered the basic information to be taking place at birth,  
10 not a physical description which can change. As a matter of  
11 fact, we tried to go overboard. As you already have pointed  
12 out, this tation did not even ask for a trace but as soon as  
13 we got this we immediately sent it out hoping to get a response.  
14 We gave it to the field. I can honestly say there was cer-  
15 tainly no intention to keep anything or to hide anything. We  
16 were trying to put something forth and see what the other  
17 agencies could do.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever get any response from the  
19 other agencies regarding Oswald?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. Not that I recall. What was the date  
21 of our teletype out to the other government agencies?

22 Mr. Goldsmith. 10 October 1963.

23 Mrs. Scaletti. So there was certainly no delay on our  
24 part in getting that material out.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. That is correct. The information contained



1 in paragraph 2 of the teletype would also seem to have been  
2 obtained from another agency. Therefore, why didn't the third  
3 agency rule preclude you from communicating that information?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. You can put a few sentences like we gave  
5 to the field to give to the other government agencies.

6 This was sent to the Department of State.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. It was sent to the FBI, too?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know. This would have been  
9 cleared with the CIA Staff which is responsible for the third  
10 agency rule. You can see it is only a five line synopsis with  
11 no detail.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. It still would have been obtained from  
13 third agency sources?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. Right. Just like we gave one sentence  
15 to Mexico City to alert other government agencies without  
16 passing the document. I am sure this must have been in dis-  
17 cussion with the CIA Staff as to how much we thought we should  
18 pass out. We cannot give nothing because how are you going to  
19 identify to the Department of State or Navy, here is somebody  
20 who might be identifiable with somebody in your records?

21 You don't want to say just look at your records. You  
22 find that unfortunately if you tell the Navy that if you want  
23 any more information on Oswald go to the Department of State,  
24 then you have to say if you go to the Department of State you  
25 had better ask for records on Lee Henry Oswald who was born on.

1 such and such a date in such and such a place, otherwise they  
2 don't know how to ask for that.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. Incidentally, you have been referring to  
4 Oswald as Lee Henry Oswald and the cable refers to him as Lee  
5 Henry Oswald. In fact the 201 file refers to him as Lee Henry  
6 Oswald. Do you know why the file would have been referring to  
7 him as Lee Henry Oswald instead of Lee Harvy Oswald?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. If I mentioned Lee Harvey it is because  
9 I am brain washed with all the events. But the Lee Henry, we  
10 generally will put in a cable the name as the 201 is opened.  
11 So, my only guess is that the basic documents from the Depart-  
12 ment of State or from somebody in that 201 file probably said  
13 his name was Lee Henry Oswald.

14 Until you find a cause or reason to change the name you  
15 leave a file in whatever name it is opened. Then you would  
16 later on amend it and correct the file.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Before we refer to these documents from  
18 the State Department that apparently led to the opening of  
19 Oswald's 201 file, let me ask you this general question. If  
20 you were to run a name trace on Lee Harvey Oswald in the CIA  
21 indices --

22 Mrs. Scaletti. Today?

23 Mr. Goldsmith. If you had run one in 1963 on Lee Harvey  
24 Oswald, would you have received a reference to a file on Lee  
25 Henry Oswald?

001748

TOP SECRET

1 Mrs. Scaletti. Very possibly. They are pretty good about  
2 that. But in 1963 I think we had to do our own. I might even  
3 have done some of that searching myself. Today it is auto-  
4 matic, you are not allowed to do your own name traces. In  
5 1963 sometimes you would do your own name trace. It was up to  
6 you to look far enough.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. It is possible in 1963 if you looked up  
8 Oswald, Lee Harvey, you might miss Lee Henry?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. Right. I would look enough to the Lee  
10 Oswald. If you saw Henry and you saw Harvey and they both had  
11 the same birth date you would pick it out and see that there  
12 was a mistake.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. What I meant was if you did a name trace  
14 on Lee Harvey and you saw Lee Henry and didn't check, it would  
15 be possible for you to miss it entirely?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. It would be possible. With your good  
17 checker, especially if there is some identifying data on the  
18 card, you would pull -- lots of times you pull many variations.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. The reason I ask the question is fairly  
20 obviously. The suggestion has certainly been made by virtue of  
21 this information being released to the public, the suggestion  
22 has been made that by opening the file in the name of Lee Henry  
23 Oswald if someone wanted to do a name trace on Lee Harvey  
24 Oswald they would miss that person and for some reason they may  
25 have had the tendency to have that name Lee Harvey Oswald over-

1 looked for whatever reason.

2 Mrs. Scaletti. The only thing I can say is that it is  
3 standard procedure to open up a file and register it in the  
4 first name that becomes available. I am not saying what was  
5 done in the case of Mr. Lee Harvey Oswald. This is the normal  
6 procedure. The normal procedure is as other names, which are  
7 a variety of that, come up cross reference cards are placed  
8 in the system. So that possibly until it is determined for  
9 sure that Lee Harvey is correct that might appear in the file as  
10 a cross reference alias to Lee Henry, in which case under Lee  
11 Henry you would have a cross index card listing the alias,  
12 "see also Lee Harvey", which would mean that you would have to  
13 do name traces under Lee Harvey.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to show you CIA number 822  
15 which is a list of American defectors which had been provided  
16 to the Agency by the State Department. On the list is Lee  
17 Harvey Oswald. According to testimony received by the Committee  
18 that letter and the attached list is what led to the opening  
19 of Oswald's 201 file. It refers to him by his name in the  
20 correct manner, Lee Harvey Oswald, and not Lee Henry Oswald.  
21 That is why there is a question as to why the file was opened  
22 in the name of Lee Henry Oswald.

23 Mrs. Scaletti. I would have no idea about that. The  
24 only thing I can point out and put in the record is that unless  
25 one has worked with name trace indices one has no comprehension

1 of the variety of the way names app-ar and are spelled and are  
2 taken off records. It just boggles the mind on how anybody  
3 finds anything sometimes.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. The issue I am concerned with is whether  
5 by opening the file under Lee Henry Oswald it would have been  
6 possible to in effect hide the information that the Agency has  
7 on Lee Harvey Oswald.

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I would say there was no idea of any  
9 birth date or there was an eroneous birth date which would make  
10 you look at the card and say "this could not be the same  
11 because this man is older than this person." A good name  
12 tracer prob dly would come up with all the references.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. If the Mexico City station was aware of  
14 the fact that Oswald had also contacted the Cuban Embassy and  
15 that he was requesting a visa, should that information have been  
16 communicated?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. Could you repeat that?

18 Mr. Goldsmith. If Mexico City station was aware that  
19 Oswald in addition to contacting the Soviet Embassy had also  
20 contacted the Cuban Embassy and that with regard to his contacts  
21 at each Embassy was requesting a visa, should that information  
22 have been passed along to the Mexican Desk as requested by the  
23 cable from headquarters to Mexico City station?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. It probably should have but it probably  
25 not necessarily would have been because the same poeple do not

1 read that traffic. In other words, the people who listen to  
2 the Cuban things would not have known anything about the Soviet  
3 traffic. They would not have known anything about Lee Harvey  
4 Oswald.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Assuming that the people at the Mexico  
6 City station knew of these contacts at the Cuban Embassy and  
7 of the fact that Oswald was requesting a visa, in other words,  
8 assuming that the person who sent the original cable to head-  
9 quarters reporting Oswald's contact with the Soviet Embassy,  
10 assuming that person very shortly afterwards found out about  
11 the contact with the Cuban Embassy and about Oswald's request  
12 for a visa, should that person have sent that information to  
13 headquarters in compliance with the request in the headquarters  
14 cable for further information on Oswald?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. I think that would be expected.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. What would you have done had you received  
17 that information?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. I probably would have jogged our memory  
19 again and we might have gone back out to the Department of  
20 State or FBI and said "Look, here is this man again, he is  
21 showing up. Now let us know what you have."

22 Mr. Goldsmith. The FBI and the State Department would  
23 have been notified?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. We would have gone back and referred  
25 to our original out message and also maybe there would have been

1 additional information coming in on the contact with the  
2 Dubans which would have made us feel that either the physical  
3 description was not right or we might have more bio, or whatever.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. When was the next time after you sent a  
5 cable to Mexico City station and you teletyped these other  
6 agencies, when was the next time you heard of Lee Harvey  
7 Oswald?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't remember. The only thing I can  
9 say is that based on what is in the file that I must have heard  
10 about it when the station came in and asked -- well, if there  
11 was nothing else in the file the name popped up again, I just  
12 don't remember about the assassination or whenever.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Would the testimony be that to the best  
14 of your recollection the next time you heard the name was when  
15 you heard about the assassination?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Probably.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. At that time did the name Oswald ring a  
18 bell? Did you remember the earlier cable traffic about him?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. I just don't know. When he was assassi-  
20 nated, I don't even remember how long it was before they go the  
21 name of Oswald.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Oswald was picked up within two hours  
23 after the assassination and the name was made public.

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Immediately?

25 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

001753

1 Mrs. Scaletti. If I were in the office unless I had the  
2 radio on -- we didn't have a radio in the office necessarily  
3 -- I would not have heard the name Oswald until the next day  
4 probably. I would assume this was a little bit unusual, I  
5 might have tied it in. I am sure the first thing they would  
6 have done is make a name trace when they came up with that  
7 name and they would come up with a 201 file all over again.

8 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall where you were on Friday,  
9 November 22, 1963?

10 Mrs. Scaletti. The only thing I remember about it is  
11 going home and finding my husband sitting in front of the TV  
12 and talking about it. I probably was at the office but I  
13 don't remember anything. I blanked out. I must have been at  
14 the office.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you remember bringing Jack Whitten the  
16 Oswald file on that day?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. I wouldn't remember that. If he had  
18 asked for it I probably did. It would have been natural for me  
19 to if I did. I just don't know.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever find a photograph of Lee  
21 Harvey Oswald at CIA headquarters?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't remember ever finding an Oswald  
23 photograph.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Right around the time of the assassination?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't remember it.

001754



1 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you find a photograph of someone  
2 whom you thought to be Lee Harvey Oswald?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't remember that either.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know Phillip Agee?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. What is your opinion of his reputation  
7 for veracity?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. You mean in the book or just in person?

9 Mr. Goldsmith. As a person.

10 Mrs. Scaletti. I think Phil had lots of problems. I  
11 certainly think he is capable of exaggerating. I certainly  
12 think he is capable -- talking about the book or as a person,  
13 I think he plunges into things, thinks they will be great and  
14 then he is disillusioned and things never turned out the way  
15 he thinks they are going to and he is dissatisfied. I am talk-  
16 ing about personal setbacks. I don't think he is quite capable  
17 of handling things.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. In terms of telling the truth do you think  
19 he generally tells the truth or not?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. I would probably say that sometimes he  
21 thinks he does but I don't think he necessarily always does.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever know a CIA employee named  
23 Joseph Smith?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. What is your opinion of his reputation?

1 Mrs. Scaletti. I didn't know Joe as much as I knew Phil.  
2 I might guess possibly that Joe might have his feet more soundly  
3 on the ground than Phil. This is just off the top of my head.  
4 I only knew him in the office and very superficially, Joe  
5 Smith.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever tell Joe Smith or Phillip  
7 Agee that you had found a photograph of Oswald or someone you  
8 thought to be Oswald?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. I did not know Joseph Smith in Mexico  
10 City. I had never seen Joe except at the station in Mexico  
11 City and Phil I only saw when I was in Mexico. I would have  
12 no reason to say that.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. So your answer to the question is no?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't recall it and I don't see that I  
15 would have any reason.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. I guess for the purpose of clarification  
17 I would like to ask the question one more time. Did you ever  
18 tell Phillip Agee or Joseph Smith that you found a picture of  
19 Oswald or someone whom you thought to be Oswald?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. Not that I can recall.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. After the assassination of the President  
22 did you have any responsibility with regard to the Oswald file?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't believe so.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you work with Jacke Whitten at all on  
25 the investigation of the assassination?

001756

TOP SECRET

1 Mrs. Scaletti. No. Not that I recall. I think that  
2 was taken away from the branch immediately.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. Will you please read CIA number 246?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. Right. I wrote that.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. What is the date of that?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. 18 May 1967.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. That pertains to Oswald?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I wrote a dispatch on 18 May 1967  
9 requesting the station to forward any photographs that they  
10 have. I don't remember this.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. Would the fact that you wrote that help  
12 refresh your recollection at all as to whether you worked on  
13 the Oswald case after the assassination?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. The only thing I can remember is that I  
15 was not a member of any task force. Somebody could have said  
16 "Charlotte write this," and I could have written it.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. In terms of responsibility for the Oswald  
18 file did you have any responsibility for that after the assassi-  
19 nation?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. I would say that the desk might have had  
21 responsibility until it was turned over to a task force, not  
22 necessarily myself.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. At the time of the assassination the file  
24 was at the Mexico Desk, is that right?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. It may not have been. It could have been

001757

TOP SECRET

1 returned to where it was where I got it from. We do not keep  
2 all the files like that, necessarily. I could have kept the  
3 file pending a reply or further investigation but that is not  
4 necessarily normal. I generally keep a copy of my cables just  
5 until I get further --

6 Mr. Goldsmith. In fact, according to the Agency's records  
7 the file was on the Mexico Desk at the time of the assassination.

8 Mrs. Scaletti. It was just waiting then for a reply.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Was there anything unusual about its  
10 being at the Mexico Desk at that time?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. No, because we had written correspondence  
12 on it. Either we can hold the file until anything else comes  
13 in or we can send it back and when we get material we can send  
14 it on. There is nothing unusual about that. In those days  
15 we were more apt to keep files than we are in these days.  
16 They try to keep them down in the central repository.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether the Mexico City station  
18 station ever obtained a photograph of Oswald?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. No, I do not.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether they ever obtained a  
21 tape recording of his voice? Let me rephrase that. At the  
22 time of the assassination do you know whether they had a tape  
23 recording of his voice?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know and they would have if they  
25 kept the tapes but they normally do not keep those tapes on the

001758

1 tap.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. What is done with the tapes?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. They are erased.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. Why are they erased?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. They erase them because they need them.

6 They extract from them what they feel is pertinent and then  
7 they are kept a certain -- at that time they were kept a  
8 certain amount of time, I don't know how much it was, a week or  
9 two weeks, in case somebody decided they wanted to keep on  
10 for the record. But they had to resue these tapes.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. As a matter of routine?

12 Mrs. Scaletti. As a matter of routine.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. This dispatch con-ained in CIA number  
14 246 with regard to the photograph of the man who had been seen  
15 leaving the Embassy, was the agency concerned about the par-  
16 ticular photograph?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes, because you can tell from the way it  
18 was written.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know why the Agency was concerned  
20 about these photographs?

21 Mrs. Scaletti. To see if they could clarify whether it  
22 was Oswald or was not who had gone in.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. This is 1967. By then they should have  
24 clarified that issue, I would think. Was there any other reason  
25 why the Agency would have been concerned about that?

001759

TOP SECRET

1 Mrs. Scaletti. Somebody must have said, "Look, we never  
2 got an answer to that," or "let us see what they have", or  
3 something. Somebody must have been doing a file review or  
4 something. It says here "The recent reopening of publicity  
5 regarding Oswald and Agency evidence, headquarters would like  
6 to determine:..." Apparently somebody did a name trace. They  
7 were asked to look something up and they could not find it.  
8 We had to go to the station to see if the station still had  
9 negatives. Most of this information was held at the station  
10 and was never sent to Washington.

11 This is a dispatch going out to Mexico asking if they  
12 have something in their files.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Let us look at CIA number 197. Will you  
14 please read the second paragraph? It is to the Director from  
15 Mexico City.

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Okay, I have read paragraph 2 of 197.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Does that paragraph suggest to you that at  
18 the time of the assassination the Mexico City station still had  
19 at least one tape of Oswald's voice? In other words, the  
20 paragraph does not say that both tapes had been erased. It  
21 says one was erased.

22 Mrs. Scaletti. This was 23 November. When was the  
23 assassination?

24 Mr. Goldsmith. 22 November.

25 Mrs. Scaletti. This was the day after the assassination.

1 It says "station unable to confirm first tape erased prior to  
2 second call." The second call was 28 September. No, it does  
3 not necessarily mean that they had the second tape in hand on  
4 23 November. They were only saying that before 28 September  
5 telephone call they had erased the tape from the first call.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. The sequence of the calls was one on  
7 September 22, one on September 28 and one on October 1.

8 Mrs. Scaletti. The first tape was erased before the  
9 second tape came in. That is why they didn't compare those  
10 two voices. It does not say they had a tape in hand.

11 Mr. Goldsmith. Really it does not say that but a person  
12 sending a cable --

13 Mrs. Scaletti. I would not interpret it that way.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. I am not suggesting we are necessarily  
15 giving it that interpretation. It gives rise to the possi-  
16 bility of that interpretation because the person sending the  
17 cable did not say all tapes are erased. It says "Unable to make  
18 voice comparison as first tape erased prior to receipt of  
19 second call."

20 Mrs. Scaletti. I was taking at face value the person  
21 is saying that we did not compare the voices because when we  
22 got the call on the second one we didn't have the first one to  
23 compare it or the transcriber did not have the first one.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Could you look at CIA number 208?  
25 Would you read the fourth paragraph?

001761

1 Mrs. Scaletti. That indicates that the transcriber  
2 believed that the two people were identical.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. Does that suggest to you that after the  
4 assassination the transcriber made a voice comparison?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. How could he make that determination?

7 Mrs. Scaletti. When you work with these transcribers,  
8 in no matter what language, to get this they replay and replay  
9 some of these conversations. They know the people who talk all  
10 the time, they can tell by their voice. They have an exceed-  
11 ingly good ear. This happens quite frequently, this is not  
12 infrequent, where a transcriber will say "look, the person I  
13 heard today I know is the same person who called in last week"  
14 or something like that. This is what they do. They train their  
15 ears and they live by their ability to identify voices, accents.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. After the assassination would all the  
17 Mexico City files pertaining to Oswald have been sent to head-  
18 quarters?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. Headquarters would not as a matter of  
21 routine have requested all that information?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know what they did. You don't  
23 ask for the entire file. They were working with the file there.  
24 They would have been doing the investigation. What would be  
25 normal I would think would be for the station to review its



1 files to see if there was anything pertinent that had not been  
2 sent to headquarters but I do not think it would be logical for  
3 them to send the file. This is my own impression and this is  
4 what I would feel would be the case.

5 But if they sent the file they would have nothing left  
6 on which to base further investigation.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Well, after the investigation had been  
8 completed would the file have been sent to headquarters?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. Probably not. They probably would have  
10 just -- as things occurred the pertinent matters would have come  
11 by cable or dispatch to Washington. I believe it was sent  
12 subsequently because I was in the field, we did a purging of  
13 the files because the files were voluminous, and I believe we  
14 sent Oswald's file to Washington.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. This is when you were in Mexico City?

16 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. During what years were you in Mexico  
18 City?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. '67 to '72. I could be wrong but I  
20 believe it was at that time we sent the file up.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Turning back for a moment to the surveil-  
22 lance operations in Mexico City, do you know how many telephones  
23 were under electronic surveillance at the Cuban compound in  
24 1963?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. I would have known in 1963. I can give

001763

TOP SECRET

1 you a ball park guess like three to five.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know specifically whether the  
3 Cuban Conulate's phone was tapped?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. I would say in all likelihood.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. A moment ago you mentioned the purging of  
6 files. I certainly do not mean to take that out of context.  
7 I understand what you are saying, they are voluminous files in  
8 Mexico City, particularly I imagine in Mr. Win Scott's station,  
9 and you were cleaning out the files as a matter of routine pro-  
10 cedure. Do you know whether in your experience with the CIA  
11 files were ever purged, removed or doctored out of the ordinary  
12 course of business?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. No, I do not.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. In other words, for deception purposes?

15 Mrs. Scaletti. As a matter of fact, we were extremely  
16 careful to make sure that every document was looked at and  
17 cross references were made or abstracts were made. We did not  
18 throw away complete things without processing every paper to  
19 make sure it was of value or not.

20 Mr. Goldsmith. To your knowledge there was never any  
21 incidents of purging of files in the ordinary course of  
22 business?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

24 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know what the term CI/SIG stands  
25 for?

001764

TOP SECRET

1 Mrs. Scaletti. It is a special office within the CI  
2 Staff.

3 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know what function of the group  
4 is?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. Was that Mrs. Egeter?

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes, it was.

7 Mrs. Scaletti. It is a secret group. We never knew what  
8 went on down there.

9 Mr. Goldsmith. How many units were there in the CI  
10 Staff ?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't remember how many there were. I  
12 can tell you the ones I knew were there.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Can you tell me which ones were there?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. CI OA, the place where we got our  
15 clearances. We had CI R&A which did some research.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. That was research and analysis?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. Can you tell me what each one was involved  
19 in doing?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. CI R&A. CI/SIG, CI liaison.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. What about CI -- did you say IO?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. What was the first one you mentioned with  
24 regard to getting your clearance?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. CI OA.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. What does the OA stand for?

2 Mrs. Scaletti. Operational Approval I believe. But this  
3 is what I remember because the names change and the number of  
4 offices changed.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever work for CI/SIG?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. Never.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether CI/SIG would ever  
8 have been involved in opening up the 201 files?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. They could have. Probably did.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you say that CI/SIG was a parti-  
11 cularly secretive unit of the CI Staff?

12 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know. All I know is that they  
13 had special files down there. If you would go down there a  
14 lot of times they would not want to give them to you, they would  
15 let you read certain things. We never asked that many questions  
16 of them. We didn't have much contact at all.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to show you CIA Number 788.  
18 Will you please examine that document?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. I see it. 788 is a normal routine file  
20 opening form.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Whos is the subject of this particular  
22 opening?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. The subject of the opening is Lee Henry  
24 Oswald.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. On the upper left hand corner of the page

1 it says "to headquarters, RI". Do you know what the RI would  
2 have stood for?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. That is the main file room. That is a  
4 preprinted form.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. In the middle of the page where it  
6 indicates other identification it is written in --

7 Mrs. Scaletti. Here or this part?

8 Mr. Goldsmith. Here. It indicates other identification.  
9 It is written in "AG". Do you know what AG would stand for?

10 Mrs. Scaletti. No. There is a whole pamphlet either on  
11 the back of this or regulations which tells you how to fill  
12 out all these. It is very complicated. They assign certain  
13 symbols that mean certain things. If you don't remember you  
14 hope somebody else does.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. Does your handwriting appear anywhere on  
16 this page?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. My handwriting does not appear on 788.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. Could you now read Commission Exhibit  
19 197?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. I read this document. I have looked at  
21 this document.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Would the information contained in that  
23 document normally have led to the opening of the 201 file?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. I cannot tell. This was not my responsi-  
25 bility. I wouldn't have found it necessary because I had

1 nothing to do with US citizens.

2 Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that. I am not suggesting  
3 at all that that document with the information contained in it  
4 was your responsibility. I am asking now, based on your  
5 experience of over 25 years with the Agency, would the informa-  
6 tion contained in that file normally as a matter of routine  
7 operating procedure have led to the opening of the 201 file?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I would say no. It might have been  
9 indexed.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. Why would you say no?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. Because there is hardly anything here.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. It indicates that someone is defecting  
13 and is going to offer military or has offered military informa-  
14 tion to the Soviets.

15 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. But you can retrieve it with an  
16 index card. Why open a folder? You open a file if you are  
17 going to gether material on it. Now, this would be the basis  
18 for opening a 201 file. If you did a name trace in central  
19 registry and you found 10 or 15 other documents on this same  
20 man. Then you would open the 201 with this document and put  
21 copies of the other document in there and there you would have  
22 a folder on this man. If there was nothing, just by itself  
23 with no other reason, if you were interested in US citizens  
24 who were going to renounce their US citizenship the most I  
25 would do would be to index it.

001768

1 Mr. Goldsmith. If I were to go to the Agency today and  
2 ask them how many documents they had, if any, on Oswald, when  
3 this particular cable came in, would they have that kind of  
4 information?

5 Mrs. Scaletti. No, I don't think so because the documents  
6 they would have by date but they would not know what date they  
7 might have received it. Now, I am sure they received a lot  
8 on Oswald dated way back but they don't necessarily date time  
9 stamp them in. Even one of those name trace forms would not  
10 necessarily -- I mean that is what they would tell you from  
11 registry if that is what came in. I don't see what they could  
12 tell you what they had available.

13 Everything is now on the computer. You would have to ask  
14 a computer expert in registry. I think you would be barking up  
15 the wrong tree.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. If someone were working as an agent, asset  
17 or source at the CIA would there be any indication to that effect  
18 effect in the person's 201 file?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. You mean if he were an agent of ours?

20 Mr. Goldsmith. An agent, source, asset?

21 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. Would that always be indicated?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. The only time it may not be the case, if  
24 a person were a casual informant of a chief of station or a case  
25 officer overseas but that would not be a real agent relationship.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. As a matter of normal procedure a 201  
2 file would indicate that a person was an agent, an asset or  
3 source?

4 Mrs. Scaletti. You are not supposed to use anybody as  
5 an agent without getting clearance which requires form after  
6 form and they all go into a folder.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. That goes to the Security office?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. No, it goes into the 201 file. You mean  
9 what we call an agent or what the press calls an agent?

10 Mr. Goldsmith. I think the press would refer to a case  
11 officer as an agent. I do not use that terminology.

12 Mrs. Scaletti. I am responding the way you --

13 Mr. Goldsmith. The case officer gets an agent out in the  
14 field.

15 Mrs. Scaletti. His 201 file has copies of all those  
16 documents. You have to request a 201. You have to get your  
17 clearance. You have to do your name traces. There are a lot  
18 of things involved. Copies of all that go into the 201.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. The file, for example, would have an  
20 indication that operational approval had been granted?

21 Mrs. Scaletti. Or requested and denied.

22 Mr. Goldsmith. In normal cases then the 201 file if the  
23 person was an agent would indicate that?

24 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. Would there necessarily be a 201 file on



1 a person who was an agent?

2 Mrs. Scaletti. I would say I have nev er known anybody  
3 who was an agent who did not have a 201 file. I will put it  
4 that way.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Would the 201 file contain information  
6 pertaining to the individual's operational activity?

7 Mrs. Scaletti. Not necessarily.

8 Mr. Goldsmith. Where would that information be contained?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. In the project.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. In the project file?

11 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

12 Mr. Goldsmith. If you wanted to find out all the projects  
13 that a particular individual had been involved in, assuming you  
14 had a need to know, you are the Director.

15 Mrs. Scaletti. If I were the Director you would turn that  
16 place over, you would have thousands and thousands-of man year.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. You could not, for example, just get out  
18 of the file of that individual a list of all his projects?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. No. Some people are very careful and  
20 they keep all this in a file. Some people don't. All the  
21 budgeting and reporting on activities comes in by project, not  
22 by man.

23 Now, you could possibly do research by getting the first  
24 time he requested and try to get a cryptonum. Then you can  
25 track this, track that but I tell you --

001771

TOP SECRET

1 Mr. Goldsmith. If you had the cryptonum would that not  
2 refer you to all the person's projects?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. No, because you could use an old crypto-  
4 nym and keep it on even though he is on different projects  
5 that don't have a cryptonym.

6 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you have any reason to believe that  
7 Oswald may have been a KGB agent?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. That is what probably came to my mind  
9 when I read the information that he was in the Soviet Union  
10 and came out with a wife and then he was in contact with the  
11 Soviets in Mexico because that would be standard operating  
12 procedure for the Soviets to meet someone in Mexico. That is  
13 the only reason I would have believed so.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you have any reason to believe that  
15 Oswald had any type of relationship with the Central Intelli-  
16 gence Agency?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. No, none whatsoever.

18 Mr. Goldsmith. When you had access to Oswald's 201  
19 file you saw no indication in there that he had any type of  
20 relationship with the Agency as an agent, source, asset, et  
21 cetera?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. No, none whatsoever. There certainly  
23 would not have gone out all this cable traffic if anybody along  
24 the way had known he was an asset. You would not have gone out  
25 with traces and things.

001772

TOP SECRET

1 Mr. Goldsmith. If he was an agent would you have noti-  
2 fied the Mexico City station?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

4 Mr. Goldsmith. Would that normally be done as a matter  
5 of standard operating procedure?

6 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes. Then somebody would be very upset  
7 that it was an agent in Mexico without telling the Chief of  
8 Station because the Chief of Station is responsible for all  
9 operational activities in his area.

10 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether the Mexico City  
11 station was ev er criticized for failing to obtain a photograph  
12 of Oswald during his stay there?

13 Mrs. Scaletti. No, I don't.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you think it is unusual that Oswald  
15 after having made five or six visits to the Soviet and Cuban  
16 compounds managed to avoid being photographed?

17 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know whether you can say he  
18 managed to avoid being photographed. What you can say is that  
19 we have not found a photograph or we don't believe we have  
20 found a photograph. Also, the photographic LPs are not 24  
21 hour a day operations. Sometime the person maybe goes to the  
22 bathroom or they miss something or the person comes in early  
23 or a person comes in late or you just get a shot, it is the  
24 back.

25 Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that. We have a situation

001773

TOP SECRET

1 where Oswald made five or six visits at least. Apparently  
2 he was never photographed.

3 Mrs. Scaletti. Then if he was not photographed, he was  
4 not photographed.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. I understand. Do you think that it is  
6 unusual that the Agency station would have gone on for so long  
7 with regard to Mr. Oswald?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know. I would say I would have  
9 thought the likelihood -- if I had gotten all the take from all  
10 the people, because the photographic LPs sometimes did not  
11 give you all the photographs that were taken, they would give  
12 you what they got -- but if you got every negative from every  
13 shot from every camera during those times I would have thought  
14 you would have had a photograph. What you might have had were  
15 shots that were blurred or backs of heads or something that  
16 you could not identify.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether Oswald was ever  
18 debriefed by the CIA when he returned from the Soviet Union?

19 Mrs. Scaletti. I have no way of knowing that. I have  
20 no reason to think he was.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Would it have been standard operating  
22 procedure to have interviewed him, debriefed him?

23 Mrs. Scaletti. That has nothing to do with the DDO. What  
24 section would do that I have no idea. Besides, that would be  
25 the Soviet Branch. We wouldn't have had anything to do with it.

001774

TOP SECRET

1 Mr. Goldsmith. I am talking about based on your experi-  
2 ence at the Agency. Apparently he would have been someone of  
3 interest. He worked at a radio factory while he was in Russia.

4 Mrs. Scaletti. I don't know how much about how the  
5 Soviet Branch handled it. What they were interested in. I  
6 really cannot answer that.

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know the name of Alexis Davison?

8 Mrs. Scaletti. Alexis?

9 Mr. Goldsmith. Alexis.

10 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

11 Mr. Goldsmith.

12 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Precilla Johnson McMillan?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

15 Mr. Goldsmith.

16 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

17 Mr. Goldsmith. George DeMoreschild?

18 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

19 Mr. Goldsmith. J. Walton Moore?

20 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

21 Mr. Goldsmith. Morris Bishop?

22 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

23 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether David Phillops ever  
24 used the name of Morris Bishop as an operational alias?

25 Mrs. Scaletti. I have no way of knowing.

1 Mr. Goldsmith. Have you ever used any operational  
2 aliases?

3 Mrs. Scaletti. I guess so. Not a regular one with any  
4 particular person.

5 Mr. Goldsmith. Let me ask you this then, again based  
6 on your general experience with the Agency. Is it customary  
7 for someone over the years to use many different operational  
8 aliases, as many as a 100, for example?

9 Mrs. Scaletti. A 100 sounds like an awful lot. Some  
10 people could change. It depends on the sensitivity of the place  
11 or how small it is. You could use the same operational alias  
12 with three or four people or you could change operational  
13 aliaes with every single person.

14 Mr. Goldsmith. If you changed it for every single person  
15 you would have a tough time remembering which one you used for  
16 which particular individual.

17 Mrs. Scaletti. No, you really wouldn't because, don't  
18 forget, it is like handling members of your family. If it is  
19 a surveillance team of course you would use one name with ten  
20 or 15 people, whoever is on the team. Say you handle ten  
21 people with an alias. That is just like talking to ten of  
22 your children. You are not going to forget that.

23 A lot of times it is only a first name alias. Then when  
24 you move to a different city or different station either you  
25 can use the same alia all over again with different people or

001776

1 you can use a new alias. These are people you are talking  
2 to every single day. It is not like remembering "gee, what did  
3 I call myself four months ago when I talked to so and so."

4 Mr. Goldsmith. I have no further questions. I would  
5 like to thank you very much for giving us this interview time.  
6 We have gone over the hour that I originally anticipated.

7 As I said at the outset the Committee at a hearing nor-  
8 mally gives the witness five minutes to make a statement. This  
9 is not a hearing but if you would like an opportunity to make  
10 a statement at this time, please feel free to do so.

11 Mrs. Scaletti. The only thing I wrote down when I  
12 thought you were a little confused, not confused but I didn't  
13 think you had a real fine appreciation for, was the organiza-  
14 tion of the Agency and how we move around. Why can't I remember  
15 where I sat and who worked with me in '63 versus '65 unless  
16 there is something that happened, like I know maybe where I  
17 sat when I got married or things like that.

18 You can be working on a desk one day and that morning you  
19 are asked to go to another desk or that morning you lose four  
20 people and then you are without somebody and within the last  
21 year when I was back from overseas I sat at the same desk but  
22 I had a couple of different bosses. The desk under me rotated  
23 twice.

24 At one point I only had three people working under me.  
25 Another time I had 20. So it is very, very volatile. It is

001777

TOP SECRET

1 not a set pattern. You may have a slot there but you don't  
2 have the people or then you have the people plus you have  
3 TDY's coming in and out. It is a constantly changing thing.  
4 It is not an easy thing unless somebody has been overseas at  
5 a station which is pretty steady, but at the headquarters jobs  
6 there is an awful lot of movement and a lot of changing. You  
7 are pulled out to go and do a special assignment or you are  
8 asked to write this or somebody down the hall isn't there and  
9 they will drop a file on your desk and say "look, we have to  
10 get a message out on this and please do this."

11 You do it and forget it the next day because you have  
12 handled it because there was a crisis and somebody wanted  
13 something done. It is not a set pattern, it doesn't change for  
14 six months or one year or something like that. There is an  
15 awful lot of change.

16 Mr. Goldsmith. Thank you very much.

17 I would like to add that the entire record of this  
18 deposition will be transcribed and you will be given an oppor-  
19 tunity to sign it and to verify it. Our office will notify you  
20 through the Office of the Legislative Counsel at the CIA and  
21 I would like to state for the record that the court reporter  
22 is to certify that the transcript is a complete, accurate and  
23 true record of all the testimony given here today.

24 (Whereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the deposition was concluded)  
25

001778

TOP SECRET



CERTIFICAT OF NOTARY PUBLIC

1

2 I, Alfred Joseph Lafrance, the officer before whom the

3 foregoing deposition has taken, do hereby certify that the

4 witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was

5 duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken

6 by me in shorthand and to the best of my ability and thereafter

7 reduced in typewriting under my direction, that said deposition

8 is a true record of the testimony given by said witness; that

9 I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the

10 parties to the action in which this deposition was taken; and

11 further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney

12 or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or

13 otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

14

15 \_\_\_\_\_

16 Notary Public in and for  
the District of Columbia

17

18 My Commission expires November 14, 1980.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

001779

CERTIFICAT OF NOTARY PUBLIC

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I, \_\_\_\_\_, the officer before whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears to the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by \_\_\_\_\_, shorthand reporter, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by him or under his direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

001780