



CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM RELEASE IN FULL

CIA HAS NO OBJECTION TO
DECLASSIFICATION AND/OR
RELEASE OF CIA INFORMATION
IN THIS DOCUMENT

CONTENTS

Summary of findings and recommendations	Page 1
Introduction	9
History of the committee	9
Nature and scope of the investigation	9
Structure of the investigation	10
I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy	18
Introduction: The Kennedy Presidency in perspective	21
Presidential assassinations in the United States	21
A new President	24
Foreign affairs: A fragile peace	24
The Cuban threat	25
Combating Communism in Latin America	27
The arms race	27
The missile crisis	27
Southeast Asia	28
Pledge to defend Europe	28
Cold war thaw	29
Growing involvement in Vietnam	29
Détente	30
At home: A troubled land	30
Civil rights progress	30
Economic policies	32
Government reform	32
War on organized crime	33
Opposition from the far right	33
November 1963: A trip to Texas	34
A. Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots at President John F. Kennedy. The second and third shots he fired struck the President. The third shot he fired killed the President.	35
1. President Kennedy was struck by two rifle shots fired from behind him	41
(a) Reliance on scientific analysis	41
(1) The medical evidence	42
(2) Reaction times and alignment	42
(3) Neutron activation analysis	44
(4) Photographic evidence	45
(5) Acoustical evidence and blur analysis	45
2. The shots that struck President Kennedy from behind were fired from the sixth floor window of the southeast corner of the Texas School Book Depository building	46
(a) Scientific analysis	47
(1) Trajectory analysis	47
(2) Photographic evidence	48
(b) Witness testimony	49
(c) Firearms evidence	49
(d) Summary of the evidence	50
3. Lee Harvey Oswald owned the rifle that was used to fire the shots from the sixth floor window of the southeast corner of the Texas School Book Depository building	51
(a) Biography of Lee Harvey Oswald	52
(b) The committee's approach	52
(1) Handwriting analysis	54
(2) The backyard photographs	54
(v)	54

Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

A. Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots—Continued

4. Lee Harvey Oswald, shortly before the assassination, had access to and was present on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository building.

- (a) Testimony of book depository employees.
- (b) Physical evidence of Oswald's presence.
- (c) Oswald's whereabouts.

- (1) Loyalty or Oswald?
- (2) Witness testimony.

5. Lee Harvey Oswald's other actions tend to support the conclusion that he assassinated President Kennedy.

- (a) The Tippit murder.
- (b) Oswald: A capacity for violence?
- (c) The motive.

B. Scientific acoustical evidence establishes a high probability that two gunmen fired at President John F. Kennedy. Other scientific evidence does not preclude the possibility of two gunmen firing at the President. Scientific evidence negates some specific conspiracy allegations.

- (a) Warren Commission analysis of a tape.
- (b) Dallas Police Department recordings.

- (1) Analysis by Bolt Beranek and Newman.
- (2) Weiss Aschenasy analysis.
- (3) Search for a motorcycle.

- (c) Other evidence with respect to the shots.
- (d) Witness testimony on the shots.
- (1) Analysis of the reliability of witness testimony.

- (e) Certain conspiracy allegations.
- (f) Summary of the evidence.

C. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that President John F. Kennedy was probably assassinated as a result of a conspiracy. The committee was unable to identify the other gunmen or the extent of the conspiracy.

1. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the Soviet Government was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.

- (a) United States-Soviet relations.
- (b) The Warren Commission investigation.
- (c) The committee's investigation.
- (1) Oswald in the U.S.S.R.
- (2) Treatment of defectors by the Soviet Government.
- (3) Yuri Nosenko.
- (4) Opinions of other defectors.
- (5) Marina Oswald.
- (6) Response of the Soviet Government.

- (d) Summary of the evidence.
- (e) Summary of the evidence.

2. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the Cuban Government was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.

- (a) United States-Cuban relations.
- (1) Bay of Pigs.
- (2) Cuban missile crisis.
- (b) Earlier investigations of Cuban complicity.
- (1) The Warren Commission investigation.
- (2) The U.S. Senate investigation.
- (3) The CIA's response to the Senate.

Page	
56	
57	
57	
57	
58	
58	
59	
59	
60	
61	
65	
65	
66	
66	
72	
75	
79	
87	
90	
91	
93	
95	
99	
99	
99	
99	
100	
100	
101	
101	
102	
102	
103	
103	
103	
103	
104	
105	
105	
106	
107	
107	
108	

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

C. The committee—Continued

2. The committee—Continued

(c) The committee's analysis of the CIA task force report.

- (1) AMLASH.
- (2) CIA-Mafia plots.
- (3) Summary of the evidence.
- (d) Cubana Airlines flight allegation.
- (e) Gilberto Policarpo Lopez allegation.
- (f) Other allegations.
- (g) The committee's trip to Cuba.
- (h) Denunciations of the 1963-64 investigation.
- (i) Summary of the findings.

Page	
109	
111	
114	
114	
117	
117	
118	
121	
126	
127	
127	
129	

3. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that anti-Castro Cuban groups, as groups, were not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, but that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that individual members may have been involved.

- (a) The anti-Castro Cuban perspective.
- (1) The missile crisis and its aftermath.
- (2) Attitude of anti-Castro Cubans toward Kennedy.
- (b) The committee investigation.
- (1) Homer S. Echevarria.
- (2) Antonio Veciana Blanch.
- (3) Silvia Otto.
- (c) Oswald and anti-Castro Cubans.
- (1) Oswald in New Orleans.
- (2) Oswald in Clinton, La.
- (3) David Ferrie.
- (4) 544 Camp Street.
- (5) A committee analysis of Oswald in New Orleans.
- (6) Summary of the evidence.

- (1) The anti-Castro Cuban perspective.
- (2) Attitude of anti-Castro Cubans toward Kennedy.

- (b) The committee investigation.
- (1) Homer S. Echevarria.
- (2) Antonio Veciana Blanch.
- (3) Silvia Otto.
- (c) Oswald and anti-Castro Cubans.
- (1) Oswald in New Orleans.
- (2) Oswald in Clinton, La.
- (3) David Ferrie.
- (4) 544 Camp Street.
- (5) A committee analysis of Oswald in New Orleans.
- (6) Summary of the evidence.

- (1) The anti-Castro Cuban perspective.
- (2) Attitude of anti-Castro Cubans toward Kennedy.
- (b) The committee investigation.
- (1) Homer S. Echevarria.
- (2) Antonio Veciana Blanch.
- (3) Silvia Otto.
- (c) Oswald and anti-Castro Cubans.
- (1) Oswald in New Orleans.
- (2) Oswald in Clinton, La.
- (3) David Ferrie.
- (4) 544 Camp Street.
- (5) A committee analysis of Oswald in New Orleans.
- (6) Summary of the evidence.

Page	
129	
130	
132	
132	
133	
133	
135	
137	
137	
139	
140	
142	
143	
143	
145	
146	

4. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the national syndicate of organized crime, as a group, was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, but that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that individual members may have been involved.

- (a) The Warren Commission investigation.
- (b) The committee investigation.
- (1) Ruby and the Dallas Police Department.
- (2) Ruby and the Dallas Police Department.
- (3) Other evidence relating to Ruby.
- (4) Involvement of organized crime.
- (5) Analysis of the 1963-64 investigation.
- (6) Carlos Marcello.
- (7) Santos Trafficante.
- (8) James R. Hoffa.
- (c) Summary and analysis of the evidence.
- (1) The Secret Service.
- (2) Choice of the motorcade route.
- (3) Allegation a Secret Service agent was on the grassy knoll.
- (4) Conclusion.

- (1) Ruby and the Dallas Police Department.
- (2) Ruby and the Dallas Police Department.
- (3) Other evidence relating to Ruby.
- (4) Involvement of organized crime.
- (5) Analysis of the 1963-64 investigation.
- (6) Carlos Marcello.
- (7) Santos Trafficante.
- (8) James R. Hoffa.
- (c) Summary and analysis of the evidence.
- (1) The Secret Service.
- (2) Choice of the motorcade route.
- (3) Allegation a Secret Service agent was on the grassy knoll.
- (4) Conclusion.

Page	
147	
148	
149	
149	
156	
158	
159	
168	
169	
172	
176	
179	
181	
181	
182	
182	
183	
184	

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued
C. The committee—Continued

5. The Secret Service, FBI—Continued

(b) The Federal Bureau of Investigation

(1) Early rumors that Oswald was an informant	185
(2) The Hosty entry in Oswald's address book	185
(3) FBI contacts with Oswald (Fort Worth, 1962)	186
(4) FBI contacts with Oswald (New Orleans, 1963)	190
(5) FBI contacts with Oswald (Dallas, 1963)	191
(6) The destruction of Oswald's note	194
(7) Conclusion	195
(c) The Central Intelligence Agency	196
(1) CIA personnel in the Soviet Russia Division	196
(2) CIA personnel abroad	198
(3) Oswald's CIA file	198
(4) Why the delay in opening Oswald's 201 file?	200
(5) Why was he carried as Lee Henry Oswald in his 201 file?	200
(6) The meaning of "A.G." under "Other identification" in Oswald's 201 file	202
(7) Why was Oswald's 201 file restricted?	202
(8) Were 37 documents missing from Oswald's 201 file?	203
(9) Did the CIA maintain a dual filing system on Oswald?	203
(10) Did Oswald ever participate in a CIA counterintelligence project?	204
(11) Did the CIA ever debrief Oswald?	205
(12) The Justice Department's failure to prosecute Oswald	207
(13) Oswald's trip to Russia via Helsinki and his ability to obtain a visa in 2 days	209
(14) Oswald's contact with Americans in the Soviet Union	211
(15) Alleged intelligence contacts after Oswald returned from Russia	213
(16) Alleged intelligence implications of Oswald's military service	217
(17) Oswald's military intelligence file	219
(18) The Oswald photograph in Office of Naval Intelligence files	221
(19) Oswald in Mexico City	224
Conclusion	225
D. Agencies and departments of the U.S. Government performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfillment of their duties. President John F. Kennedy did not receive adequate protection. A thorough and reliable investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination was conducted. The investigation into the possibility of conspiracy in the assassination was inadequate. The conclusions of the investigations were arrived at in good faith, but presented in a fashion that was too definitive	227
1. The Secret Service was deficient in the performance of its duties	227

I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

D. Agencies and departments—Continued

1. The Secret Service—Continued

(a) The Secret Service possessed information that was not properly analyzed, investigated or used by the Secret Service in connection with the President's trip to Dallas; in addition, Secret Service agents in the motorcade were inadequately prepared to protect the President from a sniper	Page 228
(1) The committee approach	228
(2) Significant threats in 1963	230
(3) Inspection of the motorcade route	233
(4) Performance at the time of the assassination	234
(b) The responsibility of the Secret Service to investigate the assassination was terminated when the Federal Bureau of Investigation assumed primary investigative responsibility	236
2. The Department of Justice failed to exercise initiative in supervising and directing the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the assassination	237
3. The Federal Bureau of Investigation performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfillment of its duties	239
(a) The Federal Bureau of Investigation adequately investigated Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the assassination and properly evaluated the evidence it possessed to assess his potential to endanger the public safety in a national emergency	239
(b) The Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted a thorough and professional investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination	239
(c) The Federal Bureau of Investigation failed to investigate adequately the possibility of a conspiracy to assassinate the President	239
(d) The Federal Bureau of Investigation was deficient in its sharing of information with other agencies and departments	239
(1) History of the FBI	239
(2) The FBI investigation	241
4. The Central Intelligence Agency was deficient in its collection and sharing of information both prior to and subsequent to the assassination	246
(a) Establishment of the CIA	246
(b) Rockefeller Commission investigation of CIA activities	248
(c) The committee investigation	248
(1) CIA preassassination performance	248
(2) The CIA and the Warren Commission	252
(3) Post-Warren report CIA investigation	255
5. The Warren Commission performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfillment of its duties	256
(a) The Warren Commission conducted a thorough and professional investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination	256

..I. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

D. Agencies and departments—Continued

5. The Warren Commission—Continued

(b) The Warren Commission failed to investigate adequately the possibility of a conspiracy to assassinate the President. This deficiency was attributable in part to the failure of the Commission to receive all the relevant information that was in the possession of other agencies and departments of the Government.

Page

(c) The Warren Commission arrived at its conclusions, based on the evidence available to it, in good faith.

256

(d) The Warren Commission presented the conclusions in its report in a fashion that was too definitive.

256

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations in the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Introduction: The civil rights movement and Dr. King.

A history of civil rights violence.

Equality in education—the 20th century objective.

A new leader emerges.

A philosophy of nonviolence.

1960: The year of the sit-ins.

1963: A year of triumph and despair.

The road to Memphis.

The last moments: Memphis, Tenn., April 4, 1968.

A. James Earl Ray fired one shot at Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The shot killed Dr. King.

(a) Biography of James Earl Ray.

(b) The committee's investigation.

1. Dr. King was killed by one shot fired from in front of him.

287

2. The shot that killed Dr. King was fired from the bathroom window at the rear of a roominghouse at 422½ South Main Street, Memphis, Tenn.

288

3. James Earl Ray purchased the rifle that was used to shoot Dr. King and transported it from Birmingham, Ala., to Memphis, Tenn., where he rented a room at 422½ South Main Street, and moments after the assassination, he dropped it near 424 South Main Street.

289

4. It is highly probable that James Earl Ray stalked Dr. King for a period immediately preceding the assassination.

290

5. James Earl Ray fled the scene of the crime immediately after the assassination.

291

6. James Earl Ray's alibi for the time of the assassination, his story of "Raoul," and other allegedly exculpatory evidence are not worthy of belief.

292

(a) Ray's alibi.

303

(b) Ray's "Raoul" story.

303

(1) Conflicting descriptions of Raoul.

305

(2) Absence of witnesses to corroborate Raoul's existence.

305

(c) Press assassination transactions.

306

(1) The rifle purchase.

307

(2) Fingerprints on the rifle.

308

(3) Rental of room 5-B at Bessie Brewer's roominghouse.

309

(4) The binocular purchase.

310

(d) Grace Walden Stephens.

310

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

A. James Earl Ray fired one shot at Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The shot killed Dr. King—Continued

7. James Earl Ray knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily pleaded guilty to the first degree murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Page

(a) Irreconcilable conflicts of interest of Foreman and Hanes.

315

(b) Foreman's failure to investigate the case.

318

(c) Coercion by Foreman and the Federal Government.

319

(d) Ray's belief a guilty plea would not preclude a new trial.

321

B. The committee believes, on the basis of the circumstantial evidence available to it, that there is a likelihood that James Earl Ray assassinated Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as a result of a conspiracy.

323

1. The FBI investigation.

325

2. The committee investigation.

325

(a) Transactional analysis.

326

(b) Ray's associates examined.

326

3. Investigation of Ray's motive.

327

(a) Ray's racial attitudes examined.

327

(b) Ego gratification as a motive.

327

(c) The prospect of financial reward.

330

(d) Conclusion on motive.

331

4. General indications of conspiracy.

333

(a) Transactions as evidence of associations.

333

5. The brothers, John and Jerry Ray.

334

(a) Evidence of Ray's contact with his brothers, 1967-68.

336

(b) Missouri State Penitentiary escape.

337

(c) The Alton bank robbery.

339

(1) Bank robbery modus operandi analysis.

342

(d) A brother was Raoul.

348

(e) The brothers and the rifle purchase.

350

(f) Motive with respect to John and Jerry Ray.

354

6. Evidence of a conspiracy in St. Louis.

358

(a) The Byers allegation.

359

(b) The backgrounds of Kaufmann and Sutherland.

360

(c) Connectives to James Earl Ray.

364

7. Conclusion.

366

C. The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that no private organizations or individuals, other than those discussed under section B, were involved in the assassination of Dr. King.

371

1. Rightwing extremist organizations.

375

(a) The Minutemen.

375

(b) Klan organizations.

377

(c) J. B. Stoner.

381

(d) William Hugh Morris.

382

2. Conspiracy allegations: Memphis.

383

(a) Citizen's band radio broadcast.

383

(b) John McFerrer.

385

3. Conspiracy allegations: New Orleans.

387

(a) William Sartor.

387

(b) Raul Esquivel.

387

(c) Reynard Rochon.

389

(d) Herman Thompson.

390

(e) Jules Ricco Kimble.

390

(f) Randy Rosenson.

392

393

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

C. The committee believes, etc.—Continued

4. Conspiracy allegations: Atlanta.....	Page 394
(a) Edna Matthews Lancaster.....	394
(b) Claude and Leon Powell.....	394
(c) Robert Byron Watson.....	395
5. Conspiracy allegations: Birmingham.....	396
(a) Jeffis Davis.....	396
(b) Walter Maddox.....	398
6. Conspiracy allegations: Louisville.....	399
(a) Clifton Baird.....	399
(b) Charles Lee Bell.....	400
7. Conspiracy allegations: St. Louis.....	401
(a) Delano Elmer Walker.....	401
8. Conspiracy allegations: Miami.....	402
(a) William Somnert.....	402
9. Conspiracy allegations: Texas.....	404
(a) Otis Moore.....	404
10. Conspiracy allegations: New York.....	404
(a) Myron Billelt.....	404
D. No Federal, State or local government agency was involved in the assassination of Dr. King.....	407
1. The Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	407
(a) The Lorraine Motel issue.....	409
(b) The instigating of violence by informants issue.....	411
(c) The FBI foreknowledge issue.....	413
(d) The FBI assistance for Ray issue.....	414
(e) FBI surveillance files in the National Archives.....	415
2. Memphis Police Department.....	416
(a) Withdrawal of the security detail.....	417
(b) The removal of Detective Redditt.....	418
(c) The transfer of two Black firemen.....	423
(d) The postassassination performance of the Memphis police.....	424
3. Missouri State Penitentiary.....	428
E. The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation performed with varying degrees of competency and legality in the fulfillment of their duties.....	431
1. The Department of Justice failed to supervise adequately the Domestic Intelligence Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the Domestic Intelligence Division's COINTELPRO campaign against Dr. King, grossly abused and exceeded its legal authority and failed to consider the possibility that actions threatening bodily harm to Dr. King might be encouraged by the program.....	431
(a) Security investigation and COINTELPRO.....	432
(1) Hoover's dislike for Dr. King.....	434
(2) Electronic surveillance of Dr. King.....	436
(3) Manipulation of the media.....	437
(4) Analysis of the impact of the FBI-inspired editorial.....	439
2. The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation performed a thorough investigation into the responsibility of James Earl Ray for the assassination of Dr. King, and conducted a thorough fugitive investigation, but failed to investigate adequately the possibility of conspiracy in the assassination. The Federal Bureau of Investigation manifested a lack of concern for constitutional rights in the manner in which it conducted parts of the investigation.....	441
(a) The FBI chain of command.....	442

II. Findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations—Continued

E. The Department of Justice, etc.—Continued

2. The Department of Justice, etc.—Continued

(b) The fugitive investigation.....	Page 443
(1) James Earl Ray identified.....	443
(2) Surveillance of Ray family considered.....	445
(c) Ray arrested in London.....	446
(c) The conspiracy investigation.....	449
(1) The method.....	449
(2) The focus.....	450
(d) Investigative excesses.....	453
(e) Conclusion.....	456
III. Recommendations of the Select Committee on Assassinations.....	459
A. Legislative recommendations on issues involving the prohibition, prevention and prosecution of assassinations and federally cognizable homicides.....	461
(a) Prohibition and prevention.....	464
(b) Prosecution.....	464
B. Administrative recommendations to the executive.....	472
C. General recommendations for congressional investigations.....	473
D. Recommendations for further investigation.....	475
IV. Separate Remarks, Views and Dissent of Members of the Committee.....	480
Separate remarks of Christopher J. Dodd.....	483
Separate views of Samuel L. Devine and Robert W. Edgar.....	483
Dissent of Robert W. Edgar.....	491
Dissent of Harold S. Sawyer.....	494
Appendix I: Staff of the Select Committee on Assassinations.....	503
Appendix II: Consultants to the Select Committee on Assassinations.....	513
Appendix III: Contractors for the Select Committee on Assassinations.....	516
Appendix IV: Statistical data and expenditures.....	519
Appendix V: Affirmative action program.....	520
Appendix VI: Enabling resolutions.....	533
Appendix VII: Index for the investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.....	534
A. Public hearings of the committee.....	573
B. Exhibits—John F. Kennedy public hearings.....	573
C. Supplemental exhibits—John F. Kennedy public hearings.....	574
D. Appendices to the John F. Kennedy public hearings.....	583
Appendix VIII: Index for the investigation of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.....	583
A. Public hearings of the committee.....	584
B. Exhibits—Martin Luther King, Jr. public hearings.....	584
C. Appendices to the Martin Luther King, Jr. public hearings.....	585
Appendix IX: Index for the public hearings of the Committee on Legislative and Administrative Reform.....	592
References for the:	593
Introduction.....	595
I. Report on the investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.....	595
II. Report on the investigation of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.....	597
III. Recommendations of the committee.....	645
	683

problems that Mr. Nosenko had, and that in the light of all of this, he would be inclined to discount the specifics of his testimony on Oswald.

I do not think that this calls into challenge the credibility of everything else Mr. Nosenko said. In fact as Mr. Hart indicated he did provide the Agency with some very valuable information, information that turned out to be correct.

Finally, as I indicated, his services to the Agency, today, are generally describing the atmosphere and general techniques that are used by the CIA, and do not get into specific questions.

Mr. FITHIAN. I am troubled a bit more by one part of that comment, I guess, than I was when I started out on this quest.

Perhaps we see the whole issue of assassinations as something more than a narrow focus, because that is the main purpose of the committee, but I would argue the case historically that when they were first interrogating Mr. Nosenko, when the Warren Commission was operating, that the request for all the facts surrounding the President of the United States would have been extraordinarily important, and therefore could reasonably be expected if the CIA was on the ball to be a very, very important question as to whether or not the person who has just been killed himself and who had previously been the chief suspect of having killed the President, that what he did or did not do in Russia would be a terribly important thing to the CIA.

Therefore, I could not pass it off as being not as important as some of the other things you are going to tell us, unless I am to agree that in your methods, your process and your sources are more important than the assassination of the President of the United States. That would bother me deeply if we were to close out the investigation on that note.

Mr. CARLUCCI. If I may clarify, I think I was describing Mr. Hart's testimony to you, and I believe he was describing a factual situation. I was certainly not passing judgment or giving approval in any sense to the way Mr. Nosenko was interrogated or handled.

Mr. FITHIAN. I was not referring to the way he was handled, either, in terms of the focus. I am just trying to focus in on the importance to the country of the individuals that the CIA had in its hands at the time.

Mr. CARLUCCI. I would not disagree with you. I suppose if I had been making the interrogation and happened to have the expertise necessary to do that, I would have liked to be able to say I would put more emphasis on the Oswald question, but I think the facts of the matter are that those in charge of the interrogation at that time did not put that much emphasis on it.

Mr. FITHIAN. One further quick question, Mr. Chairman, and then I will subside.

What I am trying to get at is whether or not the philosophy of the CIA has changed basically from 1964 to 1978, and that is this:

Is the protection of a source more important, in that case and in future cases, than any possible assassinations of the President? When it comes down to a real crunch it is more important to protect that source than it is to cooperate with the Warren Commission who is trying to get at the story of the killing in the United States.

Mr. CARLUCCI. I don't know the answer to the protection of sources, clearly that there have been information on potential violence, and have put a source in jeopardy.

You have to weigh the merits in the Warren Commission I don't know sources. My understanding is that the answer was not provided simply because of age between the two.

I don't know. I was not around, but to protect sources. Certainly, as I indicated, we make every effort to turn over a Commission, and in many cases to don't need to know the source if you put out intelligence reports in such information yet withhold the source for such a Commission to know the source. In a sensitive position, my judgment would probably tell them but request.

That is one of the fundamental principles of intelligence reports in such information yet withhold the source for such a Commission to know the source. In a sensitive position, my judgment would probably tell them but request. They could then protect the source with some confidence on the information. So the answer is that we come as possible, recognizing that may be putting people's lives in danger. Judgment call in each one of these instances.

Mr. FITHIAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman STOKES. The time of the day.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DODD. I would like to follow up on what Fithian raised and, without in any way what may be security matters, there is a question, or shortly thereafter, a photograph originally identified as Lee Harvey Oswald.

Subsequently, the identification of the person to be Lee Harvey Oswald, but over the years has been all sorts of speculation as to Mexico at the time.

To your knowledge, has the Agency had any contact with that individual?

Mr. CARLUCCI. No, sir; we have not.

Mr. DODD. The reason I raise it is in the category as Mr. Fithian's question with respect to sources and information.

I think you adequately responded to the question as to that specific piece of evidence.

Mr. CARLUCCI. No, we have not been able to identify the person.

Mr. DODD. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman STOKES. Any other members? All right.