

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

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

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

Mrs. Scaletti. I have.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand that letter?

Mrs. Scaletti. I do.

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

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

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

Mrs. Scaletti. I do.

Mr. Goldsmith. Prior to coming here today have you had any discussion with any present or former employee of the CIA 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? ~~Intelligence Assistant~~

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. Port of Spain, Trinidad.

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

14 Mrs. Scaletti. It was over Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador.

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

TOP SECRET

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

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

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

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

15 Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

001721

TOP SECRET

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
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. 19 October 1963. That is the way I read it.

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

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

Mr. Goldsmith. What time?

Mrs. Scaletti. Zulu time.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is zulu time?

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

Mr. Goldsmith. What is zed?

Mrs. Scaletti. Z.

Mr. Goldsmith. That refers to Greenwich time?

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

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

Mrs. Scaletti. I am sorry, what number?

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

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

001727

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

3 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

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

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

7 Mr. Goldsmith. Please reread it.

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

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

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

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

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

24 Mr. Goldsmith. I understand. The reason I asked the
25 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 Mrs. Scaletti. I just don't know. Sometimes you have
2 a document that references a document or soft folder or some-
3 thing. I am trying to be honest. I don't want to say I saw
4 a 201 file if it were not a 201 file which is a very specific
5 type folder.

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

8 Mrs. Scaletti. Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

21 Mrs. Scaletti. Thank you very much.

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

24 Mrs. Scaletti. From the 201 probably. As much as I can
25 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs. Scaletti. Today?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Goldsmith. The reason I ask the question is fairly obviously. The suggestion has certainly been made by virtue of this information being released to the public, the suggestion has been made that by opening the file in the name of Lee Henry Oswald if someone wanted to do a name trace on Lee Harvey Oswald they would miss that person and for some reason they may 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 faet 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

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.

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 never 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 ever 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. William Gorday?

12 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

13 Mr. Goldsmith. Precilla Johnson McMillan?

14 Mrs. Scaletti. No.

15 Mr. Goldsmith. Richard E. Snider?

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

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

CERTIFICAT OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Alfred Joseph Lafrance, the officer before whom the foregoing deposition has taken, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me in shorthand and to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced in typewriting under my direction, that said deposition is a true record of the testimony given by said witness; 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 in and for
the District of Columbia

My Commission expires November 14, 1980.

001779

CERTIFICATE 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