

JFK RECORDS

v09-16-96ccr

Cross Reference: None

Status in System:

-----

AGENCY : HSCA  
RECORD NUMBER : 180-10142-10030  
RECORD SERIES : CIA SEGREGATED COLLECTION  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 22-13-02F  
Other Agency Equity: None

-----

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR : HSCA  
FROM : CIA  
TO :  
TITLE :  
DATE : 00/00/00  
PAGES : 8  
DOCUMENT TYPE : REPORT  
SUBJECT(S) : ; ; ; AMMUG;  
CLASSIFICATION : UNCLASSIFIED  
RESTRICTIONS : 3  
CURRENT STATUS : POSTPONED IN PART  
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 08/07/95  
COMMENTS : Box 10

Date in: 01/26/96

T T F F F F F F  
F F F F F F F F

BOX 22  
F 13  
ITEM 2F

AMMU 6/1

"This Committee's investigation of Luisa  
Calderson - - - - -"

Classified original pages 1, 2, 7 are  
missing from this document. Sanitized copy  
of document is in NARA unclassified,  
release folder.

CIA/CSI/HRG

CIA HAS NO OBJECTION TO  
DECLASSIFICATION AND/OR  
RELEASE OF THIS DOCUMENT  
AS REDACTED

*not in folder*

*130X dx  
7 13  
item 2 F*

AMMUG-1

*As a result of this Committee's investigation of ~~AMMUG-1~~ has revealed that*

~~AMMUG-1~~ to Luisa Calderon, a defec-  
tor from the Cuban Intelligence Services provided the  
CIA with significant information about Lee Harvey Oswald's  
contacts with the DGI in Mexico City. This defector  
was assigned the CIA cryptonym AMMUG-1 (A-1 hereinafter).\*

CIA files reveal that A-1 defected from the DGI  
on April 21, 1964 in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. When  
he defected, A-1 possessed a number of DGI documents which  
were subsequently turned over to the CIA (CIBDOC) IN 68894,  
24 April 64) Following his defection, a CIA officer,  
Joseph H. Langosch, went to ( ) to meet A-1, debrief  
him, and arrange for A-1's travel into the United States.

(CIBID 3) (See supra cite.) On May 1, 1964, 22 reels of Langosch's  
debriefing of A-1 were forwarded to the Chief of the CIA's  
Special Affairs Staff from the ( )

(CIA Doc, DISPATCH 7762, May 1964)  
Effective on May 1, A-1 was under contract with  
the CIA for operational purposes. (CIBDOC) (Contract Approving Of-  
ficer memo, 6 May 64) By June 23, 1964, Langosch was  
convinced that A-1 would be of great value to the Agency.  
He stated:

There is no question in my mind that AMMUG-1

\*It is now known that A-1 did provide significant leads to  
the CIA regarding Luisa Calderon. It is further apparent  
that little of this information was made available by the  
CIA to the Warren Commission. Therefore, the possibility  
exists that A-1 had provided other information to the CIA  
that was relevant to the Warren Commission's work but that which  
was not properly reported to the Commission.

is a bona fide defector or that he has furnished us with accurate and valuable information concerning Cuban intelligence operations, staffers, and agents. (Langosch memo to Director of Security, 23 June 1964)

As an officer of the IGI, A-1 from August of 1963 until his defection was assigned to the DGI's Illegal Section B <sup>CIA DOC</sup> (IN 68894 24 April 64) <sup>which</sup> This section was responsible for training agents for assignment in Latin America. His specific responsibility pertained to handling of agent operations in El Salvador. <sup>CIA DOC</sup> (Personal Record Questionnaire 4 June 1964; <sup>CIA DOC</sup> In 68894 24 April 64)

~~identified for the CIA~~  
A-1 knew who were the Cuban Intelligence officers assigned to Mexico City. In this regard he initially identified Alfredo Mirabal, Manuel Vega, and Rogelio Rodríguez and the Commercial attache as DGI officers posted at the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. <sup>(supra)</sup> Langosch described A-1's knowledge of DGI operations in Mexico as follows:

In Mexico City, he knows who the intelligence people are. One is the Cuban Consul Alfredo Mirabal. He is called the Chief of the Centre. That is his title but he is actually the intelligence chief, or at least he was until the 16th of April at which time a replacement was sent to Mexico to take over. This fellow's name is Manuel Vega. The source says that the Commercial attache whose name is Ricardo Tapia or Concepcion (he is not sure which is an intelligence officer) and another one is Rogelio. (I might say that some of these names are familiar to me.) <sup>CIA DOC</sup> (p. 5 of reel 4, 23 April 1964, debriefing of A-1, 30 April (4))

FO

- 3 -

Thus, A-1 was able to provide the CIA soon after his defection with accurate information regarding DGI operations and DGI employees in Mexico City.

The Committee has reviewed the CIA's files concerning A-1. This examination was undertaken to determine: 1) whether A-1 had provided any valuable investigative leads to the CIA pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy; and 2) whether, if such leads were provided, these leads and/or other significant information was made available to the Warren Commission.

The Committee's initial review of the materials provided by the CIA to the Warren Commission did not disclose the existence of the AMMUG files. However, the Committee did <sup>during the course of its</sup> review <sup>examine</sup> a file containing material passed to the Rockefeller Commission. That file <sup>made</sup> contained reference to AMMUG-1. <sup>in this file was</sup> This ~~included~~ a memorandum of May 5, 1964 written by Joseph Langsch which concerned information A-1 provided about the Oswald case. <sup>CIA Doc</sup> (Cite <sup>Langsch memorandum, 5 May 64</sup> supra FOIA 68-2907 Also contained within this file were the A-1 debriefing memorandum of May 7, and May 8, 1964 previously <sup>CIA Doc FOIA # 687-295, attach 4 & 5</sup> cited with regard to Luisa Calderon. ~~(See)~~ Following review of the memoranda, the Committee requested access to all CIA files concerning <sup>referring to</sup> A-1.

From review of these materials, the Committee has determined that the Warren Commission did learn during mid-May 1964 that Lee Harvey Oswald probably had come in

contact with DGI officers in Mexico City.

~~Prior to learning of Oswald's probable contact with DGI officers, James Angleton, Chief of the CIA's Counter Intelligence Staff passed an internal memorandum to Raymond Rocca, also of the Counterintelligence Staff, which stated Angleton wrote in the memorandum that he had been informed by the DDP, Richard Helms, that J. Lee Rankin had contacted John McCone to request that the Director consent to an interview by the Warren Commission on May 14, 1964. (J. Edgar Hoover also appeared before the Commission on that date prior to McCone's appearance.)~~ Angleton also wrote:

I discussed with Mr. Helms the nature of the recent information which you are processing which originated with the sensitive ~~White House~~ <sup>write WH</sup> source. I informed him that in your view this would raise a number of new factors with the Commission, that it should not go to the Commission prior to the Director's appearance unless we have first had some preliminary reaction or made sure that the Director is fully aware of the implications since it could well serve as the basis for detailed questioning. The DDP stated that he would review this carefully and made (sic) a decision as to the question of timing. (Angleton memo, 12 May 1964, FOIA 689-298)

*Western Hem: ~~the letter~~ this should be defined*

Undoubtedly the ~~White House~~ <sup>WH</sup> source referred to in Angleton's memo ~~is~~ A-1. The conclusion is based in part upon the date of this memo which ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> quite close in time to A-1's defection. In addition, on ~~May 14, 1964,~~ Director McCone did appear before the Warren Commission.

~~At Angleton's request, Rocca's staff prepared a Brief prior to DCI McCone's appearance before the WC.~~

for Presentation to the Warren Commission outlining various positions adopted by the CIA vis a vis its investigative efforts and assistance to the Commission. (Brief, <sup>CIA Doc FOIA 695-32A</sup> ~~May 14, 1964~~ 1964, FOIA ~~695-302A~~)

N<sup>o</sup> 4

At Tab E of McCone's brief it states:

Within the past week, significant information has been developed by the CIA regarding the relationship with Oswald of certain Cuban intelligence personnel in Mexico City and the reaction in Havana within the Cuban Intelligence Service to the news of the assassination of President Kennedy. The Commission Staff is in the course of being briefed on the Cuban aspect (cite supra May 14, 1964 FOIA ~~695-302A~~ <sup>Ibid, Tab E</sup>)

The significant information referred to therein is the information A-1 provided. <sup>no conclusory</sup>

On May 15, 1964, the day of ~~the~~ McCone's interview, the Warren Commission received its first formal communication regarding A-1. However, the Agency did not at that time identify A-1 by his real name or cryptonym nor did the Agency indicate that the source of this information was a defector then residing under secure conditions in the Washington, D.C. area. (See <sup>Ibid</sup> ~~May 15 Letter from Helms to Rankin FOIA~~). The May 15 communication did state that the Agency had established contact

Do not insert

"with a well-placed individual who has been in close and prolonged contact with ranking officers of the Cuban Direction General de Inteligencia." (cite <sup>Ibid</sup>)

Attached to the May 15 communication was a copy of Langosch's above referenced memorandum of May 5, 1964 re-

garding A-1's knowledge of Oswald's probable contact with the DGI in Mexico City. ~~(cite above.)~~ The attachment made no reference to the source's status as a defector from the DGI. - ~~significant~~ EB:ID, attachment

As set forth in the section of the report concerning Luisa Calderon, on June 18, 1964, Howard Willens of the Warren Commission reviewed Langosch's May 5 memo and the questions upon which the information set forth in the memo was elicited. Neither the questions ~~in~~ <sup>of</sup> the memo shown to Willens made reference to the source's status as a de-factor collaborating with the CIA. ~~(cite Arthur DOOLEY~~

CIA Doc memo, 19 June 1964, (FOIA 739-319). <sup>How important is his reply?</sup>

Based upon review of the Langosch memoranda, the Committee has determined that significant information <sup>specifically, re contact & association with CIA</sup> regarding Luisa Calderon was withheld from the Warren Commission <sup>as detailed above</sup> (cite Calderon section). This information was derived from ~~the~~ debriefings of A-1. (Cite May 7 and 8 Langosch memos.) From the Committee's review of the A-1 file provided by the CIA, the Committee has not found any credible evidence indicating that other information provided by A-1 to the CIA was relevant to the work of the Warren Commission. However, in its review the Committee has determined that specific documents referenced in the A-1 file <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ not present in that file. <sup>Was it covered in previous section?</sup> <sup>Any other info w/ her</sup>

<sup>One</sup> ~~is~~ missing item <sup>is</sup> of considerable concern to the Committee.



This is a debriefing report of A-1 entitled "The Oswald Case."  
(CIA Doc (Dispatch 5035, 23 March 1965) On March 23, 1965, a

CIA dispatch records the transmittal of the report, along with eleven other A-1 debriefing reports. (CITE ID?) (Cite supra.)

Next to the listing of the "Oswald Case" debriefing report is the handwritten notation "SI." A CIA employee who has

worked extensively with the agency files system <sup>told a Committee</sup> believed <sup>Staff member that was the symbol for</sup> this notation <sup>known as</sup> to stand for the CIA component Special In-

Has CIA been asked to respond in writing to this issue?   
 ✓ intelligence. ~~Other CIA representatives believed the nota-~~  
~~tion to stand for the CIA component Special Intelligence.~~

Other CIA representatives believed the notation was a reference to the Counterintelligence component CI/SIG. In a CIA memorandum dated \_\_\_\_\_ it is stated:

{ Quote Barbara's memo. }

The Agency has been unable to locate this document and therefore the Committee cannot pass judgement upon the substance of the missing materials.

The Committee has queried A-1's case officers regarding additional information that A-1 may have supplied <sup>about</sup> regarding Oswald. Joseph Langosch when interviewed by the Committee stated that (HSCA staff interview, <sup>of</sup> Joseph Langosch, August 21, 1978), he did not have contact with the Warren Commission and does not know what information derived from A-1's debriefings was supplied to the Warren Commission. (Cite also Hidalgo and Piccolo.) He also stated that he does not <sup>interview</sup>

recall that <sup>A-1</sup> ~~AMUC~~ provided any other information on Oswald's contact with the DGI other than the <sup>set forth in the / of Mays, 7, cont.</sup> memoranda discussed herein <sup>as discussed herein</sup> ~~(Cite Colby's interview)~~ <sup>(FRID)</sup>

In a further effort to clarify the substance of information that <sup>A-1</sup> ~~AMUC~~ provided to the CIA regarding Oswald, the

*Give background explaining skepticism re CIA instability.*

Committee has attempted to locate ~~AMUC~~ <sup>A-1</sup>. The CIA has also attempted to locate ~~AMUC~~ <sup>A-1</sup> ~~(date of separation from CIA)~~ <sup>whose employment with the Agency was terminated in 1971</sup> but has been unable to determine his present whereabouts. <sup>The CIA's inability to locate A-1 has been a source of concern to this Committee particularly in light of his long association with the Agency.</sup> Thus, gaps do exist regarding information ~~AMUC~~ may

have supplied the CIA about Oswald. <sup>But</sup> ~~On the basis of the CIA's written record of the Agency, except for the Colby episode, provided the Warren Commission with all information of investigative significance.~~ <sup>With the exception of the Colby episode, provided the Warren Commission with all information of investigative significance.</sup> A broader question remains

*Confidential*

however. The Agency, as noted earlier, did not reveal to the Warren Commission that A-1 was present in the Washington, D.C. area and, under controlled conditions, accessible to the Commission. <sup>Giving due cons. to</sup> ~~Even considering the CIA's serious concern for protecting its sources, the fact that A-1's status was not disclosed foreclosed the Warren Commission from exercising a possible option, i.e. to take the sworn testimony of A-1 as it concerned Oswald and the Kennedy assassination. On this issue, as the written record tends to show, the Agency unilaterally rejected the~~ <sup>possibility of exercising this</sup> ~~option. It should not~~

*Note: Some early contributions present in case were not made until 1971.*

~~have done so.~~ <sup>What</sup> ~~The CIA did not face, in A-1's case, the enormous problems establishing bona fide as it did with Nosenko.~~ <sup>I see you last sentence sets up this good.</sup>

~~In light of the establishment of A-1's bona fides (cite Langosch's quote supra), his proven reliability and his depth of knowledge of Cuban intelligence activities, this option might well have been considered by the Warren Commission.~~