

April 11, 1996

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SCELSON SUMMARY REPORTS

**Report A** - "Summary of Relevant Information on Lee Harvey Oswald at 0700 24 November 1963"  
- This report was prepared immediately following the assassination by an unknown author, presumably Scelso. The bulk of the information seems to derive from Mexico City Station sources, both technical and human. This report is completely different from the others, probably due to the time factor. The two significant items in this report that *do not* appear in the others are the reference to the "expert monitor" and the comparison of the "Oswald voices," and a reference that remains classified.

**Report B** - Original, unexpurgated version of the report on Oswald's stay in Mexico City as prepared by Scelso. 12/13/63 - This report on Mexico City seems to have been prepared as one section of the "full" report, which I will address later. (Reports E, F, & G) Based on the routing slips attached to Reports B and C, Scelso submitted this report to DDP, C/CI, C/CI/SI, and C/SR for review. I use this version of the report as my control document.

**Report C** - Original, unexpurgated version of the report on Oswald's stay in Mexico City as prepared by Scelso, with "SR/CI" edits. (I believe this notation refers to C/CI and C/SR.) The following significant changes were suggested by these offices: 1) Delete reference to Mexico City Station judgment of Oswald at the time of his visit (page 2); 2) Delete information relating to Oswald's physical description and request for photo contained in the 10/09/63 cable from HQ to Mexico City (pages 3-4); 3) Delete section regarding standard operating procedures for handling of U.S. citizens who contact Soviet and Cuban Embassies in Mexico City (pages 3-4); 4) Delete and modify information describing HQ and Mexico City immediate responses on hearing Oswald's name in connection with the assassination (pages 4-5); 5) Delete and modify speculative information on Kostikov's role (pages 15-16); 6) Modify language regarding possibility of Oswald acting as a Soviet agent (pages 15-16); and 7) Add paragraph describing conversation between Yugoslav diplomat Vlahov and Soviet Ambassador to Mexico, Bazarov during which Vlahov said, "I knew he was wounded even before the Americans." (last page) In general, most of these suggested changes seem to omit the speculation on Scelso's part and/or CIA's standard operating procedures. The two deletion/modifications that do not fall into these two categories are the second and fourth ones. The information deleted in the latter case is crucial to understanding the pre-assassination HQ cables; and in the former case, the information relates directly to the immediate aftermath of the assassination and the initial steps that were taken by HQ and Mexico City, which is crucial to understanding CIA's evaluation of Oswald.

**Report D** - Original, unexpurgated version of the report on Oswald's stay in Mexico City as prepared

by Scelso, with SR/CI edits and with marginalia. This report is identical to Report C, except for various notes in the margin.

**Reports E & F** - First draft of initial report on Oswald case, including section on Oswald's stay in Mexico City, as prepared by Scelso. These records represent the "full" report on CIA's investigation of the Oswald case. The texts of these reports are identical, but they contain slightly different marginalia. These notes seem to be CI edits and CI/SI edits, respectively. The interesting aspect about this report is that the Mexico City section seems to have been completely rewritten. It is not apparent how the Mexico City summary reports were handled. It would not seem logical for Scelso to have written two completely different reports within a couple of days, so this section may have been rewritten by one of the two offices referenced above. For the comparative analysis of the "full" report, I use Reports E & F as the control documents.

**Report G** - First draft of initial report on Oswald case, including section on Oswald's stay in Mexico City, as prepared by Scelso, with SR/CI edits and DDP edits. Report G consists of two copies of the report, the SR/CI version and the DDP version. For the most part, the DDP version seems to incorporate the edits suggested from Reports E & F, as well as those from the SR/CI version. Moreover, the Mexico City section was completely rewritten, again. There have now been a total of four different versions of the Mexico City report. Looking at the DDP version, the following significant changes were made: 1) Deletion of entire section relating to CIA's pre-assassination knowledge of Oswald, as reported by the FBI; 2) Deletion of section relating to CIA's standard operating procedures in support of presidential protection overseas; 3) Deletion of almost the entire section relating to CIA's "surveillance" of Oswald while in the Soviet Union and the KGB's standard operating procedures for handling defectors; and 4) Deletion of the information regarding CIA's request to the Department of Navy for a photograph of Oswald. (This was the only change in the Mexico City section.) In summary, I consider the first, third, and fourth changes of substantive nature. Once again, these deletion/modifications seem to deal directly with understanding the procedures that CIA followed in evaluating Oswald.

**Report H** - Report submitted by CIA to Warren Commission entitled "Information Developed by CIA on the Activity of Lee Harvey Oswald in Mexico City 28 September - 3 October 1963" - This report seems to take information from all of the summary reports that I have discussed in this analysis, with particular attention on Oswald's visit to Mexico City. Oswald's stay in the Soviet Union and his activities upon his return to the United States are superficially addressed in one short footnote. There are four important details to address from this report: 1) the first sentence of the report is misleading, for reasons I do not need to explain; 2) in section "3", the report states that the physical description of Oswald in the first 10/10/63 cable was subsequently investigated to show that this description did not pertain to Oswald, but the report does not explain how the CIA found the "accurate" description to include in the second 10/10/63 cable that was sent only a few hours later; 3)

in section "4", the report states that CIA HQ sent a lengthy cable summary to the Mexico City Station of the background information held in the HQ file on Oswald, but again, the report does not address the fact the Oswald's pro-Castro activities in New Orleans were not included in this lengthy cable summary; and 4) in section "6", the CIA seems to have embellished somewhat on Duran's statement, reporting that Duran said "the assassin must have been a maniac." In summary, I found this report to be "watered-down," without much attention to detail or accuracy.