HW

NEWS OF THE DAY Paul L. Rosen 1/10/78

I got a call today from Bill Shackelford of the FBI's FOIA office, in reply to a letter of mine; I got some information which I ~~wx~~ want to pass on right away:

The second big release will be Wednesday, Jan. 18.

My request for the pre-ass'n Field Office files is being worked on. replies have come in ~~fux~~ from the field offices, but the documents have not yet been processed and will not be in the 1/18 release. This implies that there will be a ~~khxk~~ third release, it is not clear if they plan to make a press event out of it.

The 62-109060 file ~~kxxkxxx~~ contains quite a bit of correspondence with various researchers.

He has found and processed the Gale memo, and will send it to me (I gather, as soon as he gets around to it, given all the other requests he is working on). It is not in the 1/18 release. It was in a different file, because it related to personnel matters. This memo is pretty much the only piece of paper he found in these files that is relevant that is, I asked about other stuff in the files of the inspection division, and evidently he didn't find any. The Gale memo is roughly 30 pages or less.

Harold has sent me Ruth Dean's story from the Star of 1/1/78. I want to call everyone's attention to what Lane and Freed apparently told her; they now promise to reveal details of what Freed calls 'a real atom bomb' if a certain FBI document which they say they obtained from SS files through the FOIA isn't among the new batch of FBI documents being released this month.' This is obviously SS IMS 104, which ~~xx~~ was apparently released to Lane with the 'hot stuff' accidentally undeleted. Kostman pointed out that a deleted version was in the first batch of documents (FBI serial 105-82555-49J). I wrote about this document quite a bit when I first saw it. It's certainly interesting it reveals that some Mexico tape was played to FBI agents in Dallas. It also raises questions about how many tapes of Oswald there were, and which were routinely destroyed before the assassination, but as far as I know this document doesn't make liars out ~~xxf~~ of the CIA on this point, since there has never been a plausible claim that all the tapes were destroyed before ~~kk~~ the assassination. (This part of the Mexico problem was ~~kxxxxx~~ thoroughly confused by reports of Dave Phillips' HSC ~~kxxxxxx~~ testimony in November 1978.)

Anyway, the key section of this document, which is subject to misinterpretation, is as follows. 'The CIA advised that on October 1, 1963, an extremely sensitive source had reported that an individual ~~kx~~ identified himself as Lee Oswald, who contacted the Soviet Embassy in ~~kxxxxx~~ Mexico City, inquiring as to any messages. Special Agents of this Bureau, who have conversed with Oswald in Dallas, Texas, have observed photographs of the individual referred to above and have listened to a recording of his voice. ~~Thxxx~~ These Special Agents are of the opinion that the above-referred-to individual was not Lee Harvey Oswald.'

I think most of you have my earlier notes on this ~~xxxxxx~~ document. For now, I just want to emphasize that I think it is completely unjustifiable to ~~xxxxx~~ conclude that in fact the mystery man identified himself as as Oswald that the tape contains a voice identifying himself as Oswald or that the voice on the tape is in fact not Oswald. For example, what could easily have happened is that the FBI was told, here is a photo and a tape of this man, and, seeing that the photo was not Oswald, concluded that the man in question (and therefore the man on the tape) was not Oswald. I worry that if Lane and Freed start waving this around in their usual way, Phillips or someone will make ~~xxxx~~ them, and the critics in general, look bad. Anyhow, I have the document in question and will make it ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ available to any reporter who asks for it.

By the way, the quote attributed to me in Dean's article is generally like what I said, but it sounds like it was translated from the Hungarian and is certainly not an exact quote.

I'll update my clips list soon, but for now, I'll mention a pre-release 12/7 Reuters piece, suggesting ~~xxxxxx~~ they got background from the FBI, and a horrible piece on the ammo, etc. in Midnight, 1/3.

best to all Paul

1/5 RECEIVED.
3 TED CLIPS +