7/27/78 LW

June 24, 1978

Dear Paul:

Your 6/20 came this morning. I'm feeling a little unsteady. I skimmed but didn't quite comprehend your memo so I've gone directly to the documents to go over them and get a little bit about them on tape for Lil to retype when she has time.

The first is your item No. 940. It is FBI 97-4196-33-10 (97 is an FBI file code for registration act).

This document dated 8/23/63 has the formality of being from the SAC New Orleans to Director. A separate 97 file indicated for New Orleans. It was reviewed for the House Select committee on Assassinations on 6-28-77 so there should have been no reason for delaying its release.

I am familiar with this matter by having been told about it by Jesse Core. Your presumption about the omitted name is correct and there, of course, is no reason for withholding the name under any of the exemptions to the Act.

The memorandum was actually written by Warren DeBrueys. I knew about this from Jesse Core.

DeBrueys begins the second paragraph by stating that "two persons, one of which is believed identical with Oswald ... distributed pamphlets in front of the International Trade Mart ..." There is a factual error in this that cannot be accidental. Core was never under any illusions about the number of persons involved. He has always insisted there were three. This immediately raises a question as to why De Brueys represents him as having said there were only two.

Your item 491 is DeBrueys' report on 10-25-63 covering a period from 8-9 through 10/15/63 He describes the case as a registration act and internal security case of Cuba and there are a number of interesting notes on this besides the fact that it was sent to the Deputy Attorney General in response to your 7-1-70 FOIA request. It was given to the Church committee, too, and on the day of the assassination to Secret Service liaison.

The identification CD-1114, sixth folder of document, would indicate that it is in that CD but I don't remember its being reproduced as part of it.

The number of agencies indicated in dissemination is fairly large. I do not recall that any one has come up with it.

De Brueys in the paragraph of text on the first page refers to "the departure from New Orleans of Lee Harvey Oswald." On page B, the Cover page, four Cuban sources are listed. If any one of these is Carlos Bringuier or Carlos Quiroga, there is no basis for withholding the name under the exemptions of the Freedom of Information Act, and I think should be appealed as I think also with Core.

Under Administrative on this page it states, "One copy of this report is being furnished to the Dallas Division for information, inasmuch as that office is presently conducting inquiries to locate Lee Harvey Oswald, subject of a separate investigation ..." Is this entirely consistent with Hosty's representation about when he obtained information from New Orleans? My belief is that it is not consistent.

The remaining items are not included. I don't believe there is a cover page without any following text.

Your item 493, which is a Fain report of 5/12/60 for the period 4/27-28/60 has values in indicating files to be sought in compliance with FOIA requests. There is a different 100 file for this case, 353496, Serial 715. There is a different bureau file of the same number, a New York 105 file and a Dallas 105 file -976.

Given the nature of Cover page B, the opening obliteration indicated as confidential seems to not qualify for classification or withholding today.

ONce again there are indications of other files and other agencies from which and similar records should have been provided and have not been.

Specific FOIA request by HW

Your item 501 bears the initials JPH which represents Hosty. It is dated exactly a month before the assassination and bears the identification of the standing Oswald file as we know it, 105-82555. However, it was the 39th item as of a month before the assassination in that file at the very least. There could be more because there are not recorded serials.

There are other 100 files indicated for Dallas, 10461, for New Orleans, 16601.

Dallas was the office of origin as of this date which is a month before the assassinati and on the internal security - Russian records where Dallas was also the office of origin the 105 file in Dallas was 1435, the 100 file in New Orleans was 16926.

The opening obliteration refers to a New Orleans Airtel of 10/2/63 to Dallas. It is classified Secret whichI think is not justified after all this passing of time if it ever was.

Bearing on the legitimacy of the FBI's claim to have to "protect identity," a phrase that appears in the first sentence that is not obliterated. This is fakery. As of that time anybody, any citizen, could go to a post office and for $1.00 obtain a forwarding address. I used to do it.

after FOIA request

This says that on"10/18/63 it was determined from Mrs. Dorothy Reeder (protect identidy)" that Robert Oswald had moved.

This record appears not to have been classified until 7/5/77 when it was classified by No. 2040 and exempt from the GDS category 2&3. I believe this also was baseless.

My memory is not certain so I do not know if it is news that on page 2, the second paragraph opens, "For the information of Little Rock and Legal Mexico, subject Lee Harvey Oswald ..." and so forth. This clearly indicates that the FBI knew prior to the writing of Hosty's memo that Oswald had been to Mexico. I presume it also knew that he had returned.

Your item 502 is serial 43 in FBIHQ 105=82555. This also is dated 10/22/63.

The second paragraph of this cable would seem to be contrary to Hosty's representations to the committee. It shows that Dallas had files relating to Oswald because it had files relating to the August 9 arrest.

Copies should have been provided by CIA, New Orleans, Washington Field Office, and there is a duplicate filing under "foreign liaison unit."

HW Request

What is not obliterated on page 2 indicates that the files of the legal attache in Mexico City should have other records including those to be sent according to this cable from headquarters.

Your item 503 is New Orleans 105-82555-44. It is dated 10-31/63 and is the report of Milton R. Kaack. It lists a series of agencies to which copies were sent. The notatio on the right, which includes the name Yeagley and a date that appears to be 11-27 or 11-29-63 indicates that a copy was sent to what was then the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice which Yeagley headed. Note that on Cover page C one or both of the paragraphs totally obliterated "was classified secret by CIA and should not be further disseminated." This is an administrative part of the FBI and I find myself wondering why if it ever was appropriate it could be appropriate today. I believe it should be appealed.

Your item 505 and your appended note that the FBI at this late date is obliterating what you say you got "from the Archives years ago" and refer to your AIB item 463 is relevant in evalutating the FBI's current withholding procedures.

This is the change of address card that Oswald's self-servingly sent to the Worker in New York.

I guess it's safe to assume that you received additional pages and considered that those you sent were only the more important ones. This, of course, will make it difficult for me to compare it with what I obtain.

In your notes on this, page 3, after item 490, you say, that as far as you know "th item was never given to the Warren Commission." This is not the only record from Jesse Core not given to the Warrne Commission from what Jesse Core told me.

After this you go into "additional FBI files to be reviewed." As you notice above, I have specified files from which we have had no compliance. This can be very impo to me and if you see any file numbers that seem at all strange to you will you plea give me a list of them.

In your note to me you conclude, "If the HSC hearings do happen after Labor Day, I' try to be there. See you there?" I believe they will happen considerably before Labor Day. The best information we have received lately is that they may start abo the middle of July. They may or may not continue as late as Labor Day. I do not pl to go there at of now. I will not go there just to take in what happens because I expect nothing good to happen. However, I believe that it is going to be necessary to try and make some effort to offset what the committee is clearly going to be tryi to do. If you have any doubts about this now, I'm really surprised. Goldberg and Katz discussed it with me to a limited degree in May. I've heard from neither one since. Thanks for what you sent.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg