

**NR\_key\_name:** 95C8C981603A8F50862565930058B6B2

**SendTo:** Eileen\_Sullivan @ jfk-arrrb.gov

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

**From:** lpease@netcom.com

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 01/21/1998

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 8:07:57 AM

**ComposedDate:**

**ComposedDate\_Time:**

**Subject:** Miscommunication or...?  
I was surprised at this message because so far, in regards to documents requested by PROBE, we've had no such problem. But sadly, there are still a ton of very interesting documents that do not appear to have been declassified. Has the document referenced below been declassified? If so, where are the other 795 pages? And if not, I'd be happy to forward a response to Joe and Jim Hargrove explaining how they are mistaken about this. Thanks in advance for any help you can provide.----- Forwarded message -----  
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 1998 18:17:03 -0600  
From: Jim Hargrove <jimh@wwa.com>  
To: 'Lisa Pease' <lpease@netcom.com>  
Subject: RE: Nichols Juror Slams FBI  
On Sunday, January 18, 1998 11:35 AM, Lisa Pease [SMTP:lpease@netcom.com] wrote:  
> Great response to Steve. A while back I started to suspect he was less than sincere - others thought I was crazy. But I think we are really seeing his true colors now. Makes me wonder about Barb, who considers Steve perhaps her very best friend in all of this.  
Hi, Lisa. Always nice to hear from you. Here's a suggestion for a future Probe article. I've been reading Joe Backes' writeups on the ARRB releases, and it sure sounds to me like someone is playing games with the Records Act and the collection. Joe writes that so many docs claimed to be released are barely open at all--just a page or two from what should be a large document, for example. Other "releases" are missing entirely. And he describes how the retrieval procedures make it nearly impossible for researchers to work efficiently. So, how about an article called "The Mess at the Archives" or something like that? Joe would be a likely candidate to write it. One document from the whole wretched mess I'd like to see, for example, is a 797-page FBI report about Oswald aliases. Here's how the ARRB Web database describes it:  
"AGENCY INFORMATION AGENCY : FBI RECORD NUMBER : 124-10035-10022 RECORDS SERIES : HQ AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 105-82555-454 DOCUMENT INFORMATION ORIGINATOR : FBI FROM : DEBRUEYS, WARREN C. TO : DIRECTOR, FBI DATE : 12/02/63 PAGES : 797 DOCUMENT TYPE : PAPER, TEXTUAL DOCUMENT SUBJECTS : OSWALD, LEE, INITIAL DALLAS REPORT CLASSIFICATION : UNCLASSIFIED RESTRICTIONS : 2, 4 CURRENT STATUS : RELEASED WITH DELETIONS DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 09/24/93 OPENING CRITERIA : INDEFINITE COMMENTS : REPORT, INDEX AT END OF DOCUMENT, TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE 1b"  
And here's a portion of Joe's description of the same doc:  
"Document # 124-10035-10022 Is supposed to be a 797 page report. 3 pages of which are here. There is kind of a cover sheet with a hell of a lot of notations on it. The title of the case is interesting LEE HARVEY OSWALD, aka L. H. Oswald, Lee Oswald, Lee H. Oswald, Leslie Oswald, A. Hidell, A. J. Hidell, Alek J. Hidell, Alek James Hidell, O. H. Lee. Leslie Oswald"-----  
Some one should at least complain about this bs before everyone is too tired battling windmills to care anymore.--Jim

**Body:**

**recstat:**

**DeliveryPriority:**

**DeliveryReport:**

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**