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Some controversy has arisen in regard to the question of whether the tapes existed at the time of the assassination due to a memorandum from J. Edgar Hoover to the head of the Secret Service which said:

The Central Intelligence Agency advised that on October 1, 1963, an extremely sensitive source had reported that an individual identified himself as Lee Oswald, who contacted the Soviet Embassy in 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. These Special Agents are of the opinion that the above-referred-to individual was not Lee Harvey Oswald.

(Memorandum from Hoover to James J. Rowley, 11/23/63, pp. 4-5.) The HSCA has determined that this statement was probably based on another FBI memorandum which said:

Inasmuch as the Dallas Agents who listened to the tape of the conversation allegedly of Oswald from the Cuban Embassy to the Russian Embassy in Mexico and examined the photographs of the visitor to the Embassy in Mexico and were of the opinion that neither the tape nor the photograph pertained to Oswald, I requested Shanklin to immediately send a photograph of Oswald to our Legal Attache.

(Memorandum from Belmont to Tolson, 11/23/63, p. 1. Mr. Belmont was reporting the results of a conversation with the Special Agent in Charge in Dallas, Gordon Shanklin, that occurred at 11:50 A.M.)
Later that same day SAC Shanklin informed the Director that the tape of Oswald's voice had been erased: "It should be noted that the actual tape from which this transcript was made has been erased." (Teletype from SAC Dallas to Director, # 232220, 7:30 P.M. CST, 11/23/63. Emphasis in the original.)

The confusion about whether or not there was a tape apparently continued for several days after the SAC in Dallas informed the Director that such a tape did not exist. On 11/25/63 the FBI Legat in Mexico City sent a Cablegram to the director which said:

There appears to be some confusion in that no tapes were taken to Dallas but only typewritten transcripts supplied by CIA, the tapes not being available because they had been erased.

(Cablegram # 182 & 183, p. 2.)

The FBI was asked to explain the paragraph from the Hoover memorandum quoted above. It responded:

The paragraph appearing on pages 4 and 5 of the letterhead memorandum, which is quoted in your (FBI) request of March 17, 1978, contains some incorrect information regarding a tape recording of the voice of an individual who identified himself as Lee Oswald.

Retrievable information contained in files of the FBI indicates that this Bureau received information derived from transcripts of tape recordings furnished by another government agency which conducts intelligence-type inves-