

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

Assoc. Dir.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Asst. Dir.:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Adm. Serv.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comp. Syst.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ext. Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/>
Files & Com.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gen. Inv.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ident.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inspection	<input type="checkbox"/>
Intell.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Laboratory	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plan. & Eval.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spec. Inv.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal Coun.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Telephone Rm.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Director Sec'y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

TO : Director, FBI (PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL) DATE: 10/24/73

FROM : SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.
KANSAS CITY OFFICE

SUBJECT: PERSONNEL MATTER

In compliance with your instructions following our conversation in Kansas City on 10/19/73, I am setting forth the basic facts that we discussed. I am convinced that the administrative action taken against me in December, 1963, and again in October, 1964, was unjustified for the following reasons:

(1) The letter of censure in December, 1963, and the suspension in October, 1964, were based upon answers to questions telephonically furnished by former Assistant Director James Gale on 12/5/63. I answered these questions by memo to the SAC in Dallas dated 12/6/63.

About four years ago I had an opportunity to review my field personnel file in the Kansas City Office and noted that Serial 157 of the Dallas section of this file contains answers dated 12/8/63, which are not the same answers I submitted on 12/6/63. Most particularly I object to the answers to Questions 5 and 6 that appear in my personnel file. I am enclosing a copy of my memo to the SAC, Dallas, dated 12/6/63, which you will note is different from the one appearing in my personnel file.

I am aware, however, that former Supervisor Kenneth Howe did make alterations to my answers without my advice or consent, but with my knowledge. I am enclosing a copy of my memo to the SAC, Dallas, dated 12/6/63, with his corrections, and a copy of a routing slip from Howe to me furnishing me with the corrections. However, the answers appearing in my personnel file are not these answers either. It appears my answers were changed a second time, probably on 12/8/63, without my knowledge. The most obvious change is the false answer to Questions 5 and 6, in which I am falsely quoted as saying, "Perhaps I should have notified the Bureau earlier." This constitutes an admission of guilt, which I did not make at any time.

JPH:mfd (enc. **ENCLOSURE**)



MOVED BY SP4
V 27 1973
U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

312

Doc # 34

As to the motive for the above and the persons responsible, I believe the third paragraph of [REDACTED] letter dated [REDACTED] pretty well pinpoints the responsibility. I am enclosing a copy of this letter. b6

(2) The letter of censure and suspension dated October, 1964, constitutes double jeopardy based upon the letter of censure dated December, 1963. The only thing added to the letter of October, 1964, was the statement that I made inappropriate remarks before a Hearing Board. Yet former Director Hoover personally advised me on 5/6/64, and SAC Gordon Shanklin of the Dallas Office in June, 1964, that my testimony before the Warren Commission was excellent. The Bureau had a summary of my testimony on 5/6/64, and the full test of my testimony one week later, five months before my letter of censure in October, 1964, and no mention was made at any time concerning my inappropriate remarks until October, 1964. Mr. Hoover also assured me on 5/6/64, that the Warren Commission would completely clear the FBI. The unexpected failure of the Warren Commission to do this, I believe, was the principal reason for my second letter of censure and suspension in October, 1964.

(3) The matters covered in both letters of censure had no bearing whatsoever on the outcome of the case; namely, the prevention of the assassination of President Kennedy.

In accordance with your specific request on 10/19/73, the following should be noted regarding the failure to place Lee Harvey Oswald on the Security Index:

Oswald was not on the Security Index because he did not fit the criteria in existence as of 11/22/63. The criteria was later changed to include Oswald. It should be noted, however, even if he had been on the Security Index, no specific action would have been taken regarding him or any other Security Index subject at the time of President Kennedy's visit to Dallas.

The FBI as of 11/22/63, had only one responsibility regarding presidential protection, at the insistence of the U. S. Secret

Service. The responsibility was to furnish the Secret Service any information on persons making direct threats against the President, in possible violation of Title 18, USC, Section 871. I personally participated in two such referrals immediately prior to 11/22/63.

In conclusion, [REDACTED] in his letter dated [REDACTED] sums up my attitude in this matter that because of the action taken by the Bureau in October, 1964, the Bureau in effect told the world I was the person responsible for President Kennedy's death. b6

On 10/19/73, you asked me what I think should be done. I believe that it first must be determined if I was derelict in my duty in any manner, and was responsible for President Kennedy's death. After that it should be determined what damages I suffered, and then we can discuss the third point - what action should be taken.

I can state with a perfectly clear conscience that I in no way failed to do what was required of me prior to 11/22/63, and based upon information available to me, which was not all the information available to the U. S. Government on 11/22/63. I had absolutely no reason to believe that Oswald was a potential assassin or dangerous in any way.

I have no desire to blame anyone else or to seek an alternate scapegoat. I am firmly convinced, despite the totally unjustified conclusion of the Warren Commission, that the FBI was not in any way at fault.

In accordance with your instructions, I will not discuss the contents of this letter with anyone. In the event you want further clarification on any point, I will gladly furnish additional information to you.