

(2) Why didn't Dallas interview the wife prior to the assassination?

SECRET

Hosty

Shanklin

SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.

A separate case was opened on MARINA NIKOLAEVNA OSWALD, wife of subject, on 7/25/62, under the SOBYR program since she

The ultimate objective of such investigations is the interview of the subject under conditions considered best suited to be conducive to cooperation on their part.

When first opened, this case was assigned to former SA PAIN and was reassigned to me on 10/25/62, upon his retirement. The case at that time was in a pending inactive status on the basis of Dallas letter to the Bureau of 7/25/62, which in essence stated that UACB the case would be placed in a pending inactive status for a period of six months inasmuch as MARINA OSWALD was evidently proficient only in the Russian language.

When the case on MARINA OSWALD was reactivated, investigation on 3/3/63 determined LEE and MARINA OSWALD had left the last address in Dallas known to Immigration and Naturalization Service, (602 Elsbeth), and had moved to 214 West Neeley. This was reported to the Bureau by Dallas letter dated 3/25/63, which contained a lead to determine the present employment of LEE OSWALD.

It was not felt the above was a propitious time to interview MARINA OSWALD since the employment of LEE OSWALD was not known and further it was determined they were having some domestic difficulties as pointed out in the letter of 3/25/63. Because of LEE OSWALD's undoubted influence over MARINA OSWALD, it was believed this situation would make it difficult to attain

(2) The case on MARINA OSWALD was opened on a specific recommendation of this writer on 7/19/62, at which time it was noted that she fell within the criteria of the SOI program (Manual of Instructions, 105-E). By letter to the Bureau dated 7/25/62, Bureau was advised on a UACB basis that in view of the pending investigation on LEE HARVEY OSWALD this case would be put in a pending inactive status, to be re-opened at a later date for consideration or advisable action. This case was reactivated and in March of 1963 it was determined that the OSWALDS had just moved from their apartment on Elsbeth. It was determined that LEE OSWALD had been drinking to excess and had been beating his wife on numerous occasions. There had been many complaints from other tenants concerning this. The OSWALDS were located at another location on West Neeley Street and a letter was sent to the Bureau advising the status of the case. Upon careful review of the Manual of Instructions, Section 105-E, it was noted that it would be necessary to utilize a friend or sponsor of MARINA OSWALD for interpreter and that the atmosphere of the interview would have to be conducted in such a manner as to not cause any undue emotional stress or strain on the person being interviewed. In view of the reported marital difficulties between the OSWALDS, it was decided to wait a suitable period to determine whether the domestic situation had been sufficiently clarified, so as to permit a proper interview as desired in Section 105-E of the manual. Upon recontact of the subject in May, it was determined that the subject had moved, leaving no forwarding address. Later, when the subject was determined to be in New Orleans,

2 - Dallas

JPE:nac

(2)

SECRET

DL 100-10461

origin in this case was transferred to the New Orleans Office. Dallas Office obtained the forwarding address of MARINA OSWALD on 10/28/63, and on 10/29/63 verified her residence at 2515 W. 5th, Irving, Texas. One of the primary purposes of the interview of Mrs. RUTH PAINE on 11/1/63, was for the purpose of laying the necessary groundwork for interview of MARINA OSWALD; however, in view of the allegations concerning LEE OSWALD's contact with the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City, it was decided not to conduct this interview until Dallas had been made origin in both the case on MARINA OSWALD and LEE HARVEY OSWALD, so that the Dallas Office could be certain that we were in possession of all facts concerning both MARINA OSWALD and LEE OSWALD. Change of origin was not received by the Dallas Office until 11/21/63, and not received by this writer until 11/22/63.

Office until 11/21/63, and not received by this writer until 11/22/63, *after the decision*

the cooperation of MARINA OSWALD. It was not felt that in accordance with the provisions of Manual of Instructions, Section 105E, Page 4b, Item (b), that an approach in a SOBIA case, which must be on a friendly and cordial basis, could be effectively consummated under the circumstances.

On 8/27/63, investigation was conducted in the vicinity of 214 West Keeley with the thought in mind of determining the domestic situation at that time and the employment of LEE OSWALD in order that further consideration might be given an interview with MARINA OSWALD. It was at that time learned they had left 214 West Keeley and had given no change of address from this residence to any other location to the Post Office.

In July, 1963, sufficient information was received to show that LEE and probably MARINA OSWALD were living in New Orleans, and this was verified by New Orleans letter to the Dallas Office dated 8/13/63. This was reported to the Bureau by letter to the Bureau and New Orleans, dated 8/23/63, which set forth Dallas was submitting form FD-128 which would, when submitted, change office of origin to New Orleans and provide New Orleans with all information in Dallas file not already in their possession. This was followed by submission of the FD-128 on 9/10/63, changing origin to New Orleans and the submission of a report under that same date bringing the Dallas investigation up-to-date.

By airtel dated 10/25/63, and received at Dallas, 10/28/63, New Orleans advised that the OSWALDs had left New Orleans and requested Dallas attempt to verify their presence in the Dallas area. This verification was effectuated by investigation in the vicinity of 2515 West Fifth Street in Irving, Texas, on 10/29/63, and 11/1/63, and the Bureau and New Orleans Office were so advised by Dallas airtel to the Bureau and New Orleans, 10/30/63, with respect to MARINA OSWALD and by Dallas airtel to the Bureau and New Orleans dated 11/4/63, as to LEE HARVEY OSWALD.

No interview of MARINA OSWALD was immediately considered at the time of her location in Irving, Texas, inasmuch as it was known New Orleans would change office of origin back to Dallas in both cases on the basis of the aforementioned airtels and would coincidentally furnish the Dallas Office any information in their files not already known to Dallas. The Dallas Office felt that in order to have all the assurance possible of a successful and productive interview of MARINA OSWALD, it should be certain it was in possession of any and all information which might have any bearing on this.

FD-128 from New Orleans to the Bureau and Dallas, dated 11/15/63, changed origin to Dallas in the MARINA OSWALD case and assured Dallas it was in possession of all pertinent data in New Orleans files. An FD-128 changing origin to Dallas in the LEE HARVEY OSWALD case from New Orleans to the Bureau and Dallas, dated 11/19/63, was received in Dallas on 11/21/63. This enclosed a recent New Orleans Police Department picture of subject not previously in the possession of Dallas.

All facts known in this investigation up until the above time, with the possible exception of information indicating LEE OSWALD had been in contact with the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City, which matter is commented upon later herein, indicated the most important objective of the investigation to be the interview of MARINA OSWALD under the provisions of the SOBIR program, and the investigation was designed to avoid having MARINA OSWALD gain the impression she was being harassed or "hounded" because of her immigrant status in order that the interview when conducted might be as productive as possible.

(3) Why didn't Dallas conduct additional investigation concerning OSWALD after he returned from the USSR? Why did the only investigation conducted at that time consist of interviewing OSWALD, interviews with Government officials, three of his relatives, and two Communist Party informants?

(4) During the course of investigation by SA's JOHN W. FAIN and B. TOM CARTER, why did Dallas not ask OSWALD why he was contacted by MVD? Report indicates he was asked whether or not he was an espionage assignment and he said "No". He was asked whether or not he had furnished Russia information and he said "No". He said he had been contacted by the MVD but he never said why. Why was it Dallas never questioned him as to whether he furnished a signed statement with the Department of State, indicating that he affirmed his allegiance to the USSR?

(3) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by former SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(4) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by former SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(3) SA Fain (re)

(4) SA Carter

SA Arnold J. Brown

(5) Why was not a report submitted by Dallas on 3/25/63 until 8/23/63 concerning a lead to determine OSWALD's employment? Why the delay?

SA JAMES P. BOSTY, JR.

As previously pointed out, on the basis of known facts the principal and most important objective of the investigation concerning LEE and MARINA OSWALD was the interview of MARINA OSWALD as a SOBIR subject under conditions most likely to result in cooperation on her part. As set forth in Dallas letter to the Bureau of 3/25/63, conditions promising a successful interview did not exist as of that time, thus justifying a "cooling-off period" prior to again making an effort to interview MARINA OSWALD. The approximate 60-day period between that letter and the investigation of 5/27/63 seemed a proper period to wait prior to again making an effort to determine LEE OSWALD's employment and the feasibility and advisability of an interview with MARINA OSWALD. The investigation on 5/27/63 revealed, however, MARINA OSWALD and LEE OSWALD had moved from their last known Dallas address, 214 West Neeley, and had given no forwarding address from this residence to the Post Office.

By letter to Dallas, dated 7/17/63, the New Orleans Office furnished information indicating LEE OSWALD and probably MARINA OSWALD were in that city. A letter on the basis of this was directed by Dallas to the New Orleans Office under date of 7/29/63 requesting the New Orleans Office to verify the present of LEE and MARINA OSWALD in New Orleans. This official verification was received on 8/15/63 by New Orleans letter to Dallas dated 8/13/63. This was reported by Dallas letter to the Bureau and New Orleans dated 8/23/63.

Although it possibly would have been better to do so prior to 8/23/63, these investigative results were not reported to the Bureau until location of the OSWALDs was established in New Orleans since they did not appear particularly significant and the investigation, looking toward accomplishment of the principal objective of it, interview with MARINA OSWALD under the SOBIR program, was going forward.

(5) This phase of the investigation was handled solely
by former SA JOHN W. FAIM.

goes off
by 1 here
it is 5
to 6
the
with
one.

is N.G.
appears
in
numbering off



Vertical text on the right edge of the page, possibly a page number or reference code.

There has been no report concerning the lead on 3/25/63 to consider interviewing Mrs. OSWALD. Explain why not.

SA JAMES P. HOSBY, JR.

As stated in other portions of this communication the ultimate objective of this investigation was the interview of Mrs. OSWALD under the SOBIR program. This continues to be the principal objective of the investigation during the time the case was assigned to me, and the reasons for not reporting to the Bureau the various investigative steps being taken are covered hereinbefore.

(6) In accordance with SAC Letter 62-48E, results of investigations in Espionage and Nationalistic Tendency cases may be recorded in memorandums to the SAC. It should be noted following the submission of Dallas letter to the Bureau, 3/25/63, such a memorandum was placed in the file covering the investigation conducted in Dallas in May of 1962, also setting forth leads to contact relatives and neighbors within the Dallas - Fort Worth area. It should be noted that subsequent investigation has determined the subjects left the Dallas area in May of 1963. In July of 1963, the New Orleans Office determined that the subjects were residing in the New Orleans Division, and origin was changed. After it had been determined that the subjects had left Dallas, the lead to determine LEE OSWALD's employment appeared unnecessary at the time. It should be noted that the subjects were not active in any subversive organizations at this time and had nothing to arouse any undue interest. The sole purpose of the investigation at this time was to locate and interview MARINA OSWALD in accordance with 105-E, Manual of Instructions.

*Investigation
had been
conducted*

On this case. Explain why OSWALD was NOT
contacted when it was learned he had been in
contact with the Soviet Embassy in Mexico.

After MARINA OSWALD moved to New Orleans Office
and records furnished to that office, it was left to the dis-
cretion of the New Orleans Office how and when MARINA OSWALD
could be interviewed.

SA JAMES P. BOSTY, JR.

On 11/1/63, after investigation had been conducted
on the few days prior thereto establishing her reliability,
Mrs. MICHAEL R. (RUTH) PAINE was interviewed at 2515 West
5th Street, Irving, Texas. This resulted in verification
of the fact MARINA OSWALD was residing at that address and
further established that LEE OSWALD was visiting there
periodically, but was working at the Texas School Book
Depository Company in Dallas and residing in Dallas at an
unknown address.

On 11/4/63, Dallas directed a letter to the Bureau
and the New Orleans and Little Rock offices reporting the
verification of MARINA OSWALD's address and the information
concerning LEE OSWALD.

On 11/5/63, Mrs. PAINE was again interviewed but as
of this time had no additional information concerning LEE
OSWALD's residence address in Dallas.

Additional remarks pertinent and responsive here
are contained in the answer to questions #2 and #13.

OSWALD subscribed to "The Worker" on 9/28/62? This information was not reported until 3/25/63. Why the delay?

The information concerning OSWALD's subscription to "The Worker" was received on 10/22/62 by letter from the New York Office dated 10/17/62. At this time the case was in a closed status. A copy of the incoming New York communication was, however, routed to SA [redacted] and subsequently initialed for file.

*Fain, advised,
in chain in his watch*

After MARINA OSWALD moved to New Orleans Office, and serials [redacted] to that office, it was left to the discretion of the New Orleans Office how and when MARINA OSWALD should be interviewed.

Added to interview and [redacted] of recommendation
(8) On 11/1/63, following the interview of Mrs. ALICE WUTH PAINE, a teletype was sent requesting a change of office of origin from New Orleans to Dallas. The Dallas Office had previously received information that OSWALD had been in contact with the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City. For this reason, the Dallas Office was waiting a change of origin so that the Dallas Office would be in possession of all information before attempting an interview of the subject. It should be noted that until such time as origin was changed the Dallas Office could not be sure that we were in possession of information, and it was felt until such time this was certain, any interview would be decidedly premature.

SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.

When I reported the results of investigation in the MARINA OSWALD case following its reactivation, in Dallas letter to Bureau dated 3/25/63, I prepared this letter under a dual caption with the thought in mind and knowing the desk would reopen the LEE HARVEY OSWALD file on the basis of the copies of the letter going to that file, since it was desirable to have the cases on both individuals in a pending status during investigation looking toward the interview of MARINA OSWALD under the SOBIR program. As a result of this, I reviewed the LEE OSWALD file prior to preparing my letter and noting therein the unreported information concerning OSWALD's subscription to "The Worker," I reported this item in my aforementioned letter. The LEE OSWALD case was then reopened and assigned to me on the basis of this communication on 3/26/63.

(10) Why did I leave Dallas from 11/1/63 to 11/4/63 to advise Little Rock to discontinue efforts to locate OSWALD, thereby necessitating Little Rock communication of 11/5/63?

SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.

Following positive verification of LEE OSWALD's location in Dallas on 11/1/63, I did not return to the Dallas Office until after 5:00 p.m. This was on a Friday afternoon. With a view toward the economy program, teletypes have not customarily been used by the Dallas Field Division in asking other offices to discontinue investigation in security matters, because of the lack of urgency in most cases in connection with such matters. As a consequence, an airtel was prepared, with copies for Little Rock, reflecting location of LEE OSWALD in Dallas. All mail in security matters must go by Registered Mail and as a consequence, since the airtel could not under those circumstances go out of the Dallas Office until Monday, 11/4/63, the typing of it was put off until that time, although it had been roughdrafted on 11/1/63.

* Registering of mail on weekends and holidays can only be handled by arrangement with Post Office.

(9) The information that OSWALD subscribed to The Worker on 9/28/62 was received prior to the time this case was assigned to the writer and it was initialed for file when the case was closed. This case was not re-opened to the writer until 3/25/63, at which time this information was reported.

(10) The information concerning the whereabouts of LEE OSWALD was obtained in the late afternoon of 11/1/63, a Friday. This writer did not return to the Dallas Office until after 5 p.m. All security information must go Registered Mail. There is no Registered Mail sent out of the Dallas Office after four o'clock Friday and before the following Monday. This airtel was rough-drafted on 11/1/63, but could not be mailed until 11/4/63.

J.P.H.

(10) When did Dallas get Washington Field Office communication regarding contact with the Soviet Embassy?

SA SUPERVISOR KENNETH C. BOWE

Washington Field Office airtel of 11/19/63 containing information with respect to contact of LEE OSWALD with the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D. C. was received by the Dallas Field Division on 11/22/63

(11) The Dallas Office received the WFO communication re contact with the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D. C. 11/22/63. (This communication was never routed to this writer.)
I was verbally advised by the ASAC [unclear] [unclear] of [unclear] 11/24/63

(11) Dallas airtel of 8/23/63 indicates subject moved after 3/25/63. When did Dallas get the fact he moved?

SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.

Information that the OSWALDs had left their last known address in Dallas, 214 Keeley Street, and had left no forwarding address from this residence, was developed in investigation on 5/27/63.

(12) The Dallas Office determined on 5/27/63 that subjects had moved. Subsequent investigation reflects they actually moved on 8/11/63.

having no forwarding address

(3) Why didn't Dallas conduct additional investigation concerning OSWALD after he returned from the USSR? Why did the only investigation conducted at that time consist of interviewing OSWALD, interviews with Government officials, three of his relatives and two Communist Party informants?

(4) During the course of investigation by SA's JOHN W. FAIN and B. TOM CARTER, why did Dallas not ask OSWALD why he was contacted by MVD? Report indicates he was asked whether or not he had a passport assignment and he said "No". He was asked whether or not he had furnished Russia information and he said "No". He said he had been contacted by the MVD but he never said why. Why was it Dallas never questioned him as to whether he furnished a signed statement with the Department of State, indicating that he affirmed his allegiance to the USSR?

(3) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(4) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(3) SA Fain (re)

(4) SA Carter

SA Arnold J. Brown

(3) Why didn't Dallas conduct additional investigation concerning OSWALD after he returned from the USSR? Why did the only investigation conducted at that time consist of interviewing OSWALD, interviews with Government officials, three of his relatives, and two Communist Party informants?

(4) During the course of investigation by SA's JOHN W. FAIN and B. TOM CARTER, why did Dallas not ask OSWALD why he was contacted by MVD? Report indicates he was asked whether or not he had any espionage assignment and he said "No". He was asked whether or not he had furnished Russia information and he said "No". He said he had been contacted by the MVD but he never said why. Why was it Dallas never questioned him as to whether he furnished a signed statement with the Department of State, indicating that he affirmed his allegiance to the USSR?

(3) SA Fain (re)

(4) SA Carter

SA Arnold J. Brown

(3) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(4) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(3) Why didn't Dallas conduct additional investigation concerning OSWALD after he returned from the USSR? Why did the only investigation conducted at that time consist of interviewing OSWALD, interviews with Government officials, three of his relatives, and two Communist Party informants?

(4) During the course of investigation by SA's JOHN W. FAIN and B. TOM CARTER, why did Dallas not ask OSWALD why he was contacted by MVD? Report indicates he was asked whether or not he had an espionage assignment and he said "No". He was asked whether or not he had furnished Russia information and he said "No". He said he had been contacted by the MVD but he never said why. Why was it Dallas never questioned him as to whether he furnished a signed statement with the Department of State, indicating that he affirmed his allegiance to the USSR?

(3) SA Fain (re)

(4) SA Carter

SA Arnold J. Brown

(3) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by former SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(4) This phase of the investigation was handled solely by former SA JOHN W. FAIN.

Hesty
12/6/63

(1) Why didn't Dallas recommend OSWALD be placed on the Security Index? (Explanations to be obtained from all Agents who have had this assigned.)

(1) The Dallas Office did not recommend OSWALD for the Security Index during period that he was in the Dallas Division because the subject's activities while in the Dallas Division did not appear to fit the criteria for the Security Index as set forth in the Manual of Instructions.

Shanklin
12/8/63

stranger - pro hesty

SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.

At no time during the period when this case was assigned to me with Dallas as origin were the known activities of LEE OSWALD such as to bring him within the criteria necessary for a recommendation concerning inclusion of his name in the Security Index.

(15) Have we been giving Dallas Police information on other people and, if so, under what circumstances? Specifically, have we given Dallas Police any information concerning individuals and their subversive backgrounds?

SA JAMES P. BOSTY, JR.

There exists a situation of close liaison between the Special Services Bureau of the Dallas Police Department and the Dallas Office for exchange of information of mutual interest to both agencies with respect to racial matters and individuals identified with, or concerned with, the furtherance of the objectives of hate and klan-type organizations or activity. As provided in the Manual of Instructions, Section 122B (Racial Matters), page 8, item 2, the Bureau has the responsibility of advising government agencies and officials on both a national and local level of all pertinent information obtained concerning incidents in this category and each SAC is charged with the responsibility of seeing that necessary arrangements in this regard exist.

No information has been furnished to the Dallas Police Department by the Dallas Office on individuals with subversive backgrounds in accordance with accepted Bureau policy in this regard that no information is to be furnished from our files to the other than approved representatives of executive agencies of the federal government, except to advise cooperating law enforcement agencies of data which are matters of public record.

(16) The Dallas Office has been furnishing the Dallas information concerning racial matters and individuals relating to hate and klan-type groups. In accordance with instructions, no information has ever been furnished to Dallas PD concerning individuals with subversive backgrounds.

selective continuing basis

close liaison with Dallas PD
has furnished info. to the Dept. on continuing basis concerning indiv. in this category. No info. has been furnished on indiv. with subv. backgrounds

DL 100-10481
DL 105-1435

LEE OSWALD in Dallas, Texas, but she would furnish it to the FBI as soon as she was able to obtain it. Mrs. PAINE advised that LEE OSWALD had visited his wife, MARINA OSWALD, on 11/2 and 2/63, at Irving, Texas.

Mrs. PAINE then expressed the opinion that she considered LEE OSWALD to be a very illogical person and recalled he admitted to her being a "Trotskyite Communist."

At this point, investigation was held in abeyance since Dallas wanted to be certain it was in possession of all information the New Orleans Office had in this matter in order that additional investigation and a possible interview of MARINA OSWALD might be conducted with absolute insurance we were in possession of all pertinent facts. This was felt warranted despite the information received shortly prior to that time to the effect LEE OSWALD had been in touch with the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City, since the investigation as reflected above established LEE OSWALD was in the U. S., in the Dallas Area, and was employed in a non-strategic position where he would not have access to information important to the national defense.