

President's Commission  
on the  
Assassination of President Kennedy  
Report of Proceedings  
Held at  
Washington, D. C.  
Thursday, May 14, 1964

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# Memorandum

Tolson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Belmont	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mohr	<input type="checkbox"/>
Casper	<input type="checkbox"/>
Callahan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conrad	<input type="checkbox"/>
DeLoach	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evans	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gale	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rosen	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sullivan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tavel	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trotter	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tele. Room	<input type="checkbox"/>
Holmes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gandy	<input type="checkbox"/>

TO : MR. TOLSON

DATE: 5/19/64

FROM : A. H. Belmont

cc Mr. Belmont  
Mr. Mohr  
Mr. Malley  
Mr. Sullivan

SUBJECT: DIRECTOR'S TESTIMONY BEFORE  
THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON  
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Attached is a copy of the transcript of the Director's testimony before the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy. This transcript has been examined for accuracy, including misspellings and typographical errors on the part of the court reporter. It is noted that apparently the court reporter did not record the Director's testimony accurately in some instances. We have made as few changes as possible, in order to preserve the intent and accuracy of the Director's testimony.

This testimony was gone over by Messrs. Mohr, Malley, Branigan, M. A. Jones, Gheesling, Rogge, and me, on a word-by-word basis. In addition, Assistant Directors Sullivan, Rosen, DeLoach and Conrad have read the testimony and furnished their suggestions.

It is planned that I will personally go over these changes with Mr. Rankin of the Commission.

Enclosure

AHB:CSH (5)

*[Handwritten initials and signature]*

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Laws, Title 18, U.S.C., Sections 793 and 794. The transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

Vol. 44

Copy 12 of 12

**PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION  
ON THE  
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY**

---

**Report of Proceedings**

**Held at**

**Washington, D. C.**

**Thursday, May 14, 1964**

---

**PAGES 6497-6599**

(Stenotype Tape, Master Sheets, Carbon and Waste  
turned over to Commission for destruction.)

**WARD & PAUL  
OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
917 G STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001  
AREA CODE 202-428-4268**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**President's Commission**  
**on the**  
**Assassination of President Kennedy**

---

**EARL WARREN, *Chairman***  
**RICHARD B. RUSSELL**  
**JOHN SHERMAN COOPER**  
**HALE BOGGS**  
**GERALD R. FORD**  
**JOHN J. McCLOY**  
**ALLEN W. DULLES**

**J. LEE RANKIN, *General Counsel***

nash

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

C O N T E N T S

TESTIMONY OF

J. Edgar Hoover

John A. McCone

Richard H. Helms

PAGE

6500

6572

6576

EXHIBITS

NUMBER

IDENTIFICATION

EVIDENCE

836

6541

6541

864 & 865

6553

6553

866 & 867

6571

6571

870

6574

6574

868 & 869

6580

6580

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6497

firshain  
nash

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

ON THE

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

- - -

Washington, D. C.

Thursday, May 14, 1964

The President's Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:15 a.m., in the Hearing Room, Fourth Floor, 200 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington, D. C., Chief Justice Earl Warren presiding.

PRESENT:

Chief Justice Earl Warren, Chairman

Senator John Sherman Cooper, Member

Representative Hale Boggs, Member

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Member

Allen W. Dulles, Member

- - -

J. Lee Rankin, General Counsel

Norman Redlich, Special Assistant to General Counsel

Charles Murray, Observer

Walter Craig, Observer

Waggoner Carr, Attorney General of Texas

- - -

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6498

The Chairman. The Commission will be in order.

Director Hoover, will you please raise your right hand to be sworn, please.

You solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give before the Commission will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Hoover. I do.

The Chairman. Mr. Rankin, will carry on the examination, Mr. Director.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chief Justice, do you want to tell him briefly what our purpose is?

The Chairman. Oh, yes.

It is our practice to make a brief statement before the testimony of each witness, and I will do it now.

Mr. Hoover, will be asked to testify in regard to whether Lee H. Oswald was ever an agent, directly or indirectly, or an <sup>an</sup> ~~former~~ or acting on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in any capacity at any time, and whether he knows of any credible evidence ~~of~~ of any conspiracy, either domestic or foreign, involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.

What he has to say about an article in the National Enquirer, Commission Exhibit No. 837 and concerning the failure to include in the <sup>initial report</sup> ~~reproduction~~ of the Oswald address book the name and information concerning special agent Hosty,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

5499

and any suggestions and recommendations he may have concerning improvements or changes in provisions for the protection of the President of the United States.

Now, Mr. Rankin, you may proceed.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, will you state for the record your name and position?

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6500

TESTIMONY OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. Hoover. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Rankin. Where do you live, Mr. Hoover?

Mr. Hoover. I live at 4936 - 30th Place, Northwest, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Rankin. And you have been Director of the Bureau for some 40 years according to the newspapers?

Mr. Hoover. That is correct, since 1924.

Mr. Rankin. You have furnished us a considerable amount of information, Mr. Hoover, about whether or not Lee Harvey Oswald was ever an agent or acting for the Bureau in any capacity as informer or otherwise at any time.

Are those statements correct?

Mr. Hoover. They are correct. I can most emphatically say that at no time was he ever an employee of the Bureau in any capacity, either as an agent or as a special employee, or as an informant.

Mr. Rankin. I call your particular attention to Exhibit 835, and suggest that you will find that that is your letter, together with your affidavit about this subject matter, and other matters that you furnished to us concerning this particular subject.

Mr. Hoover. That is correct.

Mr. Rankin. Do you wish to add anything?

Mr. Hoover. No, there is nothing that I desire to add ~~other~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6501

then what ~~has~~ appeared in this letter and <sup>my</sup> the affidavit which ~~I was which~~ accompanied it to the Commission.

Mr. Rankin. You have provided many things to us in assisting the Commission in connection with this investigation and I assume, at least in a general way you are familiar with the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, is that correct?

Mr. Hoover. That is correct. When President Johnson returned to Washington he communicated with me within the first 24 hours, and asked the Bureau to pick up the investigation of the assassination because as you are aware, there is no Federal jurisdiction for such an investigation, ~~because~~ I it is not a crime to kill or attack the President or the Vice President or any of the ~~so-called~~ continuity of officers who would succeed to the presidency.

Federal

✓ However, the President has a right to request the Bureau to make special investigations, and in this instance he asked that this investigation be made, and I immediately assigned a special force headed by the special agent in charge at Dallas, Texas, to <sup>initiate</sup> ~~take up~~ the investigation, and to get all details and facts concerning it, which we obtained, and then prepared a report which we submitted to the Attorney General for transmission to the President.

Mr. Rankin. From your study of this entire matter of the assassination and work in connection with it, do you know of any

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6502

credible evidence that has ever come to your attention that there was a conspiracy either foreign or domestic involved in the assassination?

Mr. Hoover. I know of no substantial evidence of any type that would support any contention of that character. I have read all of the requests that have come to the Bureau from this Commission, and I have read ~~all the replies that~~ I have ~~gone~~ and signed all the replies that have come to the Commission.

In addition, I have read many of the reports that our agents have made and I have been unable to find any scintilla of evidence showing any foreign conspiracy or any domestic conspiracy that culminated in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Rep. Ford. May I ask this, Mr. Hoover.

As I understand your testimony, it is based on the evidence that has been accumulated thus far.

Mr. Hoover. That is correct, sir.

Rep. Ford. Is the Federal Bureau of Investigation continuing its investigation of all possible ramifications of this assassination?

Mr. Hoover. That is correct. We are receiving and we, I expect, will continue to receive for days or ~~maybe~~ weeks to come, letters from individuals that normally would probably be in the category of what we would call <sup>crank</sup> ~~a nut~~ letters in which various <sup>li</sup> wild allegations are made or <sup>in</sup> which people have ~~had~~ <sup>reported</sup> psychic vibrations, ~~or information~~. We are still running out ~~every~~

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6503

letters of that character and in turn making a report to this Commission upon it, notwithstanding <sup>the fact</sup> ~~that it can be seen~~ that on the face of it <sup>the allegation is</sup> ~~that it is~~ that without any foundation.

Individuals ~~who would not~~, who could not have known any of the facts, have made some very strange statements. There have been publications <sup>and</sup> books written, ~~in which the contents~~, the contents of which have been absurd, and without a scintilla of foundation of fact, but I feel, <sup>from</sup> ~~in view of~~ my experience in the Bureau, <sup>where</sup> we are in constant receipt all over the years of these so-called <sup>rank</sup> ~~not~~ letters, and I think that <sup>such allegations</sup> ~~this thing~~ will be <sup>possibly</sup> ~~going on~~ for some years to come.

I, personally, feel that any finding of the commission will not be accepted by everybody, because there <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ bound to be some extremists who have very pronounced views, without any foundation for them, <sup>who</sup> ~~that~~ will disagree violently with whatever findings the Commission makes.

But I think it is essential that the FBI <sup>investigate</sup> ~~run out any of~~ these <sup>are recorded</sup> ~~allegations~~ that <sup>do come in</sup> ~~do come in~~ in the future so it can't be said that we had ignored <sup>them or that</sup> ~~it and so far as~~ the case is ~~concerned~~ ~~it~~ is closed and ~~to~~ forgotten.

Rep. Ford. Could you give us some idea of how many agents are currently working to one degree or another on any aspects of this case?

Mr. Hoover. I would estimate, Congressman Ford, that there are ~~probably~~ at the present time at least 50 to 60 men giving

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6504

their entire time to various aspects of the investigation, because  
the ~~leads~~, while ~~where~~ Dallas is the office of origin, the  
~~investigation is required on~~  
~~leads run out to the~~ auxiliary offices, other offices in the country  
~~such as~~  
like Los Angeles or San Francisco, ~~and~~ even into some of the  
foreign countries like Mexico, ~~and~~ we have ~~an office~~ <sup>representatives</sup> in Mexico City.

At the ~~height~~ <sup>outlet</sup> of the investigation, ~~on~~ <sup>following</sup> the assassination,  
it was the desire of the President to have this report completed  
by the Bureau just as quickly as possible, and as thoroughly  
as possible, and I would say we had about 150 men at that time  
working on the report in the field, and at Washington, D. C.

Now, all the reports that come in from the field are,  
of course, reviewed at Washington by the supervisor in charge of  
the case, and then in turn by the assistant director of ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup>  
division, ~~which is the Domestic Intelligence Division~~, and then  
in turn by Mr. Belmont, who is the Assistant to the Director.

Reports in which there ~~have been~~ <sup>is</sup> a controversial issue or  
where statements have been made of the existence of some particular  
thing that we ~~had~~ <sup>have</sup> never heard of before, I myself, at the end  
of the -- ~~at the end of finally going~~ <sup>there</sup> over these to see that  
we haven't missed <sup>anything</sup> or haven't had any gap in ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> investigation  
so it can be tied down.

Recently ~~there was this publication~~ <sup>National E</sup> the ~~New York~~ Inquirer  
which had a fantastic article in it as to the existence of  
~~various letters and requests made, and I did not have until~~  
~~just reached this hearing this morning, the statement of the~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6505

Department. I think ~~in the article, an allegation was made~~  
~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> a letter had been written or a request <sup>that</sup> had been made by  
the Department of Justice to Chief Curry of the Dallas Police  
Department, to withhold arresting Rubinstein, or Ruby, and Oswald  
~~after the~~ <sup>Oswald</sup> attempt on General Walker's  
life.

First, I had ~~the agents at Dallas~~, the agent in charge at  
Dallas interview Chief Curry and I have sent to the Commission  
a letter <sup>as to</sup> ~~of~~ what Chief Curry had to say. He branded it as an  
entire lie. ~~That~~ <sup>that</sup> he had never received any request of that  
kind. I had our files searched to be certain we had not written  
any such letter. ~~as that~~ <sup>and found we had not.</sup> I requested the Department of Justice to  
advise me whether they had written any such letter and ~~it was~~  
~~was just handed to me this note.~~ Mr. Katzonbach advises there  
is no reference in the Department files to <sup>the</sup> alleged letter from  
<sup>any</sup> Department of Justice official to Chief Curry nor any refer-  
ence that <sup>an</sup> FBI official was asked to request the Dallas Police  
not to arrest Oswald or Ruby, ~~and~~ <sup>a</sup> letter is being sent to the  
Commission today setting forth this information.

~~So, it will be a formal record.~~

Rep. Ford. The point that I think ought to be made is  
that despite the magnitude of the effort that has been made  
by the FBI and by other agencies, and despite the tremendous  
effort that has been made, I believe, by the Commission to help  
and assist and to consolidate all of the evidence that we

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6506

possibly could, that there is always the possibility at some future date that some evidence might come to the surface.

Mr. Hoover. That is, of course, possible, yes.

Rep. <sup>Ford</sup> Hoover. I want just to be sure that no leads, no evidence regardless of its credibility will be ignored, that it will be pursued by the Bureau or any other agency to make certain that it is good, bad or of no value.

Mr. Hoover. Well, I can assure you so far as the FBI is concerned, the case will be continued in an open classification for all time. That is, any information coming to us or any report coming to us from any source will be thoroughly investigated, ~~so~~ that we will be able to either prove or disprove the allegation ~~made by the person~~. We found in the course of our investigations <sup>that</sup> individuals have made statements, and <sup>investigate</sup> yet, when we ~~tie them down or bear down on them to prove it A, B, C, D,~~ <sup>for the statement</sup> they will frankly admit <sup>is</sup> is an entire falsehood, <sup>and</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>that</sup> they don't know <sup>why</sup> ~~whether~~ they wrote the letter or why they made the statement.

But nevertheless we have the record and ~~we~~ generally in those instances <sup>we try to</sup> get a signed statement from that individual so it can be made a part of the record.

Rep. Ford. Under your authority from the President, the authority which gave you the FBI, the responsibility to conduct this investigation it is not an authority with a terminal point. It is an authority that goes on indefinitely?

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6507

Mr. Hoover. . . Very definitely so. The President wanted a full and thorough investigation made of this matter, and we have tried to do so, ~~and~~ <sup>As I have stated, I think we will</sup> continue to receive <sup>allegations, this will</sup> I think ~~it would~~ be a matter of controversy for ~~maybe~~ years to come, just like the Lincoln assassination, ~~was~~. There will be questions raised by individuals, either for publicity purposes or otherwise ~~where mental capacity may be~~ ~~impaired~~, that will raise some new angle or new aspect of it.

I think we must, and certainly we intend in the FBI to continue to run down any such allegations or reports of that kind.

Rep. Boggs. Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Yes, Congressman Boggs.

Rep. Boggs. Mr. Hoover, I don't want any cover -- to cover any ground which has been covered but I just have one or two questions.

First, let me say that you and the Bureau have been very cooperative with this Commission.

Mr. Hoover. Thank you.

Rep. Boggs. And tremendously helpful. I have been concerned about some of these wild press reports and concerned about what impact it may have ultimately on the history of this thing. For instance there is a man named Buchanan who has written a series of articles.

Mr. Dulles. A book now. A book is out, yes.

Rep. Boggs. A book now. I understand they have been widely

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6508

circulated in the European Press, and this man came here and was, as I got it from some other sources, he took in some people here, some American journalists, and I am told that this man has a Communist background, and in addition to that is a most unreliable person. He has made these allegations that the Dallas Police force was involved in the assassination and so on.

Would you have any suggestions on how this Commission should deal with sort -- with this sort of thing?

Mr. Hoover. ~~I think that~~ We have received a request from the Commission to review that book and to make a report upon any portions of it that can be contradicted or substantiated by actual facts or documents.

I know Buchanan's background. He worked on the Washington Star and he was dismissed from the Washington Star because he was a member of the Communist Party. He spent <sup>much</sup> ~~most~~ of his time in recent years in France writing for French newspapers. <sup>have</sup> and I followed the articles that he has written, <sup>about this matter only</sup> they are utterly what I would call "journalistic garbage." There is not a scintilla of truth to <sup>most of</sup> the things he has written in these articles and in <sup>his</sup> ~~this~~ book which I have had a chance to scan, <sup>but</sup> haven't actually been reviewed yet. It is being reviewed by my research section. Some of the allegations are utterly fantastic. I often wonder <sup>where</sup> ~~whether~~ some of these individuals ~~are addicted to marijuana and~~ <sup>such</sup> get ~~some~~ ideas in their head, <sup>& why they</sup> make such statements without a ~~scintilla~~ <sup>title</sup> of foundation.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6509

Now, he makes many wild charges there, and to read it, a person not knowing him, <sup>or</sup> ~~and knowing~~ his views, <sup>or</sup> ~~and knowing~~ his background ~~and emotional instability~~, would be inclined to wonder. ~~me~~ I think you are going to have that problem, as I say, for years to come.

I don't know how you can handle individuals like him other than to have the record clear upon the facts of the case, and either substantiate or disprove <sup>his statements</sup> it. I don't think too much time should be given to these individuals who have such unsavory backgrounds as Duchanan has and who <sup>made</sup> ~~obviously, reading~~ the book ~~contains in his~~ statements ~~things~~ that have been proved already to be entirely untrue.

But, at the same time I think when a book like that comes out or an article of that type comes out that deals with the assassination of the late President, I think it should be gone into from an investigative point of view, <sup>and</sup> ~~we~~ should then submit to this Commission, <sup>even</sup> ~~other~~ after ~~its conclusion~~ ~~after~~ it has concluded its hearings, ~~it should be submitted to the Commission~~, for record purposes what we have found in each particular instance.

Rep. Boggs. Now, on the other side of the fence --

Mr. Dulles. May I add one other thing just to interrupt. I wish you would add to your list a book called the Red Roses of Dallas by a man named Gun. He is a more reliable correspondent.

Mr. Hoover. He is a Philadelphia correspondent.

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6510

Mr. Dulles. He has been living in this country since 1946. I have not him over here. Let's see, he was at Dallas at the time. He was then reporting, I think, for the Italian newspaper Epoca.

Mr. Hoover. That is not the same one. ~~It is not the same one.~~

Mr. Dulles. He might have been lying, this book is full of lies.

But I think it is a book that ought to be added, too, and I will see that a copy is sent to the Bureau.

Mr. Hoover. I would appreciate that.

Rep. Boggs. On the other side of the spectrum some professor out at the University of Illinois wrote a piece in which he alleged the President was a Communist agent, President Kennedy, and Buchanan's allegations are that the extreme right assassinated the President and this fellow's allegations are that the Communists assassinated the President.

Would you care to comment? Have you read that piece?

Mr. Hoover, I have read that piece. My comment on it is this in general: I think the extreme right is just as much a danger to the freedom of this country as the extreme left.

There are groups, organizations and individuals on the extreme right who make these very violent statements, allegations that General Eisenhower was a Communist, disparaging references to the Chief Justice and at the other end of the spectrum you

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6511

have these leftists who make wild statements charging almost anybody with being a <sup>s</sup>Facist or belonging to some of these so-called extreme right societies.

Now, I have felt, ~~that they~~, and I have said publicly in speeches, that they are just as much a danger, at either end of the spectrum. They don't deal with facts. Anybody who will allege that General Eisenhower <sup>or</sup> was a Communist agent, <sup>here is something</sup> ~~is just men-~~ tally ~~seriously~~ wrong with him, ~~he is psychopathic but that has been done.~~

Now, <sup>such allegations</sup> a lot of people will read ~~that~~ because I get some of the <sup>of</sup> ~~widest~~ letters wanting to know whether we have inquired to find out whether that is true.

Well, ~~I haven't asked for any psychiatric examination of General Eisenhower because I happened to have known~~ <sup>Mr. Eisenhower</sup> quite well myself and I have found him to be a sound, level-headed man ~~but you get many things of that kind.~~

<sup>trans must be</sup> ~~then~~ In New York City there is a woman by the name of <sup>or</sup> ~~trans~~ who ~~is~~ mentally deranged ~~but~~ she stands on a Broadway corner there handing out leaflets in which she charges me with being in the conspiracy with the Communists ~~x~~ to overthrow this government and so forth.

Well now, if any person has fought communism, I certainly have fought it. We have tried to fight it and expose it in democratic ways, ~~and~~ I think that is the thing we have ~~got~~ to very definitely keep in mind in this whole problem ~~that is involved~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6512

~~I think in this investigation~~ is the security of the President and the successor to office.

Just how far you are going to go for his protection and his security. I don't think you can get absolute security without almost establishing a police state, and we don't want that. You can't put security in a black groove or a white groove. It is in a gray groove, and certain chances have to be taken. You are dealing with a human being when you are dealing with the President of the United States, and particularly this President <sup>Johnson</sup> ~~we have~~ now is a very down to earth human being, and it makes the security problem all the more difficult, but you can't bar him from the people.

There are certain things that can be done, and I submitted a memorandum to the Secret Service, and to the White House on certain security steps that might be taken and tightened up. But ~~I think when~~ you are dealing with the general public, and that is what has given me great concern in the ~~expansion~~, recent expansion, of the criteria <sup>for determination</sup> that we ~~have~~ adopted after the assassination.

Prior to that time we reported to the Secret Service all information that dealt with ~~potential individuals~~ individuals who were potential killers <sup>by whom</sup> or acts of violence might be anticipated, and they ~~then~~ The Secret Service would take that <sup>information</sup> ~~error~~ and would do with it as they saw fit. I gave great consideration to it because I am not very happy with the criteria expansion, but ~~I felt~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6513

we had to include ~~in the basic itself~~, subversives of various character, ~~the~~ <sup>and</sup> extremists, ~~that exist, and~~ ~~we~~ have, in turn, furnished <sup>their names</sup> ~~that~~ to the Secret Service. I think ~~these have been~~ <sup>have been</sup> five thousand names up to the present time already submitted and there are at least three or four thousand more that will be submitted within the next <sup>few</sup> months.

Then you come to the problem <sup>of</sup> what ~~are~~ you going to do when the Secret Service gets those names. They have to call upon the local authorities, ~~and~~ <sup>Just</sup> recently, in the City of Chicago, when the President was there, the local authorities were asked to <sup>give</sup> ~~have~~ assistance as they usually <sup>do</sup> ~~are~~ to the Secret Service and they went to the homes of some of these people, and it resulted really almost in a house arrest.

Now, I don't think there is any place in this country for that kind of thing, but these people ~~that were on the list, and~~ who belonged to extreme subversive organizations or organizations that advocated the overthrow of government by force and violence were told that they couldn't leave their house or if they did they would be accompanied by a police officer. That gives me great concern because in New York City alone, you run into maybe three or four thousand such individuals <sup>who</sup> ~~that~~ would be in ~~the area of being~~ members of subversive organizations, and then you get into the twilight zone of subversive fronts.

Now, there again, merely because a man belongs to a subversive front organization, in my estimation doesn't mean

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6514

that he is blacklisted and is a menace to the country for life.

If he belongs to 20 of them, it certainly shows either one of two things, he is either very gullible and dumb or he is

a menace. ~~That has been my attitude in regard to government,~~ <sup>never</sup> where

"That has been my attitude in regard to Government service where you find a Government employee who belonged to one or two, maybe in his early days. I don't believe this necessarily makes him a security risk. Rather, this would be dependent on the degree of his activity in the front group and his purpose and intent in associating himself with it.

18, 20 of them, I don't think he has ~~enough~~ enough good judgment to be in the government. <sup>P</sup> <sup>Some</sup> Many ministers got drawn into these ~~partisan~~ organizations, some of which are under the domination of the Communist Party.

Now, those ministers don't know that. They are just as loyal and patriotic as you and I are, but they happen to belong. Now, that is where the question of human judgment has to be used. We try to use it in selecting these names. But I was startled when I learned ~~last week or the week before last~~ <sup>the</sup> of this incident in Chicago because there you come pretty close to a house arrest and we don't want that. We don't want a gestapo. We have ~~to~~ to, I think, maintain an even balance.

I think it was very well expressed --

Mr. Dulles. May I ask you, Mr. Hoover, was this house arrest based on names you had furnished the Secret Service and they furnished the local authorities?

Mr. Hoover. Yes, sir.

ash  
ad fols

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6515

nstad flg  
nash

Rep. Boggs. That brings me back to the question I think I heard Congressman Ford ask you as I came into the room, because I think this is the crux of our investigation.

I read the F.B.I. report very carefully and the whole implication of the report is that, Number One, Oswald shot the President; Number Two, that he was not connected with any conspiracy of any kind, nature or description.

Mr. Hoover. Correct.

Rep. Boggs. Do you still subscribe to that?

Mr. Hoover. I have subscribed to it even more strongly today than I did at the time that the report was written.

You see, the original idea was that there would be either *an* this investigation by the F.B.I. and a report would be prepared in such form that it could be released to the public.

Rep. Boggs. Surely.

Mr. Hoover. Then a few days later, after further consideration, the President decided to form a commission, ~~which he, in turn, did~~, which I think was very wise, because I feel that *the report* if any agency of Government investigating what might be some shortcomings on the part of other agencies of Government ~~that~~ ought to be reviewed by an impartial group such as this Commission, ~~if~~. And the more I have read ~~of~~ these reports, <sup>the more</sup> I am convinced that Oswald was the man who fired <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ gun, and he fired three times, ~~and~~ killed the President, and wounded Governor Connally.

And I also am further convinced that there is absolutely

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

such 6516

2 no association between Oswald or Ruby. There was no evidence ever established.

Mr. Dulles. Or Oswald and anybody else? Would you go that far?

Mr. Hoover. Anybody else who might be --

Mr. Dulles. In connection with the assassination?

Mr. Hoover. Yes, I would certainly go that far.

There was suspicion at first this might be a Castro act.

Rep. Boggs. Right.

Mr. Hoover. We had information that had been obtained in Mexico City by another intelligence agency indicating there was a man who had seen a certain amount of money passed to Oswald at the Cuban Consulate, and, of course, that I think it was \$6,000 that was passed. We went into that very thoroughly, and ~~that~~ <sup>The</sup> man later retracted his statement, and stated it was not true, and ~~he~~ <sup>He was</sup> asked whether he would take a lie detector test, and he did. ~~And~~ <sup>The</sup> lie detector test showed that he was telling a lie. <sup>R</sup> As to the lie detector, I do want to make this comment on it. I have always held to the opinion that it is not a perfect piece of machinery. It is an interpretation made by human beings of what the machine, the polygraph, shows. I would never want to convict or want to ~~have~~ send to the penitentiary any person solely on the evidence of the lie detector.

~~It is a set, and~~ <sup>I</sup> It is a contribution in an investigation, more or less, psychological contribution ~~to an investigation.~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6517

3

But I have seen individuals who have failed the lie detector test and who were just as innocent as they could be.

~~But we ran out~~ That particular lead in Mexico City <sup>was</sup> completely disproved, there was <sup>no</sup> foundation for it, and <sup>we</sup> found no other associations <sup>between</sup> of ~~either~~ Oswald <sup>and</sup> Ruby.

There has been a story printed, ~~I think there was something in this inquiry or one of these things that came out that Ruby and Oswald worked together and were close friends.~~

There was no evidence, there was never any indication that we could find that Oswald had ever been in Ruby's night club or had had any association with him.

Ruby comes from Chicago, he <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ on the fringe of what you might call the elements of the underworld there. He came to Dallas, opened up the night club and it was a place where ~~some~~ ~~of the~~, certainly not the better class of people went, but it wasn't any so-called "joint", to use the vernacular. It was just another ~~one of these~~ night clubs, ~~you find in a place of that kind and~~ So far as we have been able to establish there was no relationship or contact between Oswald and Ruby or anyone else <sup>allegedly</sup> involved in this assassination.

Rep. Boggs. The F.B.I. interviewed practically everybody who ever associated with Oswald?

Mr. Hoover. It did.

Rep. Boggs. You didn't find any indication of why anyone should even suspect that Oswald would do this, do you?

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6518

4

Mr. Hoover. We found no indication at all that Oswald was a man addicted to violence.

Now, ~~The~~ first indication of <sup>an</sup> that act of violence came after he, Oswald, had been killed, and Mrs. Oswald told us about the attempt on General Walker's life by Oswald.

No one had known a thing about that.

I think in the Enquirer article there is reference to the fact that the Dallas Police knew or suspected Oswald of possibly being a party to the shooting into the house of General Walker.

Chief Curry specifically denies that.

There was no connection of that kind and there was no evidence that ~~the man~~ <sup>Oswald</sup> had any streak of violence.

We went back into his Marine Corps record, and ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> was a "loner". He didn't have many friends. He kept to himself, and when he went abroad, ~~of course, and~~ <sup>he</sup> defected to Russia; ~~that was~~ <sup>he</sup> the first evidence we had of him in our files was a statement to the press in Moscow. And then later, about 22 months later, he returned to the ~~consulate~~ <sup>Embassy</sup> there and according to the report of the ~~consulate~~ <sup>Embassy</sup> we have and which the Commission has been furnished with, the ~~consulate~~ <sup>Embassy</sup> gave him a clean bill. He had seen the error of his ways and disliked the Soviet atmosphere, et cetera, and they, therefore, cleared him, paid his way and paid his wife's way to come back to this country.

At no time, other than the so-called street disturbance

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6519

5. in New Orleans, was there any indication that he might be a fighter.

Well, in that particular <sup>instance</sup> ~~thing~~ he was handing out these leaflets that he printed for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and some of the anti-Castro forces, we have <sup>several</sup> ~~a hundred~~ thousand of them in New Orleans alone, ~~some of the anti-Castro forces~~ happened to see him and they moved in on him and immediately the police moved in and arrested him. I believe they fined him \$10, ~~for something of that kind, but that was just~~ disorderly conduct, and ~~there was no evidence in the place where he was employed, we interviewed all of the people he was associated with in this storehouse they had in Dallas there where he worked, no one had any indication of acts of violence or~~ temper or anything of that kind on his part.

Rep. Boggs. You have spent your life studying criminology and violence and subversion. Would you care ~~to~~ speculate on what may have motivated the man?

I know it would be just speculation.

Mr. Hoover. My speculation, Mr. Boggs, is ~~the fact~~ that this man was no doubt a dedicated Communist. He prefers to call himself a Marxist, but there you <sup>get into</sup> ~~are in~~ the field of exercise of semantics, almost. He was a Communist, he sympathized thoroughly with the Communist cause.

I don't believe now, as I look back on it, that he ever changed his views when he asked to come back to this country. I

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6520

6 personally feel that when he went to the American Embassy in Moscow originally ~~when he landed in Russia~~ to renounce his citizenship he should have been able right then and there to sign the renouncement, ~~that would have ended him~~. He never could have gotten back here, and I think that should apply to <sup>al</sup> most all defectors who want to defect and become a part of a system of government that is entirely foreign to ours. <sup>If</sup> they have that desire, they have ~~got~~ that right, but if they indicate a desire for it, let them renounce their citizenship at once.

That was not done. He stayed ~~around~~ in Moscow awhile and he went ~~down~~ to Minsk where he worked, ~~and~~ <sup>T</sup>There was no indication of any difficulty, personally on his part there, but I haven't the slightest doubt that he was a dedicated Communist.

There has been some question raised which cannot be resolved, because Oswald is dead, as to whether he was trying to kill the President or trying to kill the Governor. He had had some correspondence with the Governor as to the form of his discharge from the Marine Corps. ~~It was a discharge less than honorable~~. It was not a dishonorable discharge, but a discharge less than honorable after he defected.

~~and~~ Governor Connally, ~~I think at the time~~, had left the Navy Department, and was back in Texas as Governor. ~~But~~ Oswald ~~didn't know that, and he~~ may have had his anger or his animosity against the Governor, but no one can <sup>say</sup> definitely -- that is mere speculation, no one can tell that, ~~because~~ the gun and the

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6521

7

sighting of the gun was directed at the car.

Now, first, it was thought that the President had been shot through the throat, that is what the doctors at the Parkland Hospital felt when he was brought in.

If that had been true, the shot would have had to come from the overpass. But as soon as the body arrived in Washington, ~~and~~ the doctors at Bethesda Hospital performed the autopsy and it was then determined definitely from their point of view that he had been shot from the rear, and that <sup>portions</sup> ~~the back~~ of the skull had been practically shot off, ~~so that~~ there was no question <sup>but</sup> that the gun and the telescopic lens could pinpoint the President perfectly, ~~and~~ <sup>the</sup> car was moving slowly. It wasn't going at a high rate of speed, so that he had perfect opportunity to do it.

Now, some people have raised the question: Why didn't he shoot the President as the car came toward the storehouse where he was working?

The reason for that is, I think, ~~that~~ the fact there were some trees between his window on the sixth floor and the cars as they ~~came toward and then~~ turned and went through the park. So he waited until the car got out from under the trees, and the limbs, and then he had a perfectly clear view of the occupants of the car, and I think he took aim, either on the President or Connally, and I personally believe ~~probably~~ it was the President in view of the twisted mentality the man had.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

8

But he had given no indication of that -- we had interviewed him, I think, three times. Of course, our interviews were predicated to find out whether he had been recruited by the Russian intelligence service, because <sup>they</sup> ~~that is a~~ frequently ~~thing~~ they do ~~that~~.

Rep. Boggs. And had he been?

Mr. Hoover. He had not been, so he said, and we have no proof that he was.

He had been over there long enough but they never gave him citizenship in Russia at all, ~~and~~ I think they probably looked upon him more as a kind of a queer sort of individual and they didn't ~~want to~~ trust him too strongly.

But just the day before yesterday a <sup>information</sup> ~~letter~~ came to me indicating that there is a ~~training~~ espionage training school outside of Minsk ~~as this letter says~~, I don't know whether it is <sup>that he</sup> ~~he~~ was trained at that school to come back to this country to become what they call a "sleeper", that is a man who will remain dormant for three or four years and in case of international hostilities rise up and be used.

I don't know of any espionage school at Minsk or near Minsk, and I don't know how you could find out if there ever was one because the Russians won't tell you if you asked them.

They do have espionage and sabotage schools in Russia and they do have an assassination squad that is used by them but there is no indication he had any association with anything

9

of that kind.

Rep. Boggs. Now we have some people, including this man's mother, talk about Oswald having been an agent of the Government of the United States. I think his mother mentioned the C.I.A., she has made these statements publicly for money, apparently.

Mr. Hoover. Yes, she has.

Rep. Boggs. Just for the purpose of the record, I think it would be well if you would comment on that, Mr. Director.

Mr. Hoover. Of course we have interviewed his mother and his wife, and all his relatives, and everybody that he ~~is known to have associated with~~ <sup>has ever had any contact with</sup>. His mother, I would put in a category of being emotionally unstable. She has been around the country making speeches, and the first indication of her emotional instability was the retaining of a lawyer that anyone would not have retained if they really were serious in trying to get down to the facts.

But she has been in New York City, she has been in Chicago, I think other parts of the country, always speaking for money, ~~being paid admissions.~~

Now, that kind of an individual is ~~always~~ <sup>the</sup> a type that we have seen over the years, who will say almost anything to draw a crowd. Just to be able to say something sensational, ~~and~~ many times we have gone out to <sup>such</sup> people and asked them specifically, "Now, what is your basis for this?" And they will say, "Well, I just had a feeling that that was true, so I said it."

10

She has never made that statement to us, but we have many other instances where that kind of statement is made. They don't have the legal evidence that you must have if you are going to take any positive action, and I would put very little credence in anything that his mother said.

I think his wife was a far more reliable person in statements that she made, so far as we were able to ascertain, than his mother was.

I think <sup>the mother</sup> she had in mind ~~always~~, naturally, the fact she wanted to clear her son's name, which was a natural instinct, but more importantly she was going to see how much money she could make, and I believe she has made a substantial sum.

Rep. Boggs. And the allegations she has made about this man being an agent either of the C.I.A. or the F.B.I. are false?

Mr. Hoover. Well, I can certainly speak for the F.B.I. that it is false, and I have discussed the matter, naturally, with Mr. McCone, the Director of C.I.A., and he, of course, will no doubt appear himself, but there is no indication at all that he was employed by them.

We frequently get that kind of a story <sup>from</sup> of individuals who, when they get into some kind of difficulty, they will claim they were working for the C.I.A. or they were working for the F.B.I.

Rep. Boggs. Surely.

Mr. Hoover. Now, no one can work for the F.B.I. without the approval being given at Washington and a record kept of it,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6525

11

even of the confidential informants. That is very tightly controlled. We have no so-called lump sum that we can use to hire people.

So there has to be a voucher and specific details of payment, ~~et cetera~~.

And I know at no time was he either an informant or agent or a special employee or <sup>working</sup> in any capacity for the F.B.I.

As to the interviews we had with him in which he gave us some information, some of it <sup>was</sup> he did not tell the truth, ~~about~~, but ~~it~~ <sup>this</sup> was not particularly significant, ~~but in~~ the interviews we had with him I would not term ~~these interviews~~ <sup>interviews while</sup> as talking with an informant. He was ~~first~~ <sup>first</sup> under arrest by the New Orleans police, ~~during several of the interviews~~ and then after he had committed this act of assassination we interviewed him in police headquarters in Dallas. But they were the only contacts we had, I think ~~three~~ <sup>four</sup> contacts altogether, and he received no money of any kind, no promise of any kind, and <sup>there was</sup> no indication that he was rendering assistance to the United States Government. We looked upon him as a criminal, ~~and we looked upon him~~, after the assassination, of course, and prior to that time we looked upon him as an individual who we ~~were suspicious~~ <sup>suspected</sup> might become an agent of the Soviet government, ~~but there~~ <sup>there was</sup> no proof of that, and we checked him carefully.

We knew of his <sup>contact</sup> correspondence with the Soviet Embassy here at Washington, his <sup>contact</sup> correspondence with the Fair Play for

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6526

12

Cuba Committee in New York and his <sup>contact</sup> correspondence with the Worker publication in New York. And none of <sup>those contacts</sup> ~~that correspondence~~ <sup>have</sup> gives any indication of any tendency to commit violence.

~~It is just like~~ There are many people who read the Daily Worker, or what is now the ~~Weekly~~ Worker, and you certainly can't brand them as hazards to the security of the country or as potential hazards to an <sup>area</sup> ~~assassination~~. It is in that ~~area~~ <sup>area</sup> that I am particularly concerned that we don't ~~go~~ and become hysterical and go too far in restricting the citizens of our country from exercising their civil and constitutional rights. The mere fact a person disagrees with you <sup>doesn't mean he should be arrested.</sup> in a matter on communism, ~~many~~ <sup>Many</sup> of ~~these~~ Communists make very violent speeches, and we ~~have~~ <sup>know</sup> them, ~~we have them listed,~~ but I don't feel that the time has come ~~yet certainly~~ that they should be arrested. If they have violated the laws of <sup>the U.S.</sup> Congress, we will, then, proceed with prosecution, and <sup>the cases can</sup> they then go through the courts. <sup>Such cases</sup> Internationally, they last for years, before they <sup>get</sup> come to the Supreme Court, and <sup>even then such cases often</sup> ~~then go back and~~ start over on some <sup>legal</sup> ~~other~~ angle.

But, all in all, I think that the enforcement of security and the enforcement of ~~the~~ laws dealing with subversion ought to be handled in the American manner.

I am criticized by the extreme right for that. They put me in the category, I guess along with General Eisenhower, ~~that~~ <sup>But the extreme left criticizes me saying</sup> I believe that any person who has on a red necktie may be addicted to communism, and, therefore, is a great danger. That is why

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6527

13

I say the extremists at both ends are bad, and I <sup>have</sup> repeated that several times publicly.

Rep. Boggs. No doubt about the problem being a difficult one. I remember some years back when these fanatics who started shooting up the House of Representatives.

Mr. Hoover. I recall that.

Rep. Boggs. I happened to be there on the occasion and there were many suggestions that we build a bullet-proof glass enclosure around the Members of Congress and so on. Of course, all of us rejected those ideas because it would be totally incompatible with our democratic institutions and this, obviously, becomes a problem in the security of the President, that is what you are telling us, isn't it?

Mr. Hoover. That is the great problem.

We ~~now~~ <sup>have</sup> ~~of course~~, participated in the protection of the President since the assassination. The Secret Service indicates how many agents ~~they~~ <sup>it</sup> needs when the President is traveling somewhere or going somewhere in Washington, and then I assign that number of agents to the Secret Service. They are not under my direction. They are under the direction of the Secret Service because under law they are charged with the protection of the President. ~~But~~ We have never done that before, <sup>but</sup> and I felt that it was something we must do if the Secret Service desired it, ~~and~~ sometimes, <sup>such as</sup> at the time the funeral of the late President Kennedy ~~was held and they marched~~ up Connecticut Avenue, which <sup>the procession walked</sup>

CONFIDENTIAL

14

*created*

is a very, very grave security problem because they were walking with these tall buildings on either side, <sup>as I recall,</sup> and we had the responsibility for the Cathedral, and we had 43 agents in the Cathedral during the services. ~~I~~ I was more concerned about these tall buildings, because all the small buildings have been torn down along Connecticut Avenue, <sup>and there were about 6 or 7 blocks to us,</sup> ~~and here was about six or seven blocks~~ and you had not only the high officials of this government, including the President, <sup>but</sup> ~~but you had~~ the Queen of Greece, you ~~had the~~ General De Gaulle, you ~~had~~ <sup>Emperor</sup> Haile Selassie, and many prime ministers <sup>and so forth</sup> ~~and so forth~~ <sup>were present.</sup>

*they were* ~~was~~ a perfect target for someone in some window.

Now, you can't empty these buildings. It is impossible to do that because you can't go to the Mayflower Hotel and say all front rooms must be vacated. ~~You just can't do a thing like that.~~ Other office buildings <sup>are</sup> there, even taller than the Mayflower, and you can't make them keep everybody out of the front offices because then you get into a police state.

The Secret Service does try to check, ~~I know, and we check,~~ and ~~all them if we can,~~ <sup>to</sup> of finding out who have these various offices, <sup>We also check</sup> ~~and so forth~~ so if there is anything in our files on those individuals the Secret Service is at once advised, ~~just as~~ <sup>when</sup> the President goes to a banquet or a social occasion, all of the ~~help~~ <sup>employees</sup> in the hotel, the cooks, waiters and busboys and so forth are all checked <sup>by Secret Service</sup> to be certain there is no <sup>one with a</sup> background that would indicate a hazard to the President. But that is as far

15

as I think you can go. You can't put in a whole new staff of waiters <sup>and</sup> if you can't make people move out. People going to a presidential function are generally invited, ~~especially~~ by card or by list, and that is very carefully checked at the entrance by the Secret Service, ~~or the details.~~

~~So I think,~~ <sup>he</sup> suggested a few more things that possibly could be done, and some of which I have doubts about.

You speak about this matter of glass around the galleries in the House.

One of the suggestions that we made was that there be bullet proof glass in front of the President's lectern.

~~Now, I would,~~ In my own mind, I would question whether <sup>that</sup> it is wise, ~~is that not wise.~~ Knowing this President as this President is, he wants to get close to the audience, he wants to reach over and shake hands with people, <sup>that concerns</sup> that scares me ~~to death~~, because you never know <sup>when</sup> what a ~~so-called~~ emotionally unstable person may be in that crowd, ~~and~~ <sup>as</sup> you noted, he has frequently brought groups in <sup>to</sup> the White House gardens and walked around with people he didn't know. I know the Secret Service people are concerned about it. I am concerned about it.

President Truman ~~was concerned about it~~ last week and expressed <sup>his concern</sup> ~~the fact~~ that the President was taking unnecessary chances.

But the governmental agency having the responsibility for guarding him, the Secret Service, has a natural hesitancy to say,

16

"You can't do this."

Rep. Boggs. Of course, for the record, President Kennedy had the same difficulty.

Mr. Hoover. That is right. It was best expressed at Parkland Hospital. One of President Kennedy's staff made the statement ~~that when they reached the hospital, and the President was dead, he said,~~ the whole fault in this matter, <sup>was that in the</sup> ~~we had a~~ choice between politics and security, <sup>was chosen</sup> ~~and we chose~~ politics, ~~and~~ that is exactly what happened. It was an open car.

I am thoroughly opposed to the <sup>ent</sup> Presiding riding in an open car.

They did not have any armored car in the Secret Service at that time. I have now sent one of our armored cars over for the President but it is a <sup>closed</sup> limousine, ~~closed~~. But he has, on occasion, <sup>the President</sup> ~~and~~ at Gettysburg and Atlanta the other day, ~~he~~ got out of the armored car which had been flown there, ~~of course,~~ for his use, and commandeered the car of the Secret Service which is a wide open, ~~sedan,~~ ~~and~~ so he could wave and see the people.

Now, that is a great hazard, ~~tremendous hazard,~~ ~~and~~ I think he should always be in an armored car ~~and an armored car~~ that is closed, that can't have the top put down. But as you recall, President Kennedy had the bubble top off of <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ car that he was in. <sup>and</sup> It was not armored, <sup>and</sup> the bubble top was made of plastic so a bullet could have gone through it very easily.

Rep. Ford. Mr. Hoover, you have categorically testified

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

65 31

17

(that the F.B.I. never at any time had Oswald as an agent, as an informant, or in any other way.

Mr. Hoover. That is correct. I couldn't make it more emphatic.

Rep. Ford. And Mr. Belmont testified to the same last week when he was before us.

Mr. Hoover. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. Both you and he would be fully familiar with all of the records of the F.B.I. in this regard.

Mr. Hoover. We would, and we would not only be fully familiar with it because <sup>while</sup> Mr. Belmont is in charge of the Investigative Branch of the Bureau, (we have two assistants to the Director, one in charge of administrative work and the other in charge of investigative work) <sup>also</sup> we have checked the administrative <sup>records</sup> ~~change~~ where vouchers or payments would have been made ~~from~~ and there is no indication that any money was ever paid to Oswald.

We have obtained, and <sup>they are</sup> ~~I think it had been~~ on file with the Commission ~~here~~, the affidavits of the agents <sup>who</sup> at various times ~~who~~ were in contact with Oswald, to the effect that he was not an informant, that they had never paid him anything, that he was being questioned as <sup>to</sup> ~~the~~ possibility of <sup>recruitment</sup> ~~having been recruited~~ by the Soviet intelligence, so there was no evidence <sup>at</sup> of any time indicating employment by the F.B.I.

Rep. Ford. And you were not under any limitation or

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6532

18

restriction from any other authority in this regard?

Mr. Hoover. Absolutely not. I have the entire control of whether a man shall be an informant or shall not be an informant that comes under my chain of command from the local office <sup>which</sup> has the matter at hand. They can't just put on an informant without our approval. <sup>The recommendations on security informants</sup> ~~It~~ comes to the Bureau, it goes through the Assistant Director of the Domestic Intelligence Division, <sup>and, in significant cases, goes</sup> then to Mr. Belmont, and then ~~to me~~ <sup>or my seat of govt staff</sup> to my desk for my specific approval. So I have to approve every one of those who are used as informants in all classes of cases, not only in intelligence cases but in white slave cases, automobile thefts and all of these cases.

Rep. Ford. There is no limitation on what you can tell us about this situation?

Mr. Hoover. None whatsoever.

Rep. Ford. No limitation, no restrictions?

Mr. Hoover. No restriction. So far as the record of voucher in the Bureau are concerned, they are open to the inspection of this Commission at any time going back as far as you may want to go.

Sen. Cooper. May I ask just one question there?

I think you have answered it, but in your examination of this aspect as to whether or not Oswald was an informer or employe or held any relationship to the F.B.I., you, yourself, have looked into all of the means you have of determining that

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

19

fact when you make the statement to us?

Mr. Hoover. I have personally looked into that for two reasons: Because the President asked me personally to take charge of this investigation and to direct it, and I knew that the report ultimately would be made to him, and **F**or that reason I became familiar with every step and every action that was taken and **T**hen when the allegation was made by someone, I think it was the mother of Oswald first, if I recall correctly, that he was employed by some government agency, the C.I.A., or F.B.I., and maybe both, I ~~then~~ insisted upon a check being made ~~of that~~, and any record showing any indication of that being brought to me.

When they could find none, I then asked for affidavits from the field force that had dealt with Oswald ~~over the years~~ as to whether they had hired him or paid him anything or given him anything, and the affidavits are on file here that they had not.

Sen. Cooper. I think you have said there is no sum available to the F.B.I. which would enable these men, these agents, to employ him out of any funds that are made available to them.

Mr. Hoover. Oh, no, it ~~has to~~ <sup>must</sup> be done by voucher, and those vouchers are examined by the General Accounting Office every year or so.

We have no ~~so-called~~ <sup>in the field office</sup> ~~that you might say~~ lump sum for employment of informants as such <sup>which is not supported</sup> ~~by vouchers.~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6534

20

Sen. Cooper. I have just about two questions, I may have to go in a few minutes to the Senate.

I would like to direct your attention to that period of time when Oswald was a defector, beginning when he left the United States and when he returned.

Mr. Hoover. Yes, sir.

Sen. Cooper. During that period, did the F.B.I. have any jurisdiction over intelligence regarding him or any capacity to know?

Mr. Hoover. While he was in Russia?

Sen. Cooper. Yes.

Mr. Hoover. No, we did not. We were interested in knowing what he might say in Russia that appeared in the press. That was our first intimation that this man had defected, when we read it in a newspaper article. We were, of course, interested in knowing when he would return <sup>or</sup> if he would return, ~~so~~ we had no jurisdiction as to what he was doing in Russia after he had gone there.

Sen. Cooper. As I understand it, you had no capacity at that time to follow his activities?

Mr. Hoover. That is true. We have no agents in Russia. ~~The~~ Foreign Intelligence is handled by the Central Intelligence Agency, and our responsibility is domestic. We work very close together.

Sen. Cooper. Have you had the jurisdiction since the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

21

assassination or the occasion to examine persons connected with the State Department concerning the activities of Oswald in Russia?

Mr. Hoover. Well, --

Sen. Cooper. Would that be a matter for some other agency?

Mr. Hoover. That could be a matter for C.I.A. or for us after Oswald had returned here.

Sen. Cooper. Yes.

Mr. Hoover. Then he becomes ~~a citizen, he was a citizen~~ already, but then he becomes a civilian in the country here.

Now, there is what we call a delimitation agreement among the government intelligence agencies. For instance, the military branches of the government have their own intelligence services and they handle all military deviations in regard to espionage or things of that kind. If they want our assistance and ask for it we, of course, will always cooperate. In regard to C.I.A., there are many cases which C.I.A. and the F.B.I. work jointly on, of individuals that may have been recruited over in Europe by the C.I.A., not by us, because we don't have authority to do that abroad, but when that man comes to this country, the best ends of intelligence are served by <sup>a</sup> having the two agencies work very closely together, conduct joint interviews, and exchange information very, very freely. That has been going on ever since I can recall C.I.A. being in existence.

Mr. Dulles. I would like to testify to the fact that

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

22

that cooperation existed ~~during the whole period~~, and I am sure it has continued now during the whole period I was Director, with great cooperation on both sides.

Mr. Hoover. It is a very necessary thing, because the ~~thing that happens in~~ <sup>intelligence agency of</sup> many of these foreign countries, ~~their intelligence agency~~ will cover the whole world and the country itself. Whereas in this country you have ~~separate~~ <sup>separate</sup> agencies ~~that~~ <sup>covering espionage activities.</sup> C.I.A. covers the foreign activity, <sup>and</sup> the F.B.I. the domestic activities ~~in the espionage thing~~ and there must be interlocking.

An espionage agent of the Soviet Government can arrive in New York today by plane from Paris and he can be in Mexico City tomorrow.

Now, then, C.I.A. would pick him up there. We would not pick him up there.

We would watch him while in this country but <sup>as</sup> soon as he takes that plane and <sup>leaves</sup> ~~left~~ the United States C.I.A. moves in on him. If he comes back to the United States, we move in on him. <sup>we</sup> Therefore, <sup>you</sup> have a very close liaison.

As a matter of fact, what we have done in ~~our~~ government agencies is to have <sup>liaison</sup> an agent in our Bureau <sup>assigned</sup> ~~stationed~~ <sup>to contact</sup> ~~in~~ C.I.A., ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> in the Pentagon, State Department, <sup>and</sup> various other agencies ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> cut out the red tape of writing letters back and forth, <sup>relay information which</sup> In order to orally ~~see~~ <sup>has</sup> come to ~~our~~ <sup>his</sup> attention, our representative can immediately phone it over to

CONFIDENTIAL *for info*

6537

23

the F.B.I., and if there is need <sup>to</sup> meet a plane coming in to New York or a boat that is docking at New York, it is all accomplished within a matter of 45 minutes or an hour.

If you went through this letter-writing process and the paper <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ that goes on so often in the government it might <sup>take</sup> ~~be~~ a week or ten days, ~~and abroad we do have~~ <sup>IP</sup> The F.B.I. does have 10 legal attaches attached to 10 embassies abroad. Their purpose is not operational. They don't investigate in those countries any matters that have to be investigated. That, if it is to be done, is handled by the C.I.A.. ~~Our~~ <sup>to maintain</sup> purpose in being there is ~~liaison~~ <sup>such as</sup> with our opposite number ~~like in~~ <sup>the Surete Nationale in France and</sup> France ~~with the Surete Nationale and in the Philippines~~ with the national police <sup>in</sup> of the Philippines, to exchange information that is vital to our international security, and also vital to the international security of the other country.

Sen. Cooper. May I ask one other question?

Is there any, considering the number of defectors in the United States to Communist countries, which cannot be large, I would assume --

Mr. Hoover. I think there are about 36.

Sen. Cooper. Which would indicate, I would think either a lack of reliability on their part and stability or beyond that a dedicated purpose to become Communists, then upon their return, wouldn't it seem to you they should be given some special attention?

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

6539

25

satellite nations and ~~some referred~~ to Russia.

Sen. Cooper. Just one other question, because I have to go.

In the course of this investigation, as you know so well, there have been a number identified who were very close, at least to Mrs. Oswald, and a few, I can't say that were close to Oswald yet they had association with him, such as the man who drove him back and forth, Mrs. Paine with whom Mrs. Oswald lived, and others, has there been any credible, I won't say credible because if you had you would have presented it to us in your report, has there been any claims by persons that these people are in any way related to the Communist Party?

Mr. Hoover. We have had no credible evidence that they have been related to the Communist Party in this country.

Now, as to Mrs. Oswald, the wife of Oswald, there is no way of knowing whether she belonged to the Russian Communist Party in Russia. She is a rather intelligent woman, and notwithstanding ~~that~~ you have to talk with her through an interpreter ~~possibly~~, we have had no indication of her association with Communists in this country, nor have any of <sup>her</sup> his close friends or relatives.

As to his mother, we found no indication she is associated or closely associated with the Communists. She is the only one of the group that I would say is somewhat emotionally unstable that we have come in contact with. Our agents have interviewed her. She sometimes gets very angry and she won't

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6540

26

answer questions, ~~things of that kind, but~~ <sup>As to</sup> the rest of the group <sup>who</sup> that had been friends of his, or worked with him in <sup>the</sup> Texas <sup>School</sup> Book Depository, ~~they have~~ none of them have indicated any ~~indication of~~ Communist associations of any kind.

Sen. Cooper. Thank you.

Mr. Hoover. Thank you.

✓ Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, I hand you Exhibit <sup>?</sup> 83 6 and ask you to examine that and state whether or not that is the letter that you referred to in which you answered questions of the Commission concerning the National Enquirer Magazine or newspaper?

Mr. Hoover. This letter of May 8th addressed to the Commission is the letter that dealt with our interview with Chief Curry and was predicated upon the article which appeared in the National Enquirer of May 17, 1964.

Mr. Rankin. I ask you if you would care to add anything to that letter except what you have already testified to?

Mr. Hoover. No, I have nothing to add to that. Chief Curry was very specific, I am told by my agent in charge at Dallas, <sup>this article</sup> that ~~is~~ <sup>A</sup> is an absolute lie; ~~this article and~~ that none of these things set forth in the article occurred; that he received no phone call or any request of any kind oral or by phone or in writing from the Department of Justice or from the F.B.I., ~~and~~ <sup>As I read earlier, the report from the Department <sup>of Justice</sup> <sup>stated</sup> indicated</sup> that they ~~have~~ made no request.

✓ Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, I offer in evidence Exhibit <sup>?</sup> 836,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6541

27

being the letter just referred to.

The Chairman. It may be admitted.

(The document referred to was marked Commission Exhibit 836 for identification and received in evidence.)

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, is Exhibit 337 the article that you referred to in the National Enquirer?

Mr. Hoover. Yes, that is the one.

Mr. Rankin. I call your attention to Exhibit 836 and ask you if that is the letter that you referred to which describes the criteria in the handling of the security of the President that you have described in your testimony.

Mr. Hoover. This is the letter. It sets forth the criteria which were adopted, <sup>originally</sup> ~~I guess~~ ~~in 19~~ ~~the first instructions~~ ~~would probably be~~ ~~about 194~~ ~~something, I could get the exact~~ ~~date on that~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~later it was~~ incorporated in the manual of instructions that is set forth in this letter which I think <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ 1954, and then <sup>prepared</sup> ~~It~~ also includes the amended instructions to our field offices, ~~which was~~ in December of 1963, and which extended the criteria.

Mr. Rankin. Does that exhibit correctly set forth the information you had in regard to those matters?

Mr. Hoover. It does.

Mr. Rankin. Do you care to add anything to it?

Mr. Hoover. No, I have nothing to add to it at all.

Mr. Rankin. Now, in light of what happened, Mr. Hoover,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

28 I think the Commission would desire to have your comments or whatever you care to tell them, concerning the reasons why you did not furnish the information you had concerning Lee Harvey Oswald to the Secret Service prior to the time of the President's assassination.

Mr. Hoover. Well, I have gone into that very thoroughly because that was obviously one of the questions that I had in my mind when ~~this situation~~ <sup>the tragedy</sup> occurred in Dallas.

In going back over the record, and I have read each one of the reports dealing with that and the reports of Mr. Hosty who had dealt with the Oswald situation largely in Dallas, ~~they~~ <sup>we</sup> had first the matter that I have previously referred to, ~~this~~ <sup>the</sup> report of the State Department that ~~this man~~ <sup>indicated</sup> was thoroughly <sup>a</sup> safe risk here, he had changed his views, he was a loyal man now and had seen the light of day, so to speak.

How intensive or how extensive that interview <sup>in Moscow</sup> was, ~~I think it was in Moscow it was conducted~~, I don't know. But, nevertheless, it was <sup>in</sup> a State Department document that ~~had~~ <sup>was</sup> been furnished to us.

Now, we interviewed Oswald a few days after he arrived. We ~~didn't~~ <sup>did not</sup> interview him on arrival at the port of entry because that is always undesirable by reason of the fact it is heavily covered by press, and ~~it is also~~ <sup>if</sup> any relatives ~~they~~ generally are there, so we prefer to do it after the man has settled down for two or three days and become ~~all~~ <sup>we</sup> composed, ~~and~~ <sup>do</sup> it in the

CONFIDENTIAL

6543

29

privacy of our office or wherever he may be, or in his own home, or apartment, and we interviewed him twice, ~~I think~~, in regard to that angle that we were looking for. We had no indication <sup>at this time</sup> of anything other than his so-called Marxist leanings, Marxist beliefs.

We wanted to know whether he had been recruited by the Soviet government as an intelligence agent, which is a frequent and constant practice. There is not a year goes by <sup>but</sup> that individuals and groups of individuals, sometimes on those cultural exchanges, ~~that go over to Moscow, and go through Russia~~ and recruits are enlisted by the Russian intelligence, usually through blackmail, and then the individual is threatened <sup>that</sup> if he doesn't come back to this country and work for them ~~that~~ they will expose the fact that he is a homosexual or a degenerate <sup>has been indiscreet,</sup> or ~~type of that kind.~~

Pictures are usually taken of individuals who become implicated in that sort of thing, so the individual is really desperate, <sup>such blackmail</sup> and that has occurred year after year for some years. <sup>time.</sup>

In Oswald's case we had no suspicion that any pressure like that had been brought to bear on him because he had gone <sup>voluntarily</sup> and had obviously wanted to ~~be~~ live in Russia and <sup>had</sup> married a Russian woman.

After those interviews had been <sup>completed</sup> ~~closed up~~, the next step <sup>the</sup> next <sup>incident</sup> ~~impasse~~ was the difficulty he had at New Orleans, ~~and~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6544

30

We were concerned there as to whether he was functioning officially for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee which was financed and supported by Castro and Castro's government, and if he was where he <sup>obtained</sup> had ~~got~~ the money and <sup>with</sup> who he had dealt, ~~with~~.

He apparently had ~~these~~ <sup>the</sup> leaflets printed himself, ~~and~~ they ~~are~~ <sup>on</sup> very plain ordinary paper. There was no reason for us, then, to have any suspicion that he had any element of danger ~~with~~ <sup>in</sup> him.

However, we did not ignore or forget the fact that he was still in the country, and we kept track of him when he went from New Orleans to Dallas, and that was one of the reasons <sup>why</sup> Hosty went ~~out~~ to the home of Mrs. Paine, Mrs. Paine's home where he was supposed to be living and she told us where ~~he~~ <sup>Oswald</sup> was working, ~~down~~ <sup>the</sup> at ~~this~~ Texas book house, and Hosty gave her his telephone number and his name so that if there was any information or any contact she wanted to make <sup>she</sup> they could phone him at the Dallas office. ~~That was in the memorandum book.~~

Mrs. Oswald, the wife, went ~~out~~ and took down the license number of Hosty's car which was incorrect only in one digit, and ~~that was in the book that was later~~ ~~that Oswald later~~ ~~had.~~ The name, the telephone number, and the automobile license <sup>number</sup>, ~~later found in Oswald's memorandum book.~~

However, that in itself was not significant because many times we will go to see a person and tell <sup>him</sup> ~~them~~ now, "If you think of anything you want to tell us or you have any information you want to give us, here <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ my name and address, telephone number, and

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6545

31

call me," and that is what was done with Mrs. Faine because

Hosty wasn't there at the time. He was at work.

~~Insert here.~~  
Insert after line 2:

Incidentally, those items in Oswald's notebook requiring investigative attention were first set out in an investigative report of our Dallas Office dated December 23, 1963. This report was not prepared for this Commission but rather for investigative purposes of the FBI and, therefore, the information concerning Hosty's name, telephone number and license number was not included in the report as the circumstances under which Hosty's name, et cetera, appeared in Oswald's notebook were fully known to the FBI.

After our investigative report of December 23, 1963 was furnished to the Commission, we noted that Agent Hosty's name did not appear in the report. In order that there would be a complete reporting of all items in Oswald's notebook, this information was incorporated in another investigative report of our Dallas Office dated February 11, 1964. Both of the above-mentioned reports were furnished to the Commission prior to any inquiry concerning this matter by the President's Commission.

interpret for her.

Oswald was ~~down~~ at the Texas book company, and then, as I say, Hosty left his telephone number <sup>and</sup> name, and Mrs. Oswald for some reason ~~went out and~~ took down the license number.

I don't know whether she was convinced this was an agent of the F.B.I., or ~~what it could be~~, why she did it, ~~I don't know~~.

But, anyway, that was in the book that <sup>was</sup> we later found, and which ~~later~~ contained many other things ~~Hosty~~ that Oswald had entered in the book.

Now, as I say, up to that time, there had been no <sup>information</sup> ~~indication~~ that would have warranted <sup>our</sup> ~~us~~ reporting him as a potential danger or hazard to the security or the safety of the President or the Vice President, ~~which is the only responsibility the~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6516

32

~~Secret Service has as to officials,~~ so his name was not furnished at the time *To Secret Service.*

Under the new criteria which we have now put into force and effect, it would have been furnished because we now include all defectors, ~~but~~ *As* to the original <sup>criteria</sup> ~~thing,~~ which we felt <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ sound, and which ~~we felt was~~ sufficient and which we felt no one, <sup>not</sup> even the most extreme civil rights proponent could ~~take~~ take exception to, <sup>we</sup> ~~namely~~ <sup>ed</sup> limiting the furnishing of names ~~of~~ *To* persons potentially dangerous to the physical well being of the President, ~~was the only information that we would give to the Secret Service,~~ <sup>The</sup> that included emotionally unstable people <sup>who</sup> ~~had threatened the President or V. P.~~  
*P* I guess *At* my office during the course of a ~~day,~~ there are <sup>sometimes</sup> ~~probably about three or four~~ <sup>callers who</sup> ~~that we call,~~ that have to be taken <sup>out</sup> to ~~Callington~~ <sup>Gallinger</sup> Hospital because of the mental condition. <sup>They claim they</sup> They are being persecuted by radio beams and they want to see me to have these beams stopped. Now, ~~individuals like that,~~ <sup>or the President</sup> of course, you never know what tangent they are going to ~~go take,~~ <sup>take</sup> off to, and ~~that particular person is living out~~ <sup>if such a</sup> in some part of the country where the President may be going his name would ~~very rarely~~ be furnished to the Secret Service.

~~Then you have people who come,~~ One car last year, I think, crashed through the gates of the White House; the person driving wanted to see the President. <sup>The</sup> guard wouldn't let him <sup>in</sup> and so the car crashed through and got within 20 feet of the first door, ~~and~~ <sup>The</sup> guards, by that time, had their revolvers

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6547

33 out and took him into custody.

Last year ~~we~~ had a gentleman ~~who~~ drove all the way from Arizona to see me, and ~~he~~ drove up ~~to~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~these~~ marble steps of the Department of Justice, ~~and hit the door,~~ and by that time ~~of course,~~ the guards had come out and ~~we~~ took him into custody, ~~and he~~ <sup>I think</sup> ~~was~~ incarcerated in ~~the~~ Arizona.

~~These kind of~~ People <sup>of this type</sup> are among those ~~that~~ we would have furnished to the Secret Service, ~~anyway.~~ They <sup>have the</sup> ~~are out to~~ potentially <sup>to</sup> harm somebody.

We get names from members of Congress, Senators, ~~who will~~ <sup>of people</sup> ~~who~~ <sup>who</sup> have somebody come up here to the Capitol and try to threaten them or harass them, ~~on something,~~ and they ~~will~~ <sup>or advise the police.</sup> let us know about it, and we ~~will~~ make the investigation, ~~and~~ <sup>And</sup> ~~if~~ we can get the family to have the person put into an institution, we try to do so. If they don't, we may take steps to have ~~them~~ <sup>him</sup>

end unstad  
nash fle

incarcerated through legal means.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Mr. Dulles. How many names, Mr. Director, in general, could the Secret Service process?

Aren't their facilities limited as to dealing with vast numbers of names because of their limited personnel?

Mr. Hoover. I think they are extremely limited. The Secret Service is a very small organization and that is why we are fortifying them, so to speak, or supplementing them by assigning agents of our Bureau which is, of course, quite a burden on us. Our agents <sup>are</sup> assignments <sup>ad</sup> ~~run~~ about 24 to 25 cases per agent and ~~work~~ <sup>cover such involved matters as</sup> ~~from~~ bankruptcy and antitrust ~~and all that sort of~~ <sup>cases.</sup> ~~thing.~~

Now, the Secret Service has a very small group and I would ~~estimate that~~ <sup>number some</sup> think the names we have sent over ~~seven~~ <sup>A FIVE</sup> thousand, ~~and some,~~ I would guess there are about another four thousand that <sup>will</sup> go over in the next month to them.

~~Now,~~ Frankly, I don't see how they can go out and recheck those names. We keep the record up to date, ~~if~~ <sup>these names</sup> additional information comes in on ~~that particular party~~ we furnish it to the Secret Service. ~~Therefore,~~ <sup>I will</sup> they have to call upon the local authorities, unless the Secret Service force is enlarged considerably so that they can handle it entirely on their own. I think the Secret Service is entirely too small a force today to handle ~~even~~ the duties that they are handling. The great crowds that are at the White House all the time, around the gates, that go to church where the President goes, all of those

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6549

things have, of course, to be checked over by them, ~~the~~  
~~church he attends~~ <sup>the church he attends</sup> They always check, in advance and just  
 recently, ~~I think~~ a few Sundays ago, they found some individuals  
~~down~~ in the basement of the St. Mark's church in Washington, ~~where~~  
 which he was going to attend on Sunday morning, ~~and~~ his arrival  
 was held up until they could ascertain who they were, ~~and~~ They  
 were, ~~I think~~, deaf and dumb mutes who were holding a little  
~~service of their own~~ but whose identify had not been cleared with  
 the Secret Service.

Now, the presidential party was delayed about five or ten  
 minutes in reaching the church by reason of the radio call to  
 the White House to hold it up. ~~They have tremendous duties~~  
~~along that line, even today.~~

~~We~~ <sup>Secret Service</sup> are giving to ~~them~~ more and more names, ~~and~~ The total,  
 which ~~has been added~~ in addition to <sup>the names</sup> ~~what~~ they already had, will  
 reach ten thousand, ~~and~~ I ~~frankly~~ don't see how they are  
 going to be able to handle <sup>the situation</sup> ~~it~~ as they would want to handle it.  
 They have ~~got~~ to depend upon local police organizations.

Many local police departments are capable and efficient,  
 some are not. Many have good judgment and some have not.  
 Wherever you have a police department of 10, 15, 20 thousand  
 men you are bound to find a few who are ~~like bulls in a china~~  
~~shop~~, will just barge in and do something which better judgment  
 would ~~have~~ dictate should not ~~have~~ <sup>be</sup> been done, as <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ incident  
 which occurred ~~out~~ in the Midwest where they placed ~~these~~ people

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6550

<sup>under</sup>  
practically ~~in~~ house arrest.

I think it was very bad judgment and should not have been done but ~~you can't~~ the Secret Service, of course, merely turned the names over to the local authorities, and the local authorities do what they think is right.

Now, I guess their attitude with all justice to them is "Well, we will resolve the risk in our favor. If we keep these people under surveillance and keep them in the house until the President gets out of town nothing can happen from them." That is what you would call totalitarian security. I don't think you <sup>can</sup> ~~could~~ have that kind of security in this country without having a great wave of criticism against it. ~~There is a great tendency, you know, of course, as you know as well, if not better than I do,~~ there is a great tendency <sup>for</sup> of people to expect the intelligence forces and the law enforcement agencies to be able to go out and arrest people and bring them in and hold them endlessly and talk to them. We can't arrest a person <sup>without probable cause</sup> unless he ~~is~~ committing a crime in our presence and then ~~we~~ have got to arraign him promptly and ~~that arraignment~~ if ~~it is~~ not done promptly, the confession that he may have made <sup>generally</sup> cannot be used against him.

Just as a collateral matter we faced that problem in California on the ~~Frank Sinatra case~~ in the case of <sup>the</sup> kidnapping Frank Sinatra, Jr. One of the kidnapers we arrested near San Diego and we took a confession <sup>ed but we</sup> from him and it was transcribed and ~~we~~

CONFIDENTIAL

~~didn't~~ arraign him because we ~~didn't have the other two kid-~~  
~~nappers and to arraign him would have opened it up to the public~~  
and the other <sup>kidnappers</sup> would have left California and it would have been  
difficult to find them. ~~We knew the danger of that but~~

in the  
confession  
& signed it

when ~~we gave him his confession to review and sign~~, he made changes  
~~in it~~ <sup>However,</sup> the next day after arraignment, so the court held that ~~it~~  
the confession was admissible. ~~but if there had been no changes~~  
~~made in that confession it would have had to be thrown out,~~  
and not admitted.

~~Now, we don't run across that problem very often, but~~  
The Secret Service, of course, ~~are~~ <sup>is</sup> faced with the same ~~problem,~~ <sup>problem.</sup>  
~~They~~ <sup>we</sup> just can't arrest people because they may not like the <sup>in</sup> looks,  
of a person ~~They have got to have facts~~ <sup>justifying detention</sup> upon which to do it but  
the public conception is that you have a full right to go out  
and do these things, ~~which are lawless,~~ and we have stressed in  
the FBI that there must be full compliance with the laws of this  
country and with the decisions of the Supreme Court.

That is the law of the country.

Now, whether a person likes it or <sup>not</sup> ~~whether they don't like it,~~  
and there are some groups that are very violent against the  
decisions of the court, <sup>while</sup> others are very much in favor of <sup>them,</sup> ~~it,~~  
it is not for the FBI to take ~~any sides~~ <sup>the courts</sup>. We have a job to  
do and we ~~will~~ do it under the rulings of ~~law~~ and ~~if we can't~~  
we have been able to do it effectively.

I know when <sup>M</sup> the ruling came down on the prompt arraign-  
ment, there was great shouting and some strong editorials <sup>claiming</sup> that

CONFIDENTIAL

6552

it was going to wreck law enforcement. It hasn't wrecked us.

~~It is~~ It has made it more difficult but I think we have ~~not~~

to face up to the fact that law enforcement in a free country

*must*  
~~has~~ to abide by the laws of that country irrespective of how difficult it is.

*Some persons*  
~~They~~ talk about putting handcuffs on the law enforcement officers and taking them off the criminals. That is a nice

catch *ph* phrase to use in a speech or article but ~~some~~ *has not*

interfered with our work. *operating within the laws*

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, I ask you about Exhibit 825 which is first a letter and then encloses <sup>~</sup>certain affidavits of your agents.

Mr. Hoover. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rankin. You are familiar with that?

Mr. Hoover. I am familiar with that. I read all of that and signed it.

Mr. Rankin. You know those are the affidavits in regard to whether Lee Harvey Oswald was an agent or connected in any way with the Bureau that you have just testified to?

Mr. Hoover. That is correct, and the affidavits of *all* ~~each~~ agents who had any contact with him.

Mr. Rankin. I call your attention to Exhibits 864 and 865, and ask you if you have seen those before or, you have seen the original of 864 and 865 is a photostatic copy of your letter to us in answer to 864, is that correct?

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6553

Mr. Hoover. That is correct, yes. I recall very distinctly.

Mr. Rankin. Do you recall those letters involved an inquiry as to any connections of Lee Harvey Oswald with Communists or any criminal groups or others that might be conspiratorial?

Mr. Hoover. That is correct, and my letter of April 30 states the facts as they are in our files.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, we offer in evidence Exhibits 864 and 865.

The Chairman. They may be admitted.

(Commission Exhibits Nos. 864 and 865 were marked for identification and received in evidence.)

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, do you have any suggestions that you would like to tell the Commission about of your ideas that might improve the security of the President, and you might comment upon information the Commission has received.

You have a special appropriation that is related to that area.

Mr. Hoover. Well, I, at the request of --

The Chairman. Director, before you get into that question, and may I ask something that I would like to hear you discuss in this same connection?

Mr. Hoover. Yes.

The Chairman. You have told us that you had no jurisdiction down there in Dallas over this crime.

Mr. Hoover. That is correct.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

654

The Chairman. Because there is no federal crime committed, and I assume that that caused you some embarrassment and some confusion in doing your work?

Mr. Hoover. It most certainly did.

The Chairman. Because of the likelihood of your being in conflict with other authorities.

Do you believe there should be a federal law?

Mr. Hoover. I am very strongly in favor of that.

The Chairman. Against an attempt to assassinate the President?

Mr. Hoover. I am very strongly in favor of legislation being enacted and enacted promptly that will make ~~it~~ a federal crime ~~for any~~ attempt upon the life of the President and the Vice President, and ~~maybe~~ possibly the next two <sup>persons</sup> in succession, the Speaker and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, ~~because~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ Oswald case, we could not take custody of him, If we had had jurisdiction we would have taken custody of him and I do not believe he would have been killed by Rubenstein, ~~who got close enough to Oswald, and, therefore,~~ the failure to have that jurisdiction was extremely embarrassing. I think <sup>the killing of Oswald</sup> ~~it~~ has created a great fog of speculation that will go on for years, because of the things that Oswald might have been able to ~~have told~~ <sup>tell</sup> and ~~the things~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ would have been of assistance in pinning down various phases of this <sup>matter. This must</sup> ~~which~~ to be done now by ~~a~~ collecting <sup>me</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Oswald</sup> evidence from third parties, and not from ~~the party~~ himself.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6555

Now, as to the publicity that took place in Dallas, I was <sup>concerned</sup> very much ~~displeased~~ with that. We ~~for common~~ have in the FBI a crime laboratory that furnishes free service to all law enforcement agencies of the country.

(Any law enforcement agency can send <sup>a</sup> into our laboratory here in Washington any ~~specimen they have~~, evidence, blood, dirt, dust, guns, anything of that kind, and our laboratory examines it and then ~~sends the~~ report back to the ~~local~~ <sup>contributing</sup> police department that has sent it in.

<sup>This</sup> ~~What~~ was being done in the <sup>early stages of the</sup> Oswald case, ~~in the early stages of~~ it, and almost as soon as the report would reach the Dallas police department, the Chief of Police or one of the representatives of the Department would go on ~~the~~ TV or ~~a~~ radio and <sup>relate findings</sup> ~~report~~ of the FBI, giving <sup>ing</sup> ~~the~~ information as <sup>such</sup> the identification of the gun, ~~I remember~~, and ~~some~~ other <sup>items of</sup> physical ~~evidence~~ evidence.

Now, that ~~is~~ concerned me for several reasons. In the first place, I don't think cases should be tried in the newspapers, I think ~~there can be~~ a short and simple statement, <sup>can be</sup> made when a person is arrested, <sup>but</sup> ~~and~~ the ~~principal~~ details of the evidence that <sup>should be</sup> ~~you may have~~ retained until you go into court to try <sup>the case,</sup> ~~it~~

~~Not~~ Secondly, it ~~also~~ created a great deal of speculation <sup>there was</sup> ~~on~~ the part of the press. ~~They had~~ very aggressive press coverage at Dallas, ~~and~~ I was so concerned ~~to the extent~~ that I asked my agent in charge at Dallas, Mr. Shanklin, to personally go to Chief Curry and ~~to~~ tell him that I insisted that

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6556

he not go on the air any more until this ~~thing~~ <sup>case</sup> was <sup>resolved</sup> cleared up. Until all the evidence had been examined, ~~that~~ I did not want any statements made concerning the progress of the investigation. Because of the fact the President had asked me to take charge of ~~the case~~ <sup>the case</sup> I insisted that ~~he~~ <sup>and all members of his dept</sup> refrain from public statements, ~~on radio or on the air and that all members of his department do so.~~

There was an officer in his department who was constantly on the radio or giving out interviews. The Chief concurred in ~~my request~~ <sup>from further comment</sup> and thereafter refrained but of course by that time the identification of the gun was known, the caliber of the gun, where it had come from, where it had been bought and ~~all that sort of thing~~ <sup>the information</sup> which we had run down in Chicago and had furnished to the Dallas police department.

If the case had been in the hands of the FBI none of that ~~information~~ <sup>Because of the publicity</sup> would have been given out. ~~You had to~~ <sup>the charge that the</sup> face the prejudice of the community of ~~the charge that the man should have been~~ <sup>would require</sup> ~~should have had~~ a change of venue. With the publicity, ~~going~~ <sup>to</sup> out, I don't know where you could have changed the venue ~~with all~~ <sup>since</sup> the newspapers all over the state covering it, and Houston reporters and so forth, and I think ~~the~~ <sup>a</sup> Houston reporter was the first one who ~~gave the information~~, wrote the information about the ~~fact~~ that Oswald was an informant of the FBI, 730, ~~or some such number as that we had him listed.~~

We went to the newspaper reporter. He refused to tell us

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6557

his source, ~~and~~ <sup>also</sup> he said he had heard it ~~in a group~~ <sup>from other persons</sup> and we asked him the names of ~~the group~~ <sup>these persons</sup> and we got ~~the names of those other~~ <sup>interviewed them but</sup> reporters and got the names of each one of them and none of them ~~could reveal~~ <sup>would provide</sup> the source, ~~or anything about it.~~

~~I think some of them were lying but I couldn't prove it.~~

In other words, I was trying to nail down where ~~the~~ this lie starts. That, of course, is always the result where you are ~~standing~~ daily giving out press interviews because the press wants stories desperately. We have always <sup>a</sup> adopted the policy in the Bureau of no comment until we are ~~ready to make the arrest,~~ have the warrant, <sup>and</sup> make the arrest, <sup>and</sup> then a release is prepared briefly stating what the facts are, what the <sup>written</sup> complaint says, <sup>the fact</sup> ~~that is released,~~ the complaint <sup>was</sup> filed with the Commissioner, and that ends it.

~~We don't try to run it out for a week or ten days, or two weeks.~~ It is up to the ~~prosecuting attorney thereafter,~~ the U.S. Attorney thereafter and the court to try <sup>the</sup> case, <sup>and</sup> I was concerned ~~very severely concerned~~ about the demand for change of venue, because ~~the stories,~~ all the evidence was being given out, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> at that time, of course, we didn't know that Oswald was going to be killed, ~~but~~ there was a possibility that he might be confronted with some of this evidence, <sup>if</sup> it had been kept secret and <sup>used</sup> in the interrogation of him, just confronting him with what was found, <sup>such as his</sup> ~~and~~ the picture of him with the gun, <sup>which</sup> ~~later was obtained,~~ <sup>might</sup> ~~he might have been confronted with that.~~ <sup>have been helpful.</sup>

CONFIDENTIAL

A small thing can often make a man break and come forward with a full confession. ~~Whomever~~ If he knows in advance that you have ~~got~~ certain <sup>evidence</sup> ~~things~~ he ~~is going to~~ <sup>will</sup> be on guard against answering ~~those~~ questions. <sup>of course,</sup> He is always advised of his rights <sup>and</sup> ~~fact~~ <sup>fact</sup> that he can have an attorney, ~~these things~~ <sup>we</sup> always make a point of <sup>this.</sup> We generally have ~~in our cases a physician,~~ a reputable physician of the community present in our office while the prisoner is there, <sup>to administer to him +</sup> ~~so~~ <sup>that</sup> to be able to testify ~~whether~~ <sup>not</sup> he has ~~been in any degree hit or beaten or anything of that kind on the third degree~~ <sup>subjected to</sup> ~~under methods.~~

~~So, that the medical testimony can be added and~~ <sup>he</sup> is examined when he comes in and he is examined <sup>before</sup> when we take him <sup>to</sup> ~~before~~ the Commissioner. Taking him before the Commissioner in a case like Oswald, would probably have ~~had to~~ have been done within ~~maybe~~ four or five hours. ~~We never go over that and~~ generally it is always <sup>generally</sup> ~~we~~ try to <sup>arraign a prisoner</sup> keep within an hour.

~~But~~ <sup>say</sup> that makes it more difficult, you have ~~got~~ to work faster. But again I <sup>am</sup> in favor of, ~~as I say,~~ having the <sup>procedures</sup> ~~processes~~ of the law enforcement offices <sup>as</sup> as tightly bound down as we can, with due respect for the interests of ~~the~~ society.

Of course, there must be an equal balance, ~~there~~. ~~But too~~ often, ~~we~~ <sup>of course,</sup> ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> have had a rule against third degree <sup>methods,</sup> but years ago ~~many~~ many police departments used the third degree. I think very few of them use it now because if they use it they ~~come under violation~~ <sup>violate</sup> of the civil rights statutes

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6559

and we have to investigate them for having brutally handled a prisoner, ~~and many~~ <sup>that</sup> allegations are made unfairly against police officers they have used third degree <sup>methods</sup> and we are able to prove they haven't in our investigation.

That is particularly true where ~~the~~ civil rights matters <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ involved. We have ~~these kind of~~ <sup>such</sup> cases in New York, ~~and these~~ <sup>many</sup> ~~big~~ areas where ~~the~~ civil rights agitation is going on.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, to remind you of my question, any ~~sug~~ <sup>s</sup>gestions that you may have concerning the protection of the President, and the information that the Commission has that you have an special appropriation in that connection for the Bureau.

Mr. Hoover. ~~We~~ <sup>do not</sup> ~~have~~ a special appropriation for the protection of the President. ~~But~~ The Secret Service, of course, has that responsibility. ~~But~~ On December 2, I prepared ~~this~~ memorandum for the President, and for the Chief of the Secret Service at the request of the President, outlining suggestions that I felt should be considered to tighten up on the security of the President.

If the Commission desires I will be glad to leave this or I will be glad to read it to the Commission.

Rep. Boggs. Why don't you ask the Director just to summarize it.

Mr. Rankin. Will you summarize it?

Mr. Dullos. Can we have a copy of it?

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6560

Mr. Hoover. Oh, yes.

Rep. Ford. Could the copy be put in the record as an exhibit?

Mr. Hoover. Yes, sir, that is all right with me. I have no objection to it.

*Regarding travel.*  
First, ~~let's have a~~ <sup>the President's</sup> advise the Secret Service as far in advance as possible of travel plans and proposed itinerary. The reason for that is there have been Presidents who suddenly decide they are going ~~to~~ somewhere and the Secret Service, of course, ~~doesn't~~ <sup>does not</sup> have the chance always to cover the area and check the neighborhood and check the hotel or place where it may be.

Rep. Boggs. You have one like that right now, Mr. Director.

Mr. Hoover. I know from experience.

Second, avoid publicizing exact ~~groups~~ <sup>routes</sup> of travel as long as possible. Again, it has been the practice in the past to announce the President is going ~~to~~ along a certain ~~area~~ <sup>route</sup> and, therefore, great crowds will gather along that ~~area~~ <sup>route</sup>. And, therefore, I thought that was something that should not be given out and the President should be taken along some routes which are not announced.

At the present time, he goes to cities and he wants to see ~~the~~ <sup>people</sup> and the crowd wants to see him.

In Dallas, ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> route was publicized, <sup>at least</sup> 24 hours before so everybody knew where he ~~was~~ <sup>would be</sup> driving.

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6561

Third, use a specially armored car with bullet proof glass and have such cars readily available in locations frequently visited. The President, as I observed earlier in my testimony, had no armored car. <sup>to Reed Bennet</sup> He has one now which I supplied ~~them with~~ and they will have one made no doubt in due time for the President's use. But if it had been armored, I believe President Kennedy would be alive today.

Four<sup>th</sup>, avoid setting a specific pattern of travel or other activity such as visiting the same church at the same time each Sunday. <sup>P. Regarding</sup> ~~public~~ public appearances, <sup>First</sup> use maximum feasible screening of persons in attendance including use of detection devices sensitive to the amount of metal required in a fire-arm or grenade.

<sup>Second,</sup> ~~use~~ use a bullet proof shield in front of the entire rostrum in public appearances such as the swearing in ceremony at the Capitol on inauguration day, the presidential reviewing stand in front of the White House on the same day and on the rear of trains.

Third, keep to a minimum the President's movements within crowds, remain <sup>on</sup> ~~at~~ the rostrum after the public addresses rather than mingling with the audience.

Again, <sup>there is</sup> ~~is~~ great difficulty in that field.

<sup>Fourth,</sup> In appearances at public sporting events such as football games, remain in one place rather than changing sides <sup>u</sup> during the half time ceremonies.

~~If I may say~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6562

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Dulles. About the ~~armored~~ car you said if Kennedy had an armored car that might have saved him.

Would the back of the armored car have some protection to protect his head?

Mr. Hoover. Oh, yes.

Mr. Dulles. Because if the armored car had been open ---

Mr. Hoover. He must never ride in an open car; that has been my recommendation.

Mr. Dulles. The back never comes down?

Mr. Hoover. The back never comes down, and <sup>it</sup> ~~that~~ is bullet-proof, ~~and~~ the top, ~~and~~ sides, ~~and~~ the under part are all <sup>it</sup> bullet-proof construction. So that except by opening a window and waving through the window, <sup>the occupant is safe.</sup> a person can shoot through the window if the glass window is lowered.

Keep to a minimum the President's movements within crowds, ~~remain on the rostrum after public addresses rather than mingling in the audience.~~

Fourth, in appearances at public sporting events, such as football games remain in one place rather than ~~changing sides during the half time ceremonies.~~

Fifth, limit public appearances by use of ~~the~~ television whenever <sup>possible.</sup> ~~necessary.~~

Six<sup>th</sup>, avoid walking in public except when absolutely necessary.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

see page  
6561

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6563

Now, on legislation, I recommended that the President and the Vice President be added to the list of Federal officers set out in Section 1114, title 18 of the U. S. Code which deals with assaults <sup>which</sup> ~~are~~ punishable under ~~the~~ Federal law.

Mr. Rankin. You would add to that I understood from your prior remarks, the Speaker and the President Pro Tempore?

Mr. Hoover. In view of the situation which prevails at the present time the Speaker and President Pro Tempore, in other words, the line of succession under the constitution but not below that.

On the other hand -- off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Hoover. Second, furnish the Secret Service improved authority to request assistance and cooperation from other United States agencies including the military, particularly in connection with foreign travel.

Now, my reason for that is that <sup>sometimes requests for</sup> ~~so often, no doubt~~ assistance would be given but ~~sometimes that~~ assistance has <sup>to</sup> clear through red tape channels ~~to be cleared maybe~~ here at Washington <sup>through</sup> ~~by some Secretary of the Defense Department or some~~ high official of government, <sup>if</sup> ~~where~~ an emergency arises abroad, ~~where we have troops in those countries, or even in this country~~ and that emergency ~~ought to be~~ it may be of such character ~~that~~ <sup>do not have</sup> ~~it has to be done at once, you haven't got time to phone back~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~to Washington or to phone back to the Pentagon, they ought to be~~ <sup>^ Aid</sup>

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6564

immediately available by calling on the local authorities and the nearest ~~local~~ military authority, ~~that may be in that area~~.

Third, improve control of the sale of firearms requiring as a minimum, registration of every firearm sold together with adequate identification of the purchaser.

~~Now, that recommendation is being under extensive debate, not my recommendation but~~ The problem of firearms <sup>control</sup> is under

extensive debate, in both the House and Senate at the present time.

~~The~~ <sup>The</sup> gun that Oswald used <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ bought by mail order from a mail order house in Chicago, no license for it, no permit for it, no checkup on it. The only way we were able to trace it was ~~through the make of the gun and to find out where in this country that Italian made gun was sold, and we found~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ company in Chicago and later <sup>the</sup> ~~this~~ mail order slip that had been sent by Oswald to Chicago to get the gun.

Now, there are arguments, of course --

Mr. Dulles. In a false name.

Mr. Hoover. In a false name.

There <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>legislation</sup> ~~regulation~~ arguments, of course, that <sup>by</sup> ~~to~~ pass firearms ~~regulation~~ you are going to take the privilege of hunting away from the sportsmen of the country. I don't share that view with any great degree of sympathy because you have to get a license to drive an automobile and you have to get a license to have a dog, and I see no reason why a man shouldn't be willing, if he is a ~~good~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6565

law-abiding citizen, to have a license to get a firearm whether it be a <sup>rifle</sup> license or revolver *or other firearm.*

It is not going to curtail his exercise of shooting *for* sport because the police ~~will~~ make a check of his background. If he is a man who is entitled to a gun, a ~~law-abiding~~ law-abiding citizen, a permit will be granted.

Of course, today ~~the matter~~ firearms control is practically negligible, and I think some steps should be taken along that line.

Fourth, a ban <sup>on</sup> of picketing within the vicinity of the White House ~~and~~ as is now done at the U. S. Capitol and Supreme Court. ~~We have these pickets come to Washington, some come by busload and~~ <sup>these pickets</sup> some of them are well-meaning and law-abiding individuals, some are for peace and some are ~~strongly~~ more or less ~~the~~ dedicated Communists.

Rep. Boggs. It is illegal to picket a Federal court now, ~~is it~~ Mr. Director, I happen to be the author of that law.

Mr. Hoover. Yes, I am glad you had that law passed. Of course, they picket public buildings, they ~~come down and~~ march around the Department of Justice <sup>building</sup> and then, but the principal places they prefer to go <sup>are</sup> the Supreme Court building, ~~and~~ the Capitol and its grounds and the White House.

I think such <sup>picketing at the White House</sup> ~~gatherings~~, large or small, <sup>groups</sup> should be forbidden. I think at the White House they tried to get the pickets to walk across the street along Lafayette Park, ~~that sidewalk, along~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6566

~~Lafayette Square.~~ That at least takes them away from being close  
to the gate<sup>s</sup> at the White House. ~~But~~ I think there ought  
to be some control, ~~control~~ picketing, of course, is legitimate  
if it is orderly. Many times it doesn't continue <sup>to be</sup> orderly, and  
sometimes ~~these~~ pickets, as in this <sup>city</sup>, have thrown themselves  
on the pavement and the police have to come and pick them up or  
drag them away, ~~and~~ Then, of course, the charge is made of  
brutality right away.

*R* "You ought not handle them in that way." There have been  
<sup>of colored groups have</sup> Delegations <sup>and</sup> visiting me <sup>at</sup> ~~of the colored groups~~ asking why I don't  
arrest a police officer for not stopping ~~from making him stop~~  
hitting some Negro <sup>whom</sup> that he is arresting in a sit-in strike, or  
lay-in strike or <sup>demonstration</sup> ~~that they have down~~ in some ~~of these~~ southern  
cities.

~~well,~~ We have no <sup>authority</sup> ~~right~~ to make an arrest of that kind.  
Under the authority the Bureau has we have to submit those <sup>complaints</sup> to the  
Department of Justice and <sup>if</sup> they authorize us to make ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> arrest  
we will do it, ~~but we can't just go out and make a citizen's~~  
~~arrest so to speak, when there isn't being a felony committed.~~  
It is ~~disorderly conduct~~ at the most.

<sup>Those</sup> ~~That~~ in general are the ~~contents of the~~ recommendations  
I made and I will ~~have this placed on white paper and~~ ~~this~~  
~~happens to be a copy of this memorandum~~ ~~will~~ finish the Committee with  
~~this~~ a copy of this memorandum.

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Hoover, I would like to ask you in regard

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6567

to your recommendations, do you think you have adequately taken into account that the President is not only the Chief Executive but also necessarily a politician under our system?

Mr. Hoover. I have taken that into account, and I would like to say this off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Rankin. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Any other questions, gentlemen?

Rep. Boggs. I would just like to thank the Director again for all the help he has given us.

Mr. Hoover. I am happy to.

The Chairman. I would, too, on behalf of the Commission, Mr. Director, I would not only like to thank you for your testimony but for your cooperation that your people have given us throughout this entire investigation.

Mr. Hoover. Thank you very much.

The Chairman. I also want to add one other thing, having in mind the testimony you gave that this is still an open investigation, that should anything come to your attention that you believe this Commission has either overlooked or should look into you feel free to ask us to do it.

Mr. Hoover. I would most certainly do that.

The Chairman. To do it.

Mr. Hoover. I want to give all the cooperation I can to this most difficult task you have.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6568

Rep. Ford. One question.

The other day when we had the state, Justice, Judiciary Appropriation bill before the full Committee on appropriations --

Mr. Hoover. Yes.

Rep. Ford. -- and I am not a member of that subcommittee, I noticed a provision in the bill, as I recall, to the effect funds for or something of that content, of FBI responsibilities for the protection of the President.

Mr. Hoover. There is a provision for funds that we can use for the apprehension of a man who has been declared a fugitive from justice, that is where a man has committed a crime, a warrant is out for him and he has fled or where he has escaped from a penitentiary. I don't recall offhand any specific appropriation for the protection of the President.

~~There used to be a provision in our appropriation years ago that gave us authority to furnish protection to the President and to the Vice President.~~

~~That was taken out, I think, about ten years ago, and the full authority now is in the hands of the Secret Service.~~

I will look at the appropriation bill. I may be wrong there but I am quite certain that is so.

Rep. Ford. It was my recollection as I was looking at the bill in Committee there was a phrase to this effect in the language of the bill. I think it might be helpful for the record to get whatever the history is of that if it is still

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6569

a matter of the bill or the law.

Mr. Hoover. I remember that at the time Mr. Curtis was Vice President, he was Senator and then Vice President, at that time he insisted that he wanted FBI agents with him and nobody else, ~~and there was a provision made for, giving us the authority, part of which prior to that time it had been entirely in the Secret Service hands.~~

~~no years went on that was later changed and we do not have the authority to protect the President, nor the Vice President, and when Mr. Nixon <sup>took office as Vice President</sup> came in he was protected by the Secret Service ~~at his house,~~ <sup>with</sup> and when Mr. Johnson, it was the same thing.~~

~~That goes back, I think nearly maybe 15, 20 years, but I will look up, that because I remember Senator Curtis, I was a very close friend of the Senator's and when he became Vice President he wanted to have FBI men, if it was necessary. Sometimes when he was going out to some public function where he would have people bother you or try to press up too close to you he felt it desirable to have somebody with him and he asked for FBI and there was then placed in the appropriation bill which had not been in them before that provision we could furnish that protection but I am quite certain that has been removed and we have no authority to protect the President except that which we are doing now as a matter of courtesy at the request of the Secret Service.~~

~~They~~ asked us to let them have additional manpower and we

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

as a matter of assistance

have done so.

Rep. Ford. ~~That may be why it was included in the bill~~  
~~fiscal year 1965.~~

Mr. Hoover. ~~That may be, yes.~~

Rep. Ford. I think it would be helpful if you would have  
a memorandum prepared.

Mr. Hoover. I will be glad to.

Rep. Ford. Showing the history of this provision from  
its inception and whether or not it is in the bill or the pro-  
posed law for fiscal 1965.

Mr. Hoover. Yes, sir.

Rep. Ford. And the justification you have indicated.

Mr. Hoover. That was not taken up, I know, in the testi-  
mony before the <sup>Affirmative</sup> Committee. ~~Whether somebody has inserted that~~  
~~in the Committee since this thing happened, that testimony~~  
~~was not well, I gave the testimony before the Committee in~~  
January, and the testimony wasn't released until two weeks ago ~~and~~  
<sup>when</sup> the bill ~~that~~ was reported out, ~~so it may be somebody has~~  
~~inserted that back into it but~~ It was not discussed in the  
hearings, ~~that were held on it.~~

Mr. Rankin. Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, in order to complete  
the record, may I ask to have the number 866 assigned to the  
letter that Mr. Hoover is going to send about protection of the  
President, and have it admitted to this record under that number.

The Chairman. -Yes, it may be.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6571

Rep. Ford. Also a number for this memo Mr. Hoover is going to submit.

Mr. Rankin. May I assign 867?

The Chairman. Yes.

(Commission Exhibit Nos. 866 and 867 were marked for identification and received in evidence.)

The Chairman. The Commission will be in order.

Director McCone, it is customary for the Chairman to make a short statement to the witness as to the testimony that is expected to be given.

I will read it at this time.

Mr. McCone will be asked to testify on whether Lee Harvey Oswald was ever an agent directly or indirectly, or an informer or acting on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency in any capacity at any time, and whether he knows of any credible evidence or of any conspiracy either domestic or foreign involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, also with regard to any suggestions and recommendations he may have concerning improvements or changes in provisions for the protection of the President of the United States.

Would you please rise and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give before this Commission shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. McCone. I do.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~