

August 18, 1975

Mr. J. F. Kennedy
MR. CALLAHAN:

At 1:35 p. m., 8/18/75, I returned a telephone call, at his request, to Mr. Dave Muchow, Obstruction and Perjury Desk, Criminal Division of the Department. Muchow is the individual who was present in the office of Carl Belcher on the late afternoon of 8/15/75 when Belcher called me concerning our letter to the Attorney General dated 7/29/75 concerning the Dallas affair.

adv.
Muchow advised that he understood from Deputy Attorney General Kinney that the FBI had received authorization to administer oaths in our inquiry and was wondering as to whether this was some sort of special authorization given by the Department in this regard. I informed Muchow that we had received no special authorization and in fact by statute, which citation I could not recall, the FBI is empowered to place people under oath in conducting our investigations and the authorization was applicable to any individual and not restricted to just Government employees. He also mentioned that in the Mitchell case Judge Sirica had dismissed a charge against Haldeman of furnishing false information to Bureau Agents and wondered if in that instance Haldeman had been placed under oath. I informed him I had no knowledge of this but I would check it out and let him know. (Mr. Mintz advises that in the Haldeman matter the Agents had not placed Haldeman under oath and Judge Sirica would not proceed because the oath was not given.) I informed Muchow I would call back and furnish him the specific citation for our authorization in this regard.

Muchow stated he understood that there was a question as to the source being available either today or tomorrow in Washington, D. C., and if so would the Department be able to see the source and question him. I advised Muchow that the source, to my knowledge, was not in Washington, D. C., and I had no knowledge that he planned to be in Washington, D. C. He then asked whether or not it would be possible for the Department to submit some questions to the source through the Bureau. I advised him

REC-87
SL 109

7234X
18 NOV 18 1976
TEJ

1421
70 110 15 0 1976

that I could not give him an answer in this regard but reiterated what I had told Mr. Belcher on 8/15/75 that to my knowledge the source had given every bit of information he had concerning this matter to Bureau officials early in July, 1975. He then asked if an FD-302 had been prepared concerning the interview of the source and I informed him that an FD-302 had not been prepared but if he he would desire this interview could be reduced to an FD-302. I again pointed out to Muchow there was no question but that the source had given every bit of information at his disposal which had been included in our letter to the Attorney General.

Muchow stated that he and others in the Criminal Division had been reviewing this matter over the weekend, including review of Warren Commission hearings and observed that in reviewing the Warren Commission report, Marina Oswald did not testify concerning whether she knew of Oswald's visit to the Dallas Office and of a note he may have left there. Muchow thought Marina Oswald would be a logical person to be interviewed and wondered if I knew of any reason why she should not be interviewed to which I replied in the negative. I told him it was my understanding that she is still in the Dallas area. In this regard Muchow also thought the police officer who reported a conversation with SA Hosty would be a logical person to interview and this refers to a conversation Lieutenant Revill, Dallas Police Department, claims SA Hosty had with him on an elevator wherein he claims Hosty made reference to Oswald being violent.

Muchow stated at this time it appears that the following options are available and named them as follows:

1. Refer the matter back to the FBI for further interviews.
2. Have the FBI conduct further investigation with the Department outlining specific questions that should be asked.
3. Ask that the FBI allow someone from the Department to sit in on subsequent interviews.
4. Someone from the Department to conduct interviews, taking depositions in question and answer form.
5. Refer the matter to a Grand Jury.

6. Utilization of polygraph. Concerning the polygraph, Muchow asked what the Bureau's position would be on this and he was informed that there have been instances in the past when employees have been requested to take a polygraph.

After citing the above options, Muchow asked what my thoughts were as to the various options and I told him that I was not in a position to speak for the Bureau and he requested that these options be furnished to Mr. Callahan and he was assured they would be. He did make reference to the fact that it would appear that in conducting further inquiry the FBI would be investigating itself and I informed him that this is nothing new, we have highly skilled personnel who in the past have conducted inquiry involving our personnel, that we let the chips fall where they may, and this matter would be handled in the same fashion.

In conclusion, Muchow pointed out that from a review of the information we have furnished the Department to date it is felt that there are a number of "one on one" situations and further pointed out that it seems the higher up one seems in the echelon the more general was the response of the person being interviewed. He stated he and several others in his office are continuing to review this material and he did not anticipate reaching any conclusion for several days.

I asked him if he had received any inquiry from the Deputy Attorney General's office today and he replied in the negative.

Handwritten notes:
The above information is correct
1-20-74
To: [unclear]
[unclear]

Signature: J. A. Conley

Handwritten mark: 17