Honor of Arpresentatives. V. S.

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee

of the

Committee on the Judiciary

PRI OVERSIGHT

Tuesday, October 21, 1975

Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL
410 PIRST STREET, 8. E.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

ti(202) 544-6000 6.2-/19160-

| - | | GCHTENTS O |
|----------------|------|--|
| | | |
| • | ٤ | TETT MONY OF |
| | ş. · | Jenes B. Adams |
| | 4 | Deputy Associate Director Federal Bureau of Investigation |
| | ε | accompanied by Hr old Bassitt |
| | €. | Assistant Director in charge of Inspection |
| | | an charge of the production |
| | 4 | |
| | ε | |
| | ٤ | |
| | 20 | |
| | 21 | |
| | | |
| ž 4 | 12 | |
| 5 . 7 | 13 | |
| - | 14 | |
| | 25 | |
| • | 16 | |
| | 1 | |
| | 17 | |
| a, D.C. 184'13 | 18 | PAGES AT KUNCH MATERIAL IS TO BE INSERTED: 192,7)], 229, 237 |
| | 19 | |
| | 20 | 13.C 24.7 |
| . Wri`ington. | 21 | |
| ¥ . | • | |
| ¥ - | 2.2 | |
| į | 23 | |
| • | 24 | |
| | :.5 | 167 |
| 100 | | |

Tu: C:y, October 21, 1975

Fig. of Representatives Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Complier on the Judiciary, the chington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at. 9:45 o'clock a.m., in Room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Don Edwards (Chairman of the Subconduittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Edwards (presiding, Prinan, Badillo, Dodd, Butler and Kindness.

Also present: Alan A. Parker, Chief Counsel; Thomas P. Breen, Associate Minority Counsel; and Kenneth N, Klee, Minority Counsel.

Mr. Edwards. The Committee will came to cider. Today, we continue this Substantifies ": -

Mr. Chairman, M. 1 way. I have that the Mr. Drinan. Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Count? Tulion 1 Rights permit coverage of this hearing in fri: or in part by television continue equilibre or only endbroadcast, radio broschest es methods of coverage putit ::

Mr. Edwids.

16 17

2

3

Б

6

E

Ð

.. 10

11

. 12

13

14

15

18

13 :20

21

22 23

24

(Ayes) (

Mr. Edwals. Contrary?

(No response)

Mr. Edwards. The motion is carried.

Today, we continue this Subcommittee's hearings on FBI oversight. Our most recent hearing involved the presentation of the General Accounting Office of their interim report on the domestic intelligence operations of the FBI. The final report and further hearings will be held later in November.

Today we have asked the Federal Eureau of Investigation to report to us on four areas of interest.

- 1. Allegations concerning a letter allegedly written by
 Lee Harvey Oswald several days before the assassination of
 President John F. Kennedy containing threats which was received
 by the Dallas Office of the FEI and subsequently destroyed:
- 2. Allegiations indicating that Jack Ruby was a paid informer of the FBI;
- 3. Allegation by William Walter regarding a telex received by the New Orleans field office warning the Bureau's scuthern field offices that there would be an instabilination attempt;
- 4. Allegations that all information available to the FBI was not fully disclosed to the Warran Commission.

It is for the benefit of the printer and the government agencies involved that these insure by the distinct so that it degislation is needed we will be a the interest beauty.

dcal with it intelligently. If the pc onnel of the FBI violated heir own rules or Pederal statutes, then we must be sure that appropriate remedies 3. for such actions exist within the Bureau and that the legal machinery exists within the Department of Justice to evaluate 5 and prosecute if necessary. 6 We are happy to have with us today, representing the Federal Bureau of Investigation, James B. Adams, Deputy Associate 8 Director. \mathbf{g} Mr. Adams, your colleague is? 10 Mr. Adams. Haryold Bassatt, Assistant Director in Charge 11 of Inspection. 12 Mr. Edwards. Will you both lise and raise your right 13 hands. 14 Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about 15 to give this Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, 16 and nothing but the truth, so help you God? 17 Mr. Adams. 18 Mr. Bassatt. I do. 19 Mr. Edwards. Mr. Adams, you may proceed. 20 21 22 23 24 25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MENT OF JAHES B. ADAMS, UTY ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION: ACCOMPANIED BY: HAROLD BASSATT, ASSISTANT DIREC-TOR IN CHARGE OF INSPECTION

Mr. Adams. Mr. Chairman, I genuinely appreciate this opportunity to appear before your Committee.

My purpose in being here is to be as helpful as I can in your efforts to resolve serious questions that have been raised about the FBI -- questions arising from one of the gravest tragedies of our time, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy at Dallas, Texas, on November 22, 1963.

We welcome this opportunity because we sincerely believe in the integrity of the PBI, and that integrity requires and honest and complete statement of the facts for the American people.

We hope, as well, that these proceedings will help assuage at least some of the rumors and conjecture and doubts that have multiplied and spread so rapidly in this 12th year following President Kennedy's death.

Mr. Edwards. I wonder if the people in the back can hear Mr. Adams. Can they? Fine. Very good. You may proceed.

Mr. Adams. The first area in which you have expressed interest is that involving the alleged visits of Test Harvey Cowold to the Dallas FBI Office prior week. President Kennedy.

. 12

We have just completed an exhaustive internal inquiry
which leaves no doubt that Lee Harvey Oswald visited our Dallas
Office some days prior to the assassination of President Kennedy and he left a handwritten note there for the Special Agent
who was conducting our subversive activities investigation of
him.

Director Kelly and I first learned of these occurrences on July 7, 1975, when an official of the "Dallas Times-Herald" met with us here in Washington. This newspaper official acvisce that an individual, whose identify he could not reveal, had told him that Oswald had visited the Falles FBI Office, sometime prior to the assassination; that Oswald left a note — allegedly threatening in nature — for the ACent who had been handling our investigation of him; and that neither Oswald's visit nor the note was reported prior to or following the assassination of President Kennedy.

Having no knowledge of this event, the newspaperman was advised that would inquire into the matter and furnish him an official response.

Mr. Kelley immediately personally informed Attorney General Edward Levi of these allegations. He also told the Attorney General that we were initiating an inquiry to determine the truth of these allegations; and he ordered the Assistant Director of our Inspection Division to personally take charge of this matter.

fry firet, S.E., Winhapon, D.C.

The first step in our inquiry was O conduct an extensive review of all file references to Oswald in our Washington Headquarters and in the Dallas Field Office to determine if they contained any information concerning the alleged wirit by Oswald and/or the threatening note.

They did not.

The second step was to identify, locate, and interview those persons within and without the PBI who logically might be able to shed light on this matter.

Since July, 1975, nearly 80 interviews, including reinterviews of some persons, have been conducted.

The purpose and the thrusst of these interviews was to determine the answers to these important questions:

- (1) Did Lee Harvey Oswald in fact visit the Dallas FBI Office prior to the assassination?
- (2) If so, did he leave a note -- and what were its contents?
 - (3) What action was taken regarding the note?
- (4) Was the note destroyed; and if so, by whom and at whose instruction?
- The results of our inquiry convince us that the answer to the first question is an unequivocal "yes." We don't know the exact date of time, but we are confident that Lee Eurvey Usewald did visit our Dallas Field (fice in Rovember, 1963)

*** Street, S.E. Warnington, D.C. BO

The testi my of Marina Oswald and I sh Hyde Paine before the Warren Commission refers to the possibility of this visit. In response to a question concerning the PBI, Mrs. Oswald testified as follows: "Lee had told me that supposedly he had visited their office; or their building. But I didn't believe hom."

Mrs. Paine told the Warren Commission that Oswald "told me that he had stopped at the downtown office of the PBI and tried to see the agents and left a note. And my impression of it is that this notice irritated. That he left the note saying what he thought."

Mrs. Paine also testified that she "learned only a few weeks ago that he never did go into the FET office."

Interviews that we have conducted in our Dallas Office support the conclusion that Oswald visited the office prior to the assassination.

The employee who was serving as receptionist in that office in November, 1963, stated that to her recollection about a week or 10 days before the assassination an individual appeared at the reception desk and aski to see crospecific Agent by name. Upon being told that the Agent was out of the office this individual left an envelope for the Agent.

According to the receptionist, the envelope contained a note which she read and believed was signed "Lee Harvey Company".

She stated that the recognized the person who were as the

at the office when she saw pictures of of 11d in the newspapers following the assassination.

Another person who was employed at the Dallas FBI Office in November, 1963, recalled what while entering the office about midday sometime before the assassination she saw a slender, dark-haired young man whom she later could assume was Oswald with the receptionist.

A third employee was alleged to have seen Oswald at the office, however, upon interview, denied that she did.

As to the wording of the note, left at the Dalles Office, accounts vary. The receptionist recalled its contents to be somewhat as follows: "Let this be a warning. I will blow up the FBI and the Dallas Police Department if you con't stop bothering my wife."

She recalls taking the note to the Assistant Special Agent in Charge. It was her recollection that he also read the note, commented that it was from a "nut," and told her to give it to the Agent to whom it was addressed.

The Assistant Special Agent in Charge to whom the receptionist said she handed the note denied having any knowledge of it.

In addition, she expressed the belief that she also showed the note to three other employees of the Dallas Office. These three employees were in exclavate, and each denice having seen it.

The Agent or whom the note was intered recalled its wording as "If you have anything you want to learn about me, come talk directly to me! If you don't cease bothering my wife I will take appropriate action and report this to The proper authorities."

This Agent's Supervisor, who claimed to have seen the note, said that he seemed to recall it circulated some kind of threat but could not *** Temember specifics.

Aside from these three persons — the receptionist, the Agent, and the Agent's Supervisor — no one else who was interviewed admitted having seen the note. Some indicated they understood that the note contained a threat; however, this was hearsay knowledge, having come primarily from conversations they had had with the receptionist.

All who saw or heard of the note agree that there was no mention of President Kennedy or anything which would have forewarned of the assassination of the President.

In attempting to determine what action was taken regarding the note, we learned that the Agent for whom the note was intended took no action other than to place it in his workbox—where it continued to reside on the day of the assassination.

Oswald at the Dallas Police Department on the day of the assassination and returned to the Field Office about an hour later, where he went to the Office of the Special Agent it

Fret'Street, S.E., Weinfreton, D.

Re said Supervisor was in the case with the Special Agent in Charge. According to the Agent, one of them displayed the threatening note and asked him to explain its contents.

By his account, he told them he had interviewe Marina

Oswald and Mrs. Paine on November 1, 1963; and that when he

participated in the interview of Oswald that darrat the Dallas

Police Department, Oswald, upon learning the Agent's name,

commented that he was the one who was talking to and bothering

his wife — that if the Agent wanted to know something about

Oswald he should have come and talked to Oswald himself.

At this point, the Agent claims, the Special Agent in Charge ordered him to prepare a memorandum setting forth the information regarding the note and his interview with Marina Oswald and Mrs. Paine. He stated that he did prepare such a memorandum, three or four pages in length, and delivered it to the Special Agent in Charge on the evening of November 22, 1963.

The secretary to whom the Agent said he dictated this memorandum was interviewed. She said she had no recollection of the memorandum.

The Agent's Supervisor said that it was he who found the note in the Agent's workbox very soon sfter 'he essessination of President Kennedy. He stated he took the note to the office of the Special Agent in Charge but had no recollection whose the note may have gone or who may have had it the resitti

fort Street, S.E., Worthreplen, D.C. 2

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

· 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Agent, involved, however, stated, at approximately two hours after Oswald had been pronounced dead on November 24, his Supervisor told him that the Special Agent in Charge wanted to see him. He claimed that upon arriving in the Special Agent in Charge's Office, he was instructed by the Special Agent in Charge to destroy both the note and the m emorandum regarding it that he had given the Special Agent in Charge on the night of November 22.

The Agent told us that he complied with these instructions and destroyed the note and the memorandum.

The Supervisor has told us that he had no knowledge of the disposition of the note.

The Special Agent in Charge, who retired prior to the receipt of the allegations in this matter, has denied having any knowledge of Oswald's visit to the Dallas Office or of Oswald's leaving a note there. He maintains that he did not issue any orders to destroy the note. In fact, he claimed to have no knowledge of this entire matter until July, 1975.

The personnel who were assigned to the Dallas Office in November, 1963, and who have admitted personal knowledge of the Oswald visit and the note, have denied having any knowledge that the facts of this matter had been brought to the attention of FBI. Headquarters.

One employee did state, however, that the heard from an unicalled source that a meeting was held or overing to lecide

the purported the Oswald note. She nam 1 what to do wit. participants, including an Inspector from Washington. She 2 qualified this information by saying that she had no firsthand 3 information, that it was hearsay, and that she did not desire it included in her sworn statement. That Inspector, now retired 5 as well as the other alleged participants in this meeting, 6 unequivocally denied having any knowledge of the Oswald visit, 7 including the note and its destruction. 8

one former FBI official, who was an Assistant Director of the time of the assessination, has stated he discussed the Oswald case many times with the Special Agent in Charge of the Dallas Office. According to this former official, the Special Agent in Charge mentioned on one occasion that he had an internal problem involving one of his Agents who had received a threatening message from Oswald because the Agent was investigating Oswald.

The former official maintains that the Special Agent in Charge seemed disinclined to discuss the matter other than to say that he was handling it as a personnel problem with another individual who then held the rank of Assistant to the Director. This latter individual has denied under oath any such knowledge or action.

The same former Assistant Director said he thought it was common knowledge at Thi Herfquarters that a threstening message had been received from Covald. Her stand specifically

AT D GEAT

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

.20 .21 .

24

23

1 who
2 he s
3 the
4 nat:
5 Age:
6 suc:
7 had
8 tha
9 did
10 the

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

who at our Hearmarters might have knowle be regarding this, he stated it probably would be people who were concerned with the supervision of the Lee Harvey Oswald case and the assassination. After searching his memory for the identities of the Agents who had such supervisory responsibilities, he named two such Agents — both being in the Headquarters Division which he had headed at the time of the assassination. He commented that he had no direct knowledge that these Agent-Supervisors did, in fact, have this information, but felt it was possible they might because of their intimate involvement with the supervision of the ramifications involving Oswald.

Both of these Agent-Supervisors have been intuiviews and denied such knowledge.

Our inquiry into this matter has included interviews with a large humber of present and former FBl officials, including the entire still-living chain of command of the two investigative Divisions at our Headquarters which supervised the Kennedy assassination case. With the exception of the abovementioned former Assistant Director, all have furnished statements denying any knowledge in this matter.

Whatever thoughts or fears may have motivated the concealment of Lee Harvey Oswald's visit to our Dallar Office, as well as the concealment and subsequent destruction of the note he left there, the action was wrong. It was, in fact, a violation of firm rules that continue to exist in the FBI

Frest Street, S.E., Wathington, D.C.

5

6

7

B

· 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

3.0

today -- rules thich required that the far of Oswald's visit and the text of his note be recorded in the files of the Dallas Office and that they be reported to our Headquarters to be furnished thereafter to the Warren Commission.

The facts disclosed by our inquiry have been reported in. full to the Department of Justice. The Department has concluded that this is not an appropriate case for criminal prosecution at this time.

We are at this very moment making our own assessment of the facts with a view toward initiating appropriate administrative action.

The Committee has also expressed interest in allegations indicating that Jack Ruby was a paid information of the FBI.

The best answer to such assertions is to quote from letters which Director Hoover sent to the Honorable J. Lee Rankin, the General Counsel of the Warren Commission in 1964.

In one such letter, dated February 27, 1964, Mr. Hoover called attention to background information contained on pages 155 through 159 of a report dated November 30, 1963, prepared by our Dallas Office in the Kennedy assassination case. information, he told Mr. Rankin, "was obtained through a search of all files in the Dallas Office wherein references to Jack L. Ruby appeared. All available information concerning Jack Ruby contained in the balles files in the faith in the report.

Hr. Hoover's letter continued, "in term information,

19 .20

> 21 22

23

24

2 .

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Ruby was contilled by an Agent of the Da. s Office on March 11, 1959, in view of his position as a night club operator who might have knowledge of the criminal element in Dallas. He was advised of the Bureau's jurisdiction in criminal matters, and he expressed a willingness to furnish information along these lines. He was subsequently contacted on eight occasions between March 11, 1959, and October 2, 1959, but he furnished no information whatever and further contacts with him were discontinued. Ruby was never paid any money, and he was never any any time an informant of this Bureau."

In another letter to Mr. Rankin dated April 7, 1964, Mr. Hoofver again called attention to the fact that information on Jack Ruby had been furnished to the Commission in the Dallas Office's report of November 30, 1963. This letter stated, *Copies of all of the records located wherein mention is made of Ruby prior to November 23, 1963, have been prepared and are being forwarded to you."

There was nothing in these Bureau rectids indicating that Ruby furnished information to the FBI as an informant or was ever paid any money.

As you can tell, this question was thoroughly explored by the Commission, and nothing to the contrary was developed.

You have also inquired concerning reports that Jack Ruby was involved in a union killing in 1939, which fact allegedly had not been furnished the Warren Commission.

. 12

.14

contrary a misconception that has risen, there is no evidence that Jack Ruby was involved as a participant in the shooting of a union official in Chicago, Illinois, in December.

1939. Nor did the FBI attempt to conceal information concerning Ruby's alleged involvement in this crime from the Warren Commission.

The truth of the matter is that the facts of this shooting incident were not known to the FPI at the time of the assessing nation of President Kennedy.

A check of the records of the Chicago Police Department disclosed no information concerning this shooting. However; on November 25, 1963 -- three days after the assassination -- our Chicago Office found in the morgue of the "Chicago Tribune" information pertaining to the fatal shooting of a union official in 1939 in which mention of Jack Ruby, as "Jack Rubenstein," was made. Ruby was an employee of the union. He was a friend of the deceased union official, and according to the news account, was in no way implicated in the shooting.

This information was, in fact, furnished to the Warren Commission. It appears in the Commission's published report.

In addition, you have inquired about the much-publicized report concerning an alleged teletype message from FDI Head-quarters that was allegedly received in our New Orlcans Office on November 17, 1963. The teletype purportedly warned that a militant revoluntary group might attempt to annualization.

744 & OR48

Street, S.C. Warnington, C.C. 200

This story emanates from a former PEI clerical employee. He worked at our New Orleans Field Office for about four and one-half years ending in 1966. During November, 1963, he was assigned to the early morning shift -- 12:15 to 8:15 a.m. -- in that office as a security patrol clerk.

His story about the teletype first came to light early in 1958 when then-District Attorney of New Orleans stated on a television program that the former FBI clerk had been interviewed by an attorney and had told the attorney of the teletype.

On February 1, 1253, the former clerk, who the was in Jacksonville, Florida, contacted our office there to deny this televised story. He admitted having been in contact with the attorney involved; stated that the attorney wanted him to furnish information concerning a teletype from FBI Headquarters on November 17, 1963, reporting a threat to President Kennedy in Dallas; and told the Special Agent in Charge of our Jackson-ville Office that he had never received or seen a teletype or other message containing the information which the attorney sought.

The following day, the former clerical employee also contacted our New Orleans Office to advise of an additional contact he had had with the attorney involved. Our former employee claimed that he told the attorney he did not approve of

WARD B

.4.

3

4.

5

7

6

8 9

10

11

. 12 13

> 14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

what the atto: 'y and his associates were loing -- and that the information attributed to him on the television program was totally false.

The Following month, however, he contacted the United States Attorney in New Orleans and told him and two associates that there was, in fact, such a teletype message. The teletype, he maintained, was received while he was on duty as a security patrol clerk in the New Orleans Office on November 17, 1963 -- and that he called the Special Agent in Charge of the office to advise him of its contents. This, the former employee claimed, caused the Special Agent in Charge to instruct him to call certain Agents and tell them to maintain contact with various informants:

At this point -- in March, 1968 -- an extensive inquiry was launched. It included a thorough check of the files at our Beadquarters and in the New Orleans and Dallas Field Offices. No record of a teletype or any other kind of communication reporting that there would be an attempt to assassinate President Kennedy in Texas could be found.

We additionally determined that only one communication was dispatched from FBI Headquarters to the New Orleans Office on November 17, 1963 -- which was a Sunday. This was a letter enclosing a translation of a document in conjunction with a trial in a totally unrelated Fraud Against the Government case. Since the former clerk had worked the 12:15 to 8:15 c.m. thift