

Date: 10/7/64

Mr. Tolson	✓
Mr. Belmont	✓
Mr. Mohr	✓
Mr. DeLoach	✓
Mr. Casper	✓
Mr. Callahan	✓
Mr. Conrad	✓
Mr. Evans	✓
Mr. Gale	✓
Mr. Rosen	✓
Mr. Sullivan	✓
Mr. Tavel	✓
Mr. Trotter	✓
Tele. Room	✓
Miss Holmes	✓
Miss Gandy	✓

Transmit the following in _____
(Type in plain text or code)

Via AIRTEL _____
(Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (62-109060) *62-536 ✓*

FROM: SAC, DALLAS (100-10461) *(Section 91)*

RE: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY,
11/22/63, DALLAS, TEXAS
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING

Re Dallas teletype to Bureau, 10/7/64, concerning Texas Attorney General's supplemental report on the assassination.

Enclosed are four newspaper clippings concerning the release of the Texas Attorney General's report on the assassination, which are described as follows:

Clipping from "The Dallas Times Herald", Dallas, Texas, 10/5/64, captioned "Carr Report Cites Curry, FBI, Difference"

Clipping from "The Dallas Times Herald", 10/5/64, captioned "Carr Probe Supports Warren Study - Special Report Defends Dallas"

Clipping from "The Dallas Times Herald", 10/6/64, captioned "Police Not Told Enough / Connally Urges More Federal Cooperation - Cites Carr Probe on JFK Slaying"

- 3 - Bureau (Enc. 4)
- 2 - Dallas

RPG/jtf
(5)

ENCLOSURE

17 OCT 11 1964

3845

UNRECORDED COPY FILED IN 62-3392-100-114104

Approved: _____ Sent _____ M Per _____

Special Agent in Charge

XEROX

Handwritten notes and signatures in the bottom right corner.

DL 100-10461

Clipping from "The Dallas Times Herald", 10/6/64,
captioned "Report Cites Difference Between Chief Curry - FBI".

Waggoner & Curry
It is pointed out in referenced Dallas teletype
the actual Texas Attorney General's supplemental report on
the assassination consists of only twenty pages, and, for
the most part, does not deal in specifics. The newspaper
publicity indicates that in addition to the twenty-page
supplemental report, there were correspondence and several
volumes of exhibits collected by local and state officials
which would be placed in the State Archives.

Dallas, Texas
The enclosed newspaper articles refer to the fact
that Police Chief JESSE E. CURRY waited five months after the
assassination of President KENNEDY to tell the President's
Commission about a controversial memorandum, which memorandum
recorded an alleged conversation between Lt. JACK REVILL of *TEX*
the Dallas Police Department and FBI Agent JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.
According to the newspaper articles, correspondence between
Chief CURRY and J. LEE RANKIN of the President's Commission
about this controversial memorandum was released as part of
the Texas Attorney General's supplemental report; however, no
mention is actually made of same in the actual twenty-page
supplemental report.

The articles continue that in a letter to J. LEE RANKIN
dated May 28, 1964, Chief CURRY explained that after
the appointment of the President's Commission, he was
reasonably sure he would appear before that body and decided
to present the controversial memorandum personally at the time
of his appearance. He further added he felt that the Commission
would possibly desire the statement to be notarized, and he had
this done on April 7, 1964.

DL 100-10461

The newspaper articles continue that in his letter to the President's Commission, Chief of Police CURRY told how the FBI had asked him to retract a statement to the press concerning the controversial conversation between SA HOSTY and Lt. REVILL. One of the articles states that when Chief CURRY read the memorandum of Lt. REVILL on November 22, 1963, he realized the gravity and seriousness of the information it contained and on that date, before newsmen, he stated he had received information that the FBI knew of OSWALD's presence in Dallas and the Dallas Police Department had no information of OSWALD in its files. The article indicates that Chief CURRY's statement to this effect was based on the information reported by Lt. REVILL. The article continues that within a few minutes of Chief CURRY's statement to the press, he received a telephone call from SAC J. GORDON SHANKLIN in which I allegedly stated that the Bureau was extremely desirous that Chief CURRY retract his statement. The article states that Chief CURRY's letter to Mr. RANKIN states that he then appeared before the press again and retracted his original statement to the extent that he did not, of his own personal knowledge, know that the FBI knew of OSWALD's presence in Dallas and that if the FBI did know, they were under no obligation to pass such information on to the Dallas Police Department.

With respect to this article, the Bureau's attention is called to the fact that on the night of November 22, 1963, it was called to my attention that Chief of Police CURRY had been on national television and that he had either said or indicated that the FBI knew OSWALD was in Dallas and had interviewed him recently and that apparently CURRY was trying to place all the blame on the FBI.

I, thereafter, telephonically contacted Chief CURRY on November 22, 1963, and pointed out to him that we had not interviewed OSWALD in Dallas and that we were under no

DL 100-10461

obligation, as he was apparently indicating, to furnish him information on all security subjects in the area; that we had no indication that OSWALD was likely to kill the President; and that we were extending to him full cooperation. Chief CURRY advised me that he was repeating information that someone had told him and that he could not remember who had told him. He stated the next time he was on television, he would rectify this error.

It should be noted that Chief CURRY did go back on television and said he was only repeating information that someone had told him and he could not remember who. He stated the FBI had no obligation to furnish him such information and that the FBI was cooperating with him one-hundred per cent.

It would appear from this letter that CURRY wrote to RANKIN that he is now claiming that his information was based on Lt. REVILL's memorandum, which was never mentioned to me and certainly disagrees with published reports of this alleged retraction in "The Dallas Times Herald" and "The Dallas Morning News" of November 23, 1963.