

#10

*course out
to be seen*

MEMORANDUM

Important

*Copy to
Jan 27th
MTP*

*Source -
Rankin Papers
Box 17
F 287*

February 28th 1964

FOR: Mr. J. Lee Rankin
General Counsel

FROM: Leon D. Hubert, Jr.

SUBJECT: Comments on J. Edgar Hoover's letter of February 12, 1964,
with enclosed affidavits.

Aside from what any of us think of the rumor which these documents attempt to refute, the documents do not constitute a complete refutation. They purport to blackout the rumor, insofar as Dallas, New Orleans and San Francisco are concerned. (I assume that Howe is with the Dallas office; all others are identified as to their offices.)

Of course, Mr. Hoover's affidavit of February 6 covers his knowledge, but it can only do that. What about an affidavit of the head of the Security Division at headquarters FBI, Washington? He should know who is or is not an informant; and also who was paid. Besides, let it be noted that payment in money is not the only way to engage an informant. I do not think there is any chicanery here; but for the sake of a perfect record refuting the rumor, I make these comments. I would think the FBI would be interested in a refutation record, impervious even to my comments.

6A1 FBI

Rankin
24th
Mtg

MEMORANDUM

Howe with about

February 20th 1964

Wade - 24th
Mtg
Howe
response

FOR: Mr. J. Lee Rankin
General Counsel

FROM: Leon D. Hubert, Jr.

SUBJECT: Comments on J. Edgar Hoover's letter of February 12, 1964,
with enclosed affidavits.

Aside from what any of us think of the rumor which these documents attempt to refute, the documents do not constitute a complete refutation. They purport to blackout the rumor, insofar as Dallas, New Orleans and San Francisco are concerned. (I assume that Howe is with the Dallas office; all others are identified as to their offices.)

Of course, Mr. Hoover's affidavit of February 6 covers his knowledge, but it can only do that. What about an affidavit of the head of the Security Division at headquarters FBI, Washington? He should know who is or is not an informant; and also who was paid. Besides, let it be noted that payment in money is not the only way to engage an informant. I do not think there is any chicanery here; but for the sake of a perfect record refuting the rumor, I make these comments. I would think the FBI would be interested in a refutation record, impervious even to my comments.

11

never happened