To Jim Lesar and Mark Allen from Harold Weisberg 1/12/85

This is the third page of my memo on the batches of Hosty records disclosed to Mark, the third as sent to me. I do this separately in part for my own filing and in part because I made copies of only two from this larger batch. I'll keep the original of the memo because it will make better copies for my subject filing. For the same or similar reasons I'll do the same with the second record, a long one of which I've xeroxed selected pages only. Please do not take this to mean that I believe there is nothing else of value in this batch. There may well be and I may well have missed it because I'm into what now appears to be my annual sieges of bronchial infections, this being the third straight year. Last night is the first in two weeks that I got four continuous hours of sleep. But the apparently appropriate medicine brings its own problems, one of them the subject of complaint by my ulcer. So, I urge your own examinations and if you'd like questions. I'm keeping these as I receive them, filed separately as disclosed to Mark.

The 12/31/75 Director to AG covering a memo to the Senate Intelligence Committee (FBI code name not used here "Senstudy") and the memo itself are typical of how the FBI lies when it wants to lie and prepares its lies so it can, if necessary, explain them away. Not uncommonly with indignation. (#66)

Item 1 reflects the Senate's interest in the Hosty censuring. The Senate referred to one and the FBI here does not volunteer that he was censured at least twice, as is reflected in his own memo on the previous page of my memo reflects. The Senate is told to come to FBIHQ to see what it wants to see. Those records were disclosed to me. Reflects the FBI's respect for the Senate, no? And those are redacted copies, withholding from the Senate the names of others then disciplined, on the same cover the Bureau's ass basis, when they'd done nothing wrong. Their names also, to the best of my recollection are disclosed.

No, Item 2 refers to a request for records relating to the second censuring of Hosty, "on or about September 25, 1964." Doesn't the FBI know? I suggest a possible explanation of this formulation: proofs of the Warren report were out and given to even the press 9/24. I have a press set. Or I've given it to Wisconsin. But I've seen it. It is page proofs of the final version of the Report. SSC is told to go to FBIHQ to see those records. They were later disclosed to me.

Until about this time the FBI refused all requests for such (Hosty-Oswald) information from the Congress on the ground that it was making an investigation and had not completed it. I've read the records of its investigation and what it was really up to is keeping everything under wraps and its control so it could create a situation in which no action could be taken against anyone. I have separate subject-file copies, I believe with memos, of what for me are the originals.

Item 15 is written in a manner that leaves it up to the reader to comprehend the SSC's question, and from the language I take it this is the Hosty destruction of Oswald's pre-assassination letter to him. The request indicates that the SSC was underinformed or misinformed, as the FBI refers to the request, and the FBI was not about to get the matter straight for the Senate. The language here is, "Item 15 requests all materials pertaining to the meeting subsequent to November 24, 1963 and prior to the submission of the Bureau's initial report to the White House..." My emphasis. The report referred to, CD1, was forwarded 12/9/63 and it makes no mention of the Oswald letter and its destruction. But if you will look at Document 1 in the first batch where I've copied it for you with a paperclip at that point, 1 B 3, that states that this was "handled" at FBIHQ on 11/24. And "handled" does not refer to FBIHQ's first knowledge but to its action or solution. It also, of course, is acknowledgement of FBIHQ knowledge, withheld from the President, his Commission and the people in the so-called definitive report.

HAD

Additional note to JL: Is not this and most if not all the rest of this stuff eloquent rebuttal of the FBI's lie that it routinely destroys all ticklers after a few days? 0322 and other cases.

Note again on critics, C 7, "Subsequent preparation of sex dossiers on critics of probe." No wonder they had Phillips swear falsely. I wonder if you ought not try to find some way of getting this to the appeals court on that one question, what they were directed to do and how they lied about it? Did they need discovery to find this and all else like it?

The next attached page was separate, preceeded by a note about the kind of notebook used. Note that this gives a serial. It was disclosed and I used it in one of the cases to reflect that the FBI itself said I was fair to it. Until it decided not to like what I wrote. Refers to the Alan Burke Show on WNEW-TV. (New York City)

Note that the reference to Meagher is phonetic, Dallas to Director that I do not recall. Suggests overheard or tap. Later they had her name correct, including maiden name.

Hosty's 10/24/77 to Director, FBIHQ 67-694012-191, Doc. 34 (which also shows how FBIHQ can locate field office personnel records) states, graf 3, underscoring in original that he had had "an opportunity to review my field personnel file." This is quite specific in identifying the record's existence and filing and, if I do not recall incorrectly, refute's Phillips' attestation that there was none in Dallas. Unless, of course, the whole thing had been forwarded to K.C. In which event Dallas had a record of that and was deliberately deceptive. He is quite specific in identifying as Serial 157 as relevant in this matter and 0322. This also discloses that JFK assassination investigation records are included in the personnel files and why the Hosty search slip was blank.

What I told you over the phone, that Hoover, personally praised Hosty's perjurious testimony before the Commission is page 2, graf 2.

On page 3 there is indication that this memo was of 1973 because he states that is when he and Kelley spoke in KC, of which I'd known. Now that was two years before it was leaked that Oswald had left a threatening letter for him before 11/22/63 and that on orders he personally destroyed it. Here, living the fiction and hiding behind the FBI's false position, he states, 3rd graf up on 3, "I had absolutely no reason to believe that Oswald was a potential assassin or dangerous in any way." This, certainly, even for the FBI, is a rare way of referring to a threat to blow it up! (FBI's discussed for multiple copies of printed pages of his testimony)

Bassett to Held, 8/17/76, is an FBIHQ record not indicated as Not Recorded, so I wonder if the obliteration after the first graf, for which a b6 claim is made, is of a file number that could disclose what the FBI does not want to disclose. I suggest that you ask for its examination because pretty much all of the disciplinings and censures is public.

Page 1, graf 2 he admits that some in the FBI "are not being truthful" about the threatening note and its destruction. The reference to those "involved" must be some interpretation of "directly" involved because the last graf admits that 16 still working for the FBI admitted some knowledge.

Page 5 identifies this copy as from "admin Folder." 6 does too.

Repetition of Hosty's claim that there was no threat is amusing and he had to have been lying and knowing he was lying from his own description of how he destroyed it, hardly what Shanklin would have ordered him to do or how he'd have done it if innocuous. He went to the bathroom, shredded it and flushed it away.

Continues separately with third batch I received.

Dear Jim and Mark, 1/5/85 & 1/12/85

I've read the two thin and unidentified bacthes of Hosty material Mark got from the FBI and I got from you today. It is all self-serving, self-righteous, self-lauditory and irrelevant. But it does faithfully reflect the FBI line in both matters once it got caught.

There is one record of some interest. Because they bear no identifications I can't cite any so I'll attach a copy. I recall no disclosed record that in any way justifies what this says, and at the same time I cannot dismiss it as a mere error.

It says that Oswald had been contacted by the MVD of the USSR.

I don't believe it.

On the incredible factual error in the (appeals court) panel report. I had space and I've drafted an addition. I not only had it marked - I had a paperclip on that page to draw my attention to several parts that I'd marked. And forgot!

Many thanks. I give it meaning.

Best,

Resumed 1/12/85 Because these are almost all nonrecord copies, obviously from a tickler, they lack positive identifications I can use. Where I've thought of it I'll have copies attached.

marker A

The first copy. typed sideways, was on a legal-sized page. I use the standard size because that holds what I am wondering a out, the statement that Oswald "was contact ed by MVD," sourced to the Fain investigation. There was nothing at all like this in any Fain report I've seen. Rather the opposite, LHO's statement that he had not been. But was is confusing about this is that it can also be attributed the SAs Carter and Brown. But the alleged MVD contact is repeated, which reduces the possibilities of simple error at FBIHQ. Mark may want to consider giving this to Gardner or another reporter, who can then ask his own questions of the FBI. I suggest this. As soon as possible.

The first page of Document 1 in the next bacth, 1 B 3 on "Hosty note destruction," is the first unequivocal statement I've seen that FBIHQ was aware of this. (I guess I should say that I recall.) It also refers to FBIHQ's "handling" of this on or by 11/24/63. This amounts to a confession of deliberate FBI lying to the Commission and the nation that early and thereafter in its line that Oswald had never given any indication of any tendency toward violence. Which I think was (immune) perjury when Hoover and Hosty swore to it. I put the paperclips on. Again I think use should be offered promptly. See also 3 B 5

2 B 4, "Rosen characterization of FBI "standing with pockets open for evidence to drop in." By translation, the chief of investigations states they did not investigate the crime itself. Again I recall no earlier record saying this and again I recommend making it available to Gardner or another.

3 A admits the FBI had an "adversary relationship" with the commission. In giving Hoover credit for blocking Olney's choice as general counsel they also disclose that our First Unelected Ford was fronting for Hoover. 3C 1 reflects and emphasized the FBI's preparation of dossiers on WC staffers "after" Report was out. Blackmail only? The checkmark at 4. was on the original. Someone was emphasizing that the FBI and CIA (Angleton) were "pre-arranging" their answer to the commission. 7, referring to the FBI's preparation of dossiers on critics, exists in another form I'll come to. Note to JL: they had some notion of what they were told to do in 0322/0420.

The FBI devoted five volumes to that report and there was nothing in the world to prevent a sixth if necessary. So it is not space that kept all mention of that singificant and suppressed matter out of the FBI's reporting.

In the language that follows the FBI lies without actually lying,"...all Bureau ~~personnel~~ officials and supervisory personnel were interviewed by the Inspection Division..." Not all as of that time. This clearly refers to those still in the FBI as of the date of the memo, Example, Alan Belmont, as I recall, was not interviewed because he was ill. But he is directly involved according to IG records I have.

It is inconceivable that once Oswald was picked up by the police and the FBI knew it in Dallas that Dallas did not cover its own ass by telling FBIHQ immediately that Oswald had left the latter allegedly threatening to blow the FBI office and police HQ up. It also cannot be believed that in this situation Shanklin ordered its destruction on his own authority.

What Senstudy needed and the FBI knew it needed is what happened on and before 11/24, not subsequent to it. For that I expect perpetual secrecy unless some errant copies are around if anything was put on paper.

Item 16 is a cutie because of its typically FBI conclusion. I must admit that I do not recall this affidavit by, or statement by SA Joe B. Pearce. And while anything is possible, I find it hard to believe that I'd forget his saying that "Oswald was an informant or source of SA Hosty and it was not uncommon for sources to occasionally come to the office" to leave a note for the agent running him. While I acknowledge the possibility that I've forgotten, with my from-the-first interest in Oswald as someone's fink I do not believe I did. I therefore am inclined to believe that this was withheld from me. Bearing on this possibility, according to my office card file of subject files in the basement, I had none on Pearce. He was not by any means unknown to me. I remember him as writing memos "IC Pearce," or investigative clerk, not an SA. I see this is in his affidavit. The FBI's phony conclusion is that this "was looked into by the President's Commission, and there was no substance whatsoever to this particular claim." How did the Commission "look?" It took Hoover's and Belmont's self-serving statements that the FBI had no connection with Oswald. Even though as the 1/27/64 executive session makes unequivocal, Dulles told the Commission that to lie about this would be right and proper and the 11/21 ex sess discloses the Commission's view that it would never get an answer and that the FBI wanted it to fold its tents and go away because by then the FBI had solved the crime.

A comment on how the FBI can hide by its filing and make a literal interpretation of search slips to deny the existence of existing records it knows exist. Note that this is a tickler copy and we have no idea what the record copy may be. But this is designated for a single file only, that on the Senate committee. There is no indication of any assassination filing. So, the search slip would not disclose assassination filing and the FBI would therefor decided that Senstudy was not relevant and the record not responsive, responsive as it indubitably would be. It also is interesting that "Oswald+" was written on the top, suggesting, but not necessarily meaning another tickler filing. Filing instructions are never written on the tops of pages, only on the bottoms.

It also can be that what I read as Oswald + may be Oswald T, or tickler.

BARRETT's statement on his appearance before SSC. (Selected pages attached)

The underlinings, the FBI's, are not typical and I suggest were made for probable indexing or duplicating in a tickler. Oswald is not underlined but in additional to what appears to be all FBI names, Ruby and Marcello, for example, are. This suggests a tickler aimed at the committee's apparent interests, a control over information it would get, rather, perhaps, to inform the FBI of rather than necessarily control.

Bassett regards it as insignificant when there was a rumor he heard that before the assassination the alleged assassin appeared and left Hosty a note. (2)

Page 5, penult graf, Barrett states that "an Agent in Dallas had at one time opened a PCI case on Ruby." This reflects what is the FBI's practise, the keeping of records related to Ruby as a PCI. But none produced in 78-0322 despite my repeated appeals for it. This also reflects the fact that such records should appear on any search slips. And thus show automatically if a search had been made. (There should in fact be at least a dozen informant contact forms in the file plus the request for permission to use him and the granting of that permission.)

The questioning about alleged disciplining of the SA whom used Ruby as a PCI and allegedly found him unproductive may be garbled in SSC's mind with a report I got from a former SA that Ruby has been used by Will Hay Griffin (deceased), informant who had been disciplined in New Orleans before assignment to Dallas. (Griffin's hip-pocket

In general, the time, effort and emphasis wasted on the irresponsible theorizing of so many critics by the committee is apparent in this report of its questioning. That time and effort might well have been devoted to responsible leads, not idle and unsupported theories based on distortions and exaggerations.

On page 13 Barrett reports being sent to KRLD-TV to get any relevant pictures. He does not report being asked if he got any and does not volunteer.

The SSC had been told by SAs that they were told "that the investigation was to establish that Oswald acted alone."

(3) Why didn't Dallas conduct additional investigation concerning OSWALD after he returned from the USSR? Why did the only investigation conducted at that time consist of interviewing OSWALD, interviews with Government officials, three of his relatives and two Communist Party informants?

(4) During the course of investigation by SA's JOHN W. FAIN and B. TOM CARTER, why did Dallas not ask OSWALD why he was contacted by MVD? Report indicates he was asked whether or not he had espionage assignment and he said "No". He was asked whether or not he had furnished Russia information and he said "No". He said he had been contacted by the MVD but he never said why. Why was it Dallas never questioned him as to whether he furnished a signed statement with the Department of State, indicating that he reaffirmed his allegiance to the USSR?

(3) SA Fain (re)

(4) SA Carter

SA Arnold J. Brown

(3) This phase of the investigation was handled solely former SA JOHN W. FAIN.

(4) This phase of the investigation was handled solely former SA JOHN W. FAIN.

SECRET

Attachment B

The Federal Bureau Of Investigation

I. Early Bureau Response To The President's Assassination

A. November 22-25, 1963

1. Early teletypes; instructions to field; Hoover, Sullivan, Belmont memos; 80 agents to Dallas

2. Jenkins memo of Nov 24: Hoover says Oswald alone did it, Bureau must "convince the public Oswald is the real assassin."

3. Hoover memo on Nov 26: "wrap up investigation; seems to me we have the basic facts now" 62-109060-1490

4. Hoover memo on Nov 29: "hope to have investigation wrapped up by next week"

B. Lee Harvey Oswald

1. Establishing chain of evidence, bullet to gun, etc.

[redacted] Refer

3. Hosty note destruction: handling by Bureau on Nov 24 and effect in subsequent days

4. Interviews of Oswald associates, Marina wiretap MC MARINES, ETC.

REFERRAL DOCUMENT
FOI/PA # 24,326
APPEAL #
CIVIL ACT. #
E.O. # 12356
DATE 2/5/84

(S-1 [redacted]
(S-2 [redacted] Referred

C. Jack Ruby

1. Basic facts, early memos

2. Hoover suspicion of basement entry and assistance

3. extensive teletypes and reports on organized crime connections, also Hoover's own memos

4. contacts in 1959 as P.C.I - for use as informer on criminal element in Dallas

SECRET

Doc #1

24,326 Multiple Sources
Classified by SCSFIJ/GCL
Classify on: OADR 2/5/84

SECRET

2. Structure and Methods of the Bureau Investigation

A. Basic Organization and Jurisdiction

1. Legal basis of FBI involvement in probe, statutes,
2. Hoover and Belmont memos
3. Organization chart

B. General Investigative Division G.I.D.

1. Rosen testimony on "ancillary nature" of probe; lack of meetings; assignment to bank robbery desk
2. Supervisors Senate testimony on physical evidence chain
3. Sullivan on lack of communication with Domestic Intelligence - the Division running the probe of LHO
LACK OF COORDINATION BETWEEN DIV 5+6.
4. Rosen characterization of FBI "standing with pockets open waiting for evidence to drop in"
5. Supervisors testimony on LHO not being included in G.I.D. probe other than in relation to physical evidence
6. Rosen didn't know of "Gale Report" which found deficiencies in Bureau coverage of Oswald
DID NOT INITIAL IT.

C. Domestic Intelligence Division D.I.D. DIV. 5

1. LHO background established, prior coverage
2. Sullivan testimony on chaotic process, lack of input
3. Soviet experts handled Oswald investigation
4. Secret disciplining of DID officials who handled pre-assassination investigation of Oswald
5. Incident of Sullivan's people copying GID files
6. Hosty note destruction: Sullivan lack of knowledge
7. Assignment of Ruby probe to Civil Rights Division - outside of DID jurisdiction, thus not a part of general Oswald investigation.

SECRET

SECRET

B. Investigation of Potential Cuban Aspects

1. Cancellation of orders to contact Cuban sources on Nov 23

Referred [redacted] (S-1)(S)

3. Deletion of [redacted] (S-2)(S) from memo provided to Commission

4. Cuban experts and supervisors excluded from investigation b1

5. Church Committee findings on narrow Cuban focus

6. [redacted] (S-1)(S)

E. Investigation of Potential Organized Crime Aspects

1. Hoover memos and teletypes on Ruby connections

2. Ruby phone records

3. Justice Dept. interest in probing O.C. aspects

4. Chicago interviews with Ruby associates

5. Evans and Staffeld (and Denahy and Stanley) statements on not being consulted

6. Use of Ruby as informant on Dallas criminal element

7. LCN sources available at time

3. Bureau Relationship With Warren Commission

A. Formation of Warren Commission

1. Hoover opposition: memo and Jenkins memo

2. Rattenbach testimony and Sullivan statement

3. Early memos - adversary relationship

4. Hoover blocking Warren's choice for general counsel

5. Preparation of dossiers on staff and members.

SECRET

SECRET

B. Assistance To Warren Commission

1. Basic scope of official relationship

2. Early friction over informant allegation (LHO)

3. Withholding of Hosty name from Oswald notebook

4. Hoover instructions to agents not to volunteer info. to WC

5. Destruction of Hosty note: implications

6. Withholding of secret "Gale Report" on Bureau mistakes in earlier Oswald probe; disciplining of officials

7. Hoover instructions ordering that no Bureau official attend earliest WC session, despite Katzenbach request

8. Delay in sending information to Commission regarding Bureau's past nine contacts with Ruby

9. Apparent withholding of "oswald imposter" memos of 1960-1961

Referred [redacted]

11. Handling of Ruby polygraph

C. Related Bureau Actions and Activities

SEPT. 24, 64

1. Preparation of dossiers on WC staff after the Report was out

2. Hoover's leaking of early FBI report (Sullivan statement)

3. Hoover views on Communism and Oswald (Kronheim letter)

4. Sullivan relationship with Angleton: pre-arranging of answers to Commission questions.

5. Secret plan to distribute Oswald-Marxist posters in Bureau plan to discredit Communist Party; prejudicial aspects

6. Hoover reaction to Warren Report

7. Subsequent preparation of sex dossiers on critics of probe

8. Questions regarding FBI's continual pledge that "case will remain open for all time;" actual designation of it as "closed" in internal Bureau files.

SECRET

62-109090 SEC 27 7-20-66 FROM
SAC, NEW YORK TO DIRECTOR. ALSO:
62-109060-4151
HAROLD WEISBERG - AUTHOR OF BOOK
"WHITEWASH".
CRITICISM OF F.B.I. - WARREN COMM. REPORT.

62-109090-493 SAC, DALLAS TO DIRECTOR
8-16-66 SECTION 28
SYLVIA MARR - INDEX ON THE TESTIMONY
AND EXHIBITS CONTAINED IN THE PRESIDENTS
COMM. ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRES. J.F.K.

62-109090-539 SEC 29 11/25/66
WICK TO DeLOACH.
REPORT EXPLAINING DISCREPANCIES IN
J.F.K. AUTOPSY REPORT.

Dept Copy

Attachment C

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
MAY 1962 EDITION
GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

Assoc. Dir.
Asst. Dir.
Admin.
Comp. Syst.
Ext. Affairs
Files & Com.
Gen. Inv.
Ident.
Inspection
Intell.
Laboratory
Plan. & Eval.
Spec. Inv.
Training
Legal Coun.
Telephone Rm.
Director Sec'y

TO : Director, FBI (PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL) DATE: 10/24/73

FROM : SA JAMES P. HOSTY, JR.
KANSAS CITY OFFICE

SUBJECT: PERSONNEL MATTER

In compliance with your instructions following our conversation in Kansas City on 10/19/73, I am setting forth the basic facts that we discussed. I am convinced that the administrative action taken against me in December, 1963, and again in October, 1964, was unjustified for the following reasons:

(1) The letter of censure in December, 1963, and the suspension in October, 1964, were based upon answers to questions telephonically furnished by former Assistant Director James Gale on 12/5/63. I answered these questions by memo to the SAC in Dallas dated 12/6/63.

About four years ago I had an opportunity to review my field personnel file in the Kansas City Office and noted that Serial 157 of the Dallas section of this file contains answers dated 12/8/63, which are not the same answers I submitted on 12/6/63. Most particularly I object to the answers to Questions 5 and 6 that appear in my personnel file. I am enclosing a copy of my memo to the SAC, Dallas, dated 12/6/63, which you will note is different from the one appearing in my personnel file.

REC 15 62-494012-191

I am aware, however, that former Supervisor Kenneth Howe did make alterations to my answers without my advice or consent, but with my knowledge. I am enclosing a copy of my memo to the SAC, Dallas, dated 12/6/63, with his corrections, and a copy of a routing slip from Howe to me furnishing me with the corrections. However, the answers appearing in my personnel file are not these answers either. It appears my answers were changed a second time, probably on 12/8/63, without my knowledge. The most obvious change is the false answer to Questions 5 and 6, in which I am falsely quoted as saying, "Perhaps I should have notified the Bureau earlier." This constitutes an admission of guilt, which I did not make at any time.

JPH:mfd (enc. 4)

ENCLOSURE

MOVED BY [illegible] NOV 27 1973

3/7w

Doc #34

As to the motive for the above and the persons responsible, I believe the third paragraph of [redacted] letter dated [redacted] pretty well pinpoints the responsibility. I am enclosing a copy of this letter. b6

(2) The letter of censure and suspension dated October, 1964, constitutes double jeopardy based upon the letter of censure dated December, 1963. The only thing added to the letter of October, 1964, was the statement that I made inappropriate remarks before a Hearing Board. Yet former Director Hoover personally advised me on 5/6/64, and SAC Gordon Shanklin of the Dallas Office in June, 1964, that my testimony before the Warren Commission was excellent. The Bureau had a summary of my testimony on 5/6/64, and the full test of my testimony one week later, five months before my letter of censure in October, 1964, and no mention was made at any time concerning my inappropriate remarks until October, 1964. Mr. Hoover also assured me on 5/6/64, that the Warren Commission would completely clear the FBI. The unexpected failure of the Warren Commission to do this, I believe, was the principal reason for my second letter of censure and suspension in October, 1964.

(3) The matters covered in both letters of censure had no bearing whatsoever on the outcome of the case; namely, the prevention of the assassination of President Kennedy.

In accordance with your specific request on 10/19/73, the following should be noted regarding the failure to place Lee Harvey Oswald on the Security Index:

Oswald was not on the Security Index because he did not fit the criteria in existence as of 11/22/63. The criteria was later changed to include Oswald. It should be noted, however, even if he had been on the Security Index, no specific action would have been taken regarding him or any other Security Index subject at the time of President Kennedy's visit to Dallas.

The FBI as of 11/22/63, had only one responsibility regarding presidential protection, at the insistence of the U. S. Secret

Service. The responsibility was to furnish the Secret Service any information on persons making direct threats against the President, in possible violation of Title 18, USC, Section 871. I personally participated in two such referrals immediately prior to 11/22/63.

In conclusion, [redacted] in his letter dated [redacted] sums up my attitude in this matter that because of the action taken by the Bureau in October, 1964, the Bureau in effect told the world I was the person responsible for President Kennedy's death. b6

On 10/19/73, you asked me what I think should be done. I believe that it first must be determined if I was derelict in my duty in any manner, and was responsible for President Kennedy's death. After that it should be determined what damages I suffered, and then we can discuss the third point - what action should be taken.

I can state with a perfectly clear conscience that I in no way failed to do what was required of me prior to 11/22/63, and based upon information available to me, which was not all the information available to the U. S. Government on 11/22/63. I had absolutely no reason to believe that Oswald was a potential assassin or dangerous in any way.

I have no desire to blame anyone else or to seek an alternate scapegoat. I am firmly convinced, despite the totally unjustified conclusion of the Warren Commission, that the FBI was not in any way at fault.

In accordance with your instructions, I will not discuss the contents of this letter with anyone. In the event you want further clarification on any point, I will gladly furnish additional information to you.

Attachment D

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : MR. HELD

DATE: 8/17/76

FROM : H. N. BASSETT

SUBJECT: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

PURPOSE: [redacted] b6

On 10/21/75 Mr. Adams testified before a Congressional Committee relative to Lee Harvey Oswald's visit to the Dallas Office prior to the assassination of President Kennedy, his leaving of a note and its subsequent destruction. A question was raised at that time and subsequently by the press as to what disciplinary action the Bureau planned on taking. The Bureau's official stance was that since the matter was still pending before Congressional Committees, no action would be taken until conclusion of their inquiries. This matter has been followed since that time. Mr. Mintz has advised that since the Congressional inquiries are now concluded, he sees no reason to delay further administrative action. The purpose of this memorandum, therefore, is to analyze this situation and to submit appropriate recommendations.

SYNOPSIS: b6 [redacted]

7 SEP 10 1976

During Mr. Adams' testimony when the ~~issue of possible disciplinary~~ action was raised, he pointed out that this was a grave responsibility and a grave matter to consider since we must recognize the possibility that in the passage of time recollections may be hazy. Further, consideration had to be given to possibly disciplining some who have been as candid as they can within the bounds of their recollections and yet not disciplining others who are not being truthful.

As a result of the inquiry, it was positively established that there were four principals involved, namely, Nannie Lee Fenner, ~~SA Kenneth C.~~ Howe, SA James P. Hosty, Jr., and retired SAC Gordon Shanklin. Since the inquiry Fenner and Howe have retired.

23 SEP 9 1976

Excluding Hosty, there are 16 current employees who, during the inquiry, admitted to varying degrees some knowledge of Oswald's visit, the note and the destruction. Some of the information they furnished was

1 - Messrs. Adams, Jenkins, Mintz, Walsh
HNB:jmb
(6) 7 SEP 21 1976

Letter of Censure SVC CJW 9/7/76

CONTINUED - OVER

(84)

FBI/DOJ

at variance with information furnished by others, but there was no way to establish whether they were being untruthful or the passage of time had simply made it impossible to recall the events. The main fact, however, was that none of these individuals played any role in the handling or destruction of the note. Moreover, without exception, when asked why they had not brought the matter to the attention of their superiors, they advised that they assumed a matter of such gravity would have been brought to the attention of the SAC.

There are eight current employees who disclaim any knowledge of the matter whatsoever. There is no reason to question the veracity of these denials yet the inquiry certainly established a large number of individuals had some knowledge but were not directly connected with the incident. Furthermore, not everyone assigned to Dallas at the time of the assassination was interviewed simply because there was no logical reason to do so. It is possible that they too may have known of the situation and would truthfully inform us of it, thus raising the question: Is it fair to take action against those who were candid with us when there are others where no action would be taken simply because there was no reason to interview? [redacted] b6

It is possible that we will never know what really happened. We know that the Congressional Committees did not establish anything that our inquiry did not. If Hosty is telling the truth and he destroyed the note on the instructions of the SAC, this must be taken into consideration even though former SAC Shanklin denies any knowledge of the matter whatsoever. Also, it must be considered that Hosty has already paid a heavy price. He was in effect placed in position of double jeopardy when censured and placed on probation in 1963 and, with no really new information developed, later was censured, placed on probation, suspended for 30 days, and transferred. He was denied a within-grade increase because of this latter action for almost a nine-month period [redacted] b6

CONTINUED - OVER

Memorandum to Mr. Held
Re: Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That no action be taken against those employees listed in the details of this memorandum who admit some knowledge of the matter but are not directly related to the incident.

[redacted]

66

APPROVED:
Asst. Dir.:
Adm. Asst. to Dir.:
Asst. Dir.:
Adm. Serv.
Inspection
Intell.
Laboratory
Legal Coun.
Plan. & Eval.
Rec. Mgmt.
Spec. Inv.
Training

SEE DETAILS NEXT PAGE.

Memorandum to Mr. Held
Re: Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

DETAILS:

On 10/21/75 Mr. Adams testified before the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary. On that occasion Mr. Adams discussed in detail the inquiry conducted by the Bureau relative to Lee Harvey Oswald's visit to the Dallas Office prior to the assassination of President Kennedy and the note left by Oswald and its subsequent destruction. During that testimony the issue of possible disciplinary action was raised and Mr. Adams, in essence, pointed out that this was a grave responsibility and a grave matter to consider since we must recognize the possibility that in view of the passage of time, recollections may be hazy. Further, consideration had to be given to possibly disciplining some who have been as candid as they can within the bounds of their recollection and yet not disciplining others who are not being truthful.

Shortly after Mr. Adams' testimony press inquiries were received as to what action the Bureau planned on taking, and the official Bureau stance was that since the matter was still pending before Congressional Committees, no action would be taken at that time.

This matter has been followed on a 30-day basis with Mr. Mintz. On 8/13/76 Mr. Mintz advised that he had been informed by [redacted] that testimony taken by the Edwards Committee has not yet been printed and it is unlikely that the hearings will be printed. Further, Congressman Edwards has no plan at this time to issue a report stating any conclusion regarding this matter. His intention was to await the outcome of the Church Committee inquiry to determine whether the Church Committee developed any facts at variance with the testimony offered before the Edwards Committee. According to [redacted] apparently no inconsistent facts were developed by the Church Committee. Mr. Mintz also advised that it was recommended by the Church Committee that the Inouye Committee continue the inquiry regarding President Kennedy's assassination, but the Inouye Committee has not acted to authorize a continuation of that inquiry as yet. William Miller, Staff Director of the Inouye Committee, advised [redacted] on 8/12/76 that the Inouye Committee will adopt the recommendation to continue the inquiry; however, it is not believed that their inquiry would be directed at the Oswald visit, the note and destruction of same. Mr. Mintz advised, therefore, that the Congressional inquiries are now concluded and sees no reason to delay further administrative action in this matter.

As Appears in admin Folder.

CONTINUED - OVER

Memorandum to Mr. Held
Re: Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

As may be recalled, the Bureau was able to determine that there were four principals involved in the matter at hand, namely, Nannie Lee Fenner, SA Kenneth C. Howe, SA James P. Hosty, Jr., and SAC Gordon Shanklin. At the time of our inquiry Shanklin was the only one of the four in a retired status. Since that time, however, Fenner retired 3/12/76 and Howe retired 6/18/76.

Briefly, the facts developed were that Oswald did indeed visit our Dallas Office sometime prior to the assassination of President Kennedy. He delivered a note to Mrs. Fenner. She claimed the note was threatening in nature and said something to the effect, "Let this be a warning. I'll blow up the FBI and the Dallas Police Department if you don't stop bothering my wife." The note was addressed to SA Hosty. She claimed she showed the note to the then ASAC Kyle Clark (now retired) who instructed her to give it to Hosty. Howe, then the supervisor of Hosty, could not remember the contents of the note but seemed to recall it contained some type of threat. Howe seemed to recall that he found the note in Hosty's workbox probably about the day of the assassination and brought the note to SAC Shanklin. Hosty admits the existence of the note, claims it was not threatening in nature, and that he destroyed the note upon the instructions of SAC Shanklin. Shanklin disclaimed any knowledge whatsoever of the matter.

In conducting our inquiry we learned that several people were aware to some degree that Oswald had visited the office and left a note for Hosty. In talking to these people, without exception, when asked why they had not brought the matter to the attention of their superiors, they advised they simply assumed that a matter of such gravity would have been reported to the SAC. They advised generally that they acquired the information through conversations with other people well after the incident had occurred. Some of these people furnished information at variance with that furnished by others, leading one to raise the question as to whether they were being untruthful or whether the passage of time had simply made it impossible to recall the events. The main fact, however, with regard to all of these individuals is that none of them played any part whatsoever in the handling of the note as outlined previously. Those people who are still employed who had some knowledge of this matter in varying degrees are as follows:

[redacted]

As Appears in admin Folder.

CONTINUED - OVER

Memorandum to Mr. Held
Re: Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

[redacted]

As Appears in admin. Folder

On the other hand, there were people in the Dallas Office who disclaimed any knowledge whatsoever of the matter, they being [redacted] While we have no information at all questioning the veracity of the denials of these individuals, the inquiry covering interviews with both current and former employees certainly established a large number of them had some knowledge of the matter but were not directly connected with the incident. Therefore, to take action against those employees who admit some knowledge but were not directly connected with the incident and at the same time take no action against those denying knowledge could be an injustice to all concerned.

Another thing to take into consideration is the fact that everyone who was assigned to Dallas at the time of the assassination was not interviewed. Many of them are current employees assigned to various offices. They were not interviewed simply because there was no logical reason to do so. It is possible that they too may have known of the matter and would truthfully inform us of it, but here again we are placed in the same position as we are now with regard to those people we did interview. All things considered, it is not felt that any action should be taken against the aforenamed individuals who are currently on our rolls [redacted] b6

With regard to Hosty, he claims he was instructed by the SAC to destroy the note. We probably will never know the facts as to whether this actually occurred. It is our understanding that the Congressional Committees never learned of anything other than what we developed in our inquiry. If Hosty indeed destroyed the note on the instructions of the SAC, he was following the instructions of his superior and this must be taken into

CONTINUED - OVER

consideration. Also taken into consideration is the fact that Hosty suffered considerably many years ago. In fact, Hosty in effect was placed in double jeopardy. On 12/13/63 he was censured and placed on probation for inadequate investigation. With really no new information developed concerning Hosty, later he was censured, placed on probation, suspended for 30 days, and transferred to Kansas City. This action occurred in October, 1964. He was eligible for within-grade increase beginning 9/27/64 but was not given same and, in fact, was finally granted a within-grade increase 6/20/65. As can be seen, Hosty has already paid a heavy penalty.

[redacted]

b6

[redacted]

Attachment
E

Oswald +

1 - Mr. J. B. Adams
1 - Mr. H. N. Bassett
2 - Mr. J. A. Mintz
(1 - Mr. J. B. Hotis)

December 31, 1975

1 - Mr. W. R. Wannall
1 - Mr. W. O. Cregar
1 - Mr. F. Woodworth
1 - Mr. J. P. Thomas
1 - Mr. T. J. McNiff

The Attorney General

Director, FBI

U. S. SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES (SSC)

Reference is made to SSC letter dated December 11, 1975, requesting access to various materials contained in Bureau files relating to this Bureau's investigation of Lee Harvey Oswald and/or the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Enclosed for your approval and forwarding to the SSC is the original of a memorandum which constitutes a partial response to the requests contained in referenced SSC letter.

A copy of the above memorandum is being furnished for your records.

Enclosures (2)

62-116395

1 - The Deputy Attorney General
Attention: Michael E. Shaheen, Jr.
Special Counsel for
Intelligence Coordination

TJM:adn/lhb
(13)

Doc #66 66

1 - Mr. J. B. Adams
1 - Mr. H. N. Bassett
2 - Mr. J. A. Mintz
(1 - Mr. J. B. Hotis)
1 - Mr. W. R. Wannall
1 - Mr. W. O. Cregar

62-116395

December 31, 1975

1 - Mr. F. Woodworth
1 - Mr. J. P. Thomas
1 - Mr. T. J. McNiff

U. S. SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE TO
STUDY GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS WITH
RESPECT TO INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES (SSC)

Reference is made to SSC letter dated December 11, 1975, requesting access to various materials contained in Bureau files relating to this Bureau's investigation of Lee Harvey Oswald and/or the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Set forth below is this Bureau's response to indicated items mentioned in referenced letter. Responses to the remaining items are being prepared and you will be advised when such preparations have been completed.

Item 1 references the July 6, 1964, memorandum from C. R. Davidson to Mr. Callahan, which was provided by this Bureau in response to SSC inquiry dated November 18, 1975, and requests materials pertaining to the December 13, 1963, censuring and probation of Special Agent (SA) James P. Hosty, Jr. No memorandum dated July 6, 1964, could be located as having been furnished the SSC as stipulated above. It is believed the above request refers to the April 6, 1964, memorandum from C. R. Davidson which was made available to the SSC in response to the latter's request of November 18, 1975. Materials responsive to all sections of Item 1 are available at FBI Headquarters for review by appropriate SSC personnel. This material, for reasons of privacy, has been excised to delete names of individuals, other than SA Hosty, against whom administrative action was taken.

Item 2 requests materials similar to that requested in Item 1, as such materials pertain to the censuring of SA Hosty on or about September 25, 1964.

TJM:lhb
(12) ORIGINAL AND ONE COPY TO AG

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES (SSC)

Materials responsive to Item 2, excised for reasons stated above, are available at FBI Headquarters for review by appropriate SSC personnel.

Item 15 requests all materials pertaining to the meeting subsequent to November 24, 1963, and prior to the submission of the Bureau's initial report to the White House, which meeting is more fully referenced in the September 23, 1975, affidavit of former SA Henry A. Schutz, in response to Item 5 of the SSC's request dated October 31, 1975. The Inspection Division of this Bureau made no further inquiry concerning information in former SA Schutz's affidavit other than it should be noted all Bureau officials and supervisory personnel were interviewed by the Inspection Division concerning Oswald's visit to the Dallas Office prior to the assassination and his leaving of a note for SA Hosty. No additional information was developed concerning the meeting at the office of former Bureau official Mr. Alan Belmont, and, in fact, the only Bureau official who claimed to have any knowledge of such a visit and note was W. C. Sullivan. The SSC has previously been furnished the results of all interviews conducted of Bureau officials and supervisory Agents concerning this matter.

Item 16 requests all materials, reports, analysis or inquiries conducted as a result of the statement by SA Joe A. Pearce that "Oswald was an informant or source of SA Hosty and it was not uncommon for sources to occasionally come to the office for the purpose of delivering some note to the contacting Agent." The above quoted statement is contained in an affidavit furnished by SA Pearce to the Inspection Division during the latter's inquiry concerning the Oswald visit to the Dallas Office and his leaving a note for SA Hosty. However, in reporting the results of this interview to the Attorney General earlier this year, attention was directed to the fact that this allegation concerning Oswald's being a source or informant of SA Hosty was looked into by the President's Commission, and there was no substance whatsoever to this particular claim.

1 - The Attorney General

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
Birmingham, Alabama
December 24, 1975

In Reply, Please Refer to File No.

+ Attachment
F

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
INTERVIEW OF SPECIAL AGENT
ROBERT M. BARRETT,
DECEMBER 17, 1975

I, Special Agent Robert M. Barrett, was interviewed by Committee Staff member Paul Wallach, in Room 608, Carroll Arms, Washington, D.C. The interview began at 2:02 PM and was recorded by Mr. Alfred H. Ward.

At the outset, Mr. Wallach advised that the Committee was attempting to determine whether or not there was any basis for reopening of the case of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. He further stated the Committee was reviewing the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) before and after the assassination.

Mr. Wallach asked when I arrived in Washington, D.C., and how I received notice to come to Washington, D. C., for this interview. He was told I arrived about 5:45 PM on December 16, 1975, and that on Friday, December 12, 1975, I had received notice of a teletype from FBI Headquarters to my office in Birmingham, Alabama, instructing me to report to Washington, D.C., on December 17, 1975, for this interview.

Mr. Wallach asked if I had conferred with any Bureau officials prior to this interview. I informed him that I had met with Inspector John Hotis of the Legal Counsel Division. Mr. Wallach asked for the contents of this discussion and I advised him that I had asked Mr. Hotis if he knew the reason why I was being interviewed by the Committee, and that Mr. Hotis had stated he did not know the reason or purpose other than it concerned my role in the assassination investigation.

[redacted]

81

I told Mr. Wallach that Mr. Hotis had further informed me that I should decline to answer any questions as to sensitive sources, sensitive techniques, on-going investigations, and any information received from a third agency.

Mr. Wallach asked if I had talked to Mr. Paul Daly, and he was informed Mr. Daly was in and out of the office frequently and that I had had very little conversation with him. Mr. Wallach asked how long I had talked with Mr. Hotis, and I told him the above conversation was very brief, that I was originally informed the interview was to take place at 10:00 AM, that this was subsequently changed to 2:00 PM and that I had spent the time in Mr. Hotis' office waiting and occasionally discussing other unrelated matters.

I also told Mr. Wallach that I had been interviewed earlier on December 17, 1975, by Assistant Director Harold N. Bassett, and Deputy Assistant Director J. Allison Conley. Mr. Wallach asked what this interview was about, and I told him I was questioned as to any knowledge I had of Lee Harvey Oswald coming to the FBI Office in Dallas prior to the assassination and leaving a note for Special Agent James Hosty. I told Mr. Wallach what I had previously told Mr. Bassett, that some four or five months after the assassination I was asked by someone in the Dallas Office, whose identity I can't recall, (because what this unrecalled person asked me was a rumor and insignificant) if I had heard the rumor that Oswald had come to the Dallas Office where he asked Nan Fenner, the Receptionist, to see Hosty. I recall there being no mention of any note left by Oswald, nor did Hosty, or anyone else in Dallas ever talk to me about the incident, the note or the contents of the note. Mr. Wallach asked if I had reported to anyone in Dallas at the time the above incident and Mr. Wallach was advised I did not report a rumor and that I treated it as a rumor, in that I promptly forgot about it as I was very busy at the time conducting investigations of other matters having to do with the assassination.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
INTERVIEW OF SPECIAL AGENT
ROBERT M. BARRETT,
DECEMBER 17, 1975

Mr. Wallach asked if Mr. Hotis had informed me of my right to counsel and I stated this had been done. Mr. Wallach then advised me of my right to counsel and my right to refuse to answer any questions. I advised Mr. Wallach I was aware of my rights.

Mr. Wallach advised me that recorded results of this interview would later be available to me, in Washington, D.C. I asked if I would be furnished a copy and if a copy would be furnished the Bureau. I was informed that the Bureau would not be furnished a copy nor would anyone, other than myself, from the Bureau, have access to this report. I was also told that I would be advised by mail when I could have access to the report. Mr. Wallach did not say if I would be furnished a copy. He also said I could request the presence of a Senator during the interview, which request I did not make.

Mr. Wallach then asked about my Bureau career and assignments prior to November 22, 1963. He was advised of my assignments in Phoenix from 1952 to 1954, in Amarillo, Texas, from 1954 to 1956, and in Dallas from 1956 to 1966. Mr. Wallach inquired as to what kind of investigative work I was doing as of November 21, 1963, and I told him that primarily I was assigned to investigations having to do with organized crime, gambling, and criminal intelligence, and occasionally some involved civil rights cases, and some extortion cases. Mr. Wallach asked how long I had been doing such work and who else in the Dallas Office was either working with me or doing similar work. I told him I had been working these type cases since November, 1957, and that I was assisted by SA Ivan D. Lee from about 1960, or so, until the assassination, at which time Lee and I were both assigned to the assassination investigation, primarily, for about a year.

Mr. Wallach then asked me to define a "hip pocket informant" and after I gave him my definition, he asked if I had any in Dallas. I defined a "hip pocket informant" as a source of information whose identity was never made known nor was there ever any record made that such a person was being used as an informant. I told Mr. Wallach I have never employed "hip pocket informants" in Dallas or elsewhere.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
INTERVIEW OF SPECIAL AGENT
ROBERT M. BARNETT,
DECEMBER 17, 1975

Mr. Wallach asked if I knew of, or had heard of "Carlos" Trafficante of Tampa, and Carlos Marcello of New Orleans, Louisiana. I said that in investigations of organized crime matters, I had become acquainted with these names, but I believed the correct name was Santos Trafficante, to which Mr. Wallach agreed. Mr. Wallach asked if I knew of a man named McWillie (Phonetic) and I said I could not recall ever having heard of this name.

Mr. Wallach asked if I knew of Jack Ruby. I said I had known Ruby as the owner or operator of two Dallas night clubs, that were frequented by pimps, prostitutes and persons involved in criminal activities. I was asked if I had ever talked to Ruby and I said I had on maybe two occasions prior to November 21, 1963, but I could not recall the contents of these conversations, other than it most likely had to do with persons who frequented Ruby's night clubs.

Mr. Wallach asked if I was aware of a connection of Ruby with Trafficante, with Marcello, and with McWillie (Phonetic). I said I was not aware of any connection by Ruby with any of these persons and repeated that I did not recall the name McWillie.

Mr. Wallach asked if I was acquainted with the term "PCI" - "potential criminal informant", if I knew Jack Ruby was a PCI of the Dallas Office, and if I knew the identity of the FBI Agent in Dallas, a "red headed fellow" who had had Ruby assigned to him, and which Agent was later disciplined or transferred. I had just begun to answer Mr. Wallach, when U. S. Senator Richard D. Schweicker, of Pennsylvania, entered the room at 2:33 PM and thereafter took part jointly in the interrogation of me with Mr. Wallach, after introducing himself. Mr. Wallach briefly reviewed with Senator Schweicker what had previously transpired in the interview. Senator Schweicker asked if I knew Ruby was a PCI and if I was not aware of Ruby's connections with organized crime.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
INTERVIEW OF SPECIAL AGENT
ROBERT E. BARRETT
DECEMBER 17, 1975

I stated that my investigation of organized crime and criminal intelligence matters in Dallas were primarily concerned with the activities of Joseph Francis Civello and his associates and the activities of a roving band of criminals, not connected with Civello, who used Dallas as a base for their activities. I stated that in these investigations neither I nor SA Lee had become aware of any involvement by Ruby in organized crime matters or any association with the persons who were the subjects of our investigations.

At this point, 2:37 PM, Senator Schweicker asked Mr. Wallach if I had been sworn, and when told that I had not, Senator Schweicker placed me under oath, making reference to all the answers I had given prior to being sworn, as well as those I would give after being sworn.

I pointed out that if Ruby had been involved in organized crime matters, such as association with Trafficante or Marcello, and this had become known to the FBI, I was sure I, as an Agent assigned to organized crime investigations in Dallas where Ruby resided, would have been so advised and that this was not the case.

In answer to the questions about Ruby being a PCI, I stated I had heard something after November 24, 1963, that an Agent in Dallas had at one time opened a PCI case on Ruby, but I did not know any details such as when this occurred, the name of the Agent, and I was not aware that this Agent, whoever he was, had been disciplined because of any dealings with Ruby or for having Ruby as a PCI.

Senator Schweicker then asked if when a person is designated a PCI, the Agent makes such a recommendation to his superior and that Ruby had been made a PCI because of his connections with organized crime. I explained that a person can be designated a PCI by the Agent because of his association with the criminal element, his residence, his employment, or for any of a number of reasons, and that this person may never furnish any pertinent or useful information or be of any value. Senator Schweicker then asked if PCIs were not paid and I said they were only paid when they furnished pertinent or good useful information only on a C.O.D. basis. I was asked if Ruby had ever been paid and I said I had no knowledge of any such payment.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
INTERVIEW OF SPECIAL AGENT
ROBERT M. BARRETT
DECEMBER 17, 1975

I was asked if I had any opportunity to see Oswald in the police department at that time or any other subsequent time and I stated to the best of my knowledge Oswald had been taken to the office of Captain "Will" Fritz, that I never did go to Captain Fritz's office at any time on November 22, 23, or 24, 1963, and that I had never personally observed Oswald subsequent to his arrest in the theater in Oak Cliff.

At this point in the interrogation, Mr. Wallach asked me if I knew that disciplinary action by the Bureau had been taken against SA (James) Hosty. I advised them that I was aware of this through my association with Hosty in Dallas. I was then asked if I knew that some Assistant Directors of the FBI had been disciplined because of their handling of certain matters in the assassination investigation. I stated I was not aware of this and had no knowledge of any such disciplinary action.

Mr. Wallach then asked me if I had attended a "going away" party held, not in the Dallas Office, for Hosty by his friends in Dallas. I stated I did not recall any such party and further felt that if there had been such a party I would have been invited and would have attended because Hosty and I were in the same car pool, we attended the same church, we belonged to the same clubs, and I had coached his son on the school football team, and further, that many of Hosty's friends were also my friends.

I was asked if I recalled a conference being held by SAC J. Gordon Shanklin on the early morning of November 23, 1963, in which Agents of the Dallas Office were given instructions on investigation to be conducted that day. I stated that I recalled reporting to work on Saturday, November 23, at about 6:00 AM after having worked to about 3:00 AM that same morning from the Friday before, and I did not recall any such conference held by Mr. Shanklin.

I was asked if there had not been a conference on the morning of November 24, 1963, in which Mr. Shanklin instructed the Dallas Agents not to go near the area at the city jail where Oswald was being removed that day and I

stated I did recall those instructions, and further, I had been instructed, along with SA Ivan D. Lee, to go to KRLD-TV Station to obtain any pertinent photographs that that station might have and further, that while there I had observed, on closed circuit television, the Oswald shooting in the basement of the police department. I was asked if I had any knowledge of a telephone call received by the FBI during the night of November 23-24, 1963, containing a threat against Oswald. I said that to the best of my knowledge, I did recall something to the effect that SA Hilton Newsom had been on duty during the early morning hours of November 24 at the Dallas FBI Office and had received such a call. I could not recall at this time who was the source of this information nor did I recall any details as to the contents of the call.

Mr. Wallach then asked if there had not been some occasions when Agents of the Dallas Office had been discussing the assassination and discussing whether or not it was their opinions that it was the act of one man acting alone or was a conspiracy. I stated I was sure that there had been such discussions on an informal basis but that I could not recall any details or anything as to when such discussions were held or who was present and, further, that I was sure that everyone connected with the investigation would have made some personal conclusions.

At this point, Mr. Wallach asked if it was not true that Mr. Shanklin or some other Bureau official had given explicit directions that the investigation was to establish that Oswald acted alone in connection with the assassination. Before I could answer this question, Mr. Wallach stated that such information had been received from other FBI Agents. I stated that this was not so, that I did not believe any other Agents had made such statements, and further, that we had, to the contrary, been given instructions to conduct our investigation in an effort to establish all the facts to identify all persons involved.

At this point, which was about 4:23 PM, Senator Schweicker left the room and did not take any further part in the interrogation.