

Released under the John  
F. Kennedy  
Assassination Records  
Collection Act of 1992  
(44 USC 2107 Note).  
Case#:NW 50953 Date:  
04-09-2018

# File #:

62-112-116395

---

# Serial Scope:

EBF 665

---

62-116395-665

ENCL. 7  
16

SFP:eks 9-9-75

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

U. S. SENATE SELECT  
COMMITTEE ON  
INTELLIGENCE

Re is made to the SSC August 20, 1975, request for FBI materials and specifically, to Part V, for which delivery was requested by September 9, 1975. Enclosed for ur approval and forwarding to the SSC is the orig of a memorandum in full response to Part V. Also enclosed for ur records is a copy of the memo prepared for the SSC.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2AUM/rw

SSC-REQUEST, August 20, 1975

Part V, 1

Retain:  
UNEXCISED

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2 PAM/ru

167-10498

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# Memorandum

TO : SAC, LOS ANGELES (100-19949)

DATE: 6/5/72

FROM : SA GILBERT G. BENJAMIN

SUBJECT: "CHANGED"  
BELLA STUMBO, aka  
Della Coover  
SM - ~~C (FRAGANALYSIS) (ADIV)~~  
OO: Los Angeles

*excused to protect FBI informant*

On 5/31/72 CSLA 6596-S advised DELLA COOVER is using the pseudonym Bella Stumbo; so this matter has been marked "changed".

CSLA indicated COOVER is using the Bella Stumbo alias in connection with her position as a staff writer for the "Los Angeles Times".

## ACTION

ADEX should be changed to include the new alias and subject's position as a staff writer for the Times. Also, since subject is writing under a still different pseudonym, for the Monterey Park Progress newspapers, it is suggested that consideration be given to advising the Internal Revenue Service that she may be receiving payroll checks under these pseudonyms and not reporting her total income correctly. Appropriate investigation should be conducted to verify subject's use of the additional pseudonym.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2ALM/ru

*excused to protect FBI informant*  
1 - 134-3171A (CSLA 6596-S)  
1 - 80-420 (LOS ANGELES TIMES)

100-19949-100

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 6 1972	
FBI - LOS ANGELES	

*Kinder*

GGB/scb  
(3)

11000 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
July 25, 1972

District Director  
Internal Revenue Service  
P. O. Box 391  
Los Angeles, California 90053

Dear Sir:

For your information the Los Angeles Office of the FBI is conducting an official investigation involving a Della Coover, born September 1, 1920, Social Security Account Number 557-16-3953.

It has come to the attention of the Los Angeles Office that Della Coover is a staff officer for the Los Angeles Times newspaper using pseudo name of Della Stumbo and that she may not be reporting her earnings from this employment.

Enclosed is a recent article written by Bella Stumbo.

This information is being brought to your attention for whatever action you deem necessary.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2A/MPW

Very truly yours,

*W. G. Grapp*  
WESLEY G. GRAPP  
Special Agent in Charge

Enclosure 1

- 2 - Addressee (RM)  
① - Los Angeles (100-19949) *POST*  
BPK/bab  
③

100-19949-1  
SEARCHED \_\_\_\_\_  
INDEXED \_\_\_\_\_  
SERIALIZED \_\_\_\_\_  
FILED \_\_\_\_\_

(Mount Clipping in Space Below)

3 FAMILIES VISITED

'They Said  
He Shot a  
Little Girl'

BY FELLA STUMBO

Times Staff Writer

Early in the evening of July 2, a 4-year-old girl named Joyce Ann Huff was shot to death as she played in a yard in Hawaiian Gardens. She was hit with 42 shotgun pellets fired from a passing car. Subsequently, three Chicago youths from the neighboring Norwalk barrio were arrested. Being held on suspicion of murder in the killing are Donald Antelo, 21, Oscar Hernandez, 22, and Michael Ramirez, 17.

Donald Antelo's mother Beatrice, 50, is a devout Catholic. She has a makeshift altar in her bedroom where she prays each night before going to bed. She had just finished her rosary the night police came looking for her son.

"There were four of them at the door. They rushed through the house, searching for Don. I said he wasn't home, but what did they want him for? And they said because he shot a little girl, that my boy killed a child."

Beatrice Antelo was sitting at her kitchen table, staring listlessly at a cold cup of coffee in front of her, her voice a weary whisper.

"They didn't have uniforms on, so I thought maybe they were some of Don's friends playing a bad joke. I told them to stop fooling around about something so awful."

Though it was nearly noon now, Beatrice Antelo still wore her houserobe and slippers. Her small kitchen was half lost in the stagnant gloom of drawn shades and closed windows.

"I said no, it was impossible. Not my son. He would never in his life do such a terrible thing."

Beatrice Antelo dropped her head into her hands. An elderly woman who lost a lung to tuberculosis years ago, she has now taken a three-week vacation from her job. She spends most of her days in bed, reliving the night she lost her son.

"They told me I better help them find Don. They said a bunch of police were searching all over the

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2A/MLW

(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)

IV-1 Los Angeles Times  
Los Angeles, Calif.

Date: 7/19/72  
Edition: Wednesday final  
Author:  
Editor:  
Title: Dell Coover

Character:  
or  
Classification: 100-19949  
Submitting Office: LOS ANGELES

Being Investigated

SEARCHED.....INDEXED.....  
SERIALIZED.....FILED.....  
JUL 24 1972  
FBI - LOS ANGELES  
Kuders

### A Family Reared on Welfare

Beatrice Antelo, a long-time divorcee, has two boys, 10 and 13, who were born in Don Antonio's home. They died during an outbreak of meningitis. "I wish the boys were old enough to be by without me at home," she says. She reared them on welfare. Then she went to work at a local food packing plant where she earns \$3.00 a month. Rent on her small, two-bedroom house, which is no better, no worse than most of the other dilapidated bungalows lining the main streets of Newark's half-square-mile Mexican American barrio, is \$75 a month.

"I wish some one would tell him," Mrs. Antelo couldn't stop. "So I went to Ph two of them. We drove everywhere I could think of looking for my boy."

But she had little success, she says, she tried to tell the city officials, who listened politely, that they had made some grotesque mistake.

She knew her son. He was a good boy. He loved children. He and his girlfriend wanted to have a big family when they got married—which would be as soon as Don found a job. It isn't easy to find a job when you don't have a car to look outside the barrio, she had explained.

Meanwhile, she pointed out, Don was a good student at Cerritos College. He studied hard, made good grades, "was determined to make something out of himself."

Beatrice Antelo absentmindedly stroked a tiny brown dog sleeping peacefully in her lap. He is her watchdog. When strangers approach the house, he pokes his head through a broken living room window pane and barks with comic ferocity.

Don had been in trouble before, of course, she continued, an edge of bitterness creeping into her voice as she told how he had been thrown out of Excelsior High School four years ago because "he had long hair before it was common." He had brushes with the police before, too, she said, without elaborating—but most barrio youths have similar experiences.

### 'Won't Care About Saving Him'

"You have to live here to know what it's like. Police everywhere, poverty you can't escape, no jobs..." Her voice trailed off in a resigned shrug. She makes less than \$3,000 annually, so she can't afford to hire a private attorney to defend her son, she said. And she's certain the court-appointed public defender "won't care about saving him."

A cough suddenly seized her. The doctor has warned her against interviews, she explained. She doesn't answer the telephone much anymore either because it often turns out to be somebody calling her the mother of a monster or threatening to bomb her house or, worse still, to harm her older son, 31, a father of two with a job outside Newark.

"I guess it makes people feel better to get the hate off their chests when something as horrible as this happens," she sighed. "I just hang up."

But her mind clearly wasn't on herself—it was still on that last night on the scene that had awaited her when she and the two officers returned home.

"They had already found Don and the Ramirez boy," she said. "They were heading out front, surrounded by police. They had no car on."

Beatrice Antelo turned her face away, toward the wall where a bare calendar of the Ascension hung. It was the gloom. The police had freed his hands as she went to talk to him, she said.

"He ran to me and put his arms around me and he said, 'Mama, I didn't do it, I didn't do it.'"

She reared, fighting back tears. "And he cried like a little child."

Then Beatrice Antelo, weary with an agony few mothers ever know, laid her head down on her table and sobbed in helpless, hopeless despair.

Helen Hernandez, 40, and her husband Antonio, 55, sat side by side on their couch in a sunless living room overflowing with glimmering sports trophies and photographs of their five sons, ages 23-13. They looked stunned, like two people who have tried, yet failed to comprehend fully what has happened to them this summer.

Which is probably understandable, for nothing in their experience has prepared them to deal with a murder charge against a member of their family—least of all against Oscar, their quietest, oldest son.

Helen and Antonio Hernandez are a soft-spoken, almost timid couple. They came to Norwalk from Phoenix 25 years ago. Since then, they have evidently lived according to a single, uncomplicated philosophy -- namely, people who work hard, worship God, discipline their children, and mind their own business will make out accordingly. Life might be meager, but it will advance smoothly and peaceably and, perhaps, for their children, it may even become progressively richer.

And, until July, the Hernandez formula had seemed a sound one.

Antonio, a big solid man dressed in neat polyester slacks and a crisp button-down shirt, is a grinder in a nearby steel foundry. He has saved his money and now almost owns his modest little pink house which by barrio standards is a comfortable one. He takes pride in it.

#### Bashful Woman

Helen, a stout, bashful woman with a fresh-scrubbed, friendly face, prone to twisting nervously at her wedding rings, has always been single-mindedly devoted to her duties as a wife and mother. Never has she even considered working outside her home, though the Hernandez family, like most in the barrio, has always needed more money than they have had.

Both devoted Jehovah's Witnesses, the couple have also enforced a rigid brand of religion in their household. Their sons have been taught, among other things, that violence is evil.

It is, therefore, with boundless pride that Helen and Antonio Hernandez report there are no high school dropouts in their family -- and no loafers, no hippies, no huns, no convicts. Only hard-working, sports-minded, clean-living, patriotic Americans. Especially the latter.

When Helen Hernandez's 19-year-old son was drafted, she beams, he went to serve his country without question. He was in the Army for a year until an automobile accident earned him both a medical discharge and a permanent speech impediment. Now he works in a Norwalk packing plant.

Likewise, when Oscar Hernandez was drafted he too went willingly, serving as a guard at Da Nang Air Force base in Vietnam until his discharge with two Bronze Stars last summer. He had been looking for a job ever since.

"He never really talked much about Vietnam. Except he was glad he didn't have to kill anybody," says Helen Hernandez, her voice shy, hesitant.

"Oscar never liked to box in high school either, because he didn't like to hit anybody. So he played baseball. And track."

She blushed, embarrassed; it seemed to defend her son's passive nature.

Indeed, it soon becomes amply apparent to a stranger in the Hernandez household that making excuses for Oscar—who is accused of driving the car that carried Joyce Ann Huff's killer—is considered somehow undignified, even unpatriotic, insofar as it might imply a fear that the American system of justice is incapable of discovering truth independently and dispassionately on its own.



And in addition to their spilling faith that Oscar will be done, the Hernandez couple have the added solace, unlike Beatrice Antelo, of having a private attorney, a family friend, who will represent their son in court.

#### 'To Easygoing'

"Oscar was so quiet, so easygoing. He stayed home most of the time," says Helen Hernandez proudly. "I watched television, he read a lot of books and sports magazines. And he always helped me around the house. Every morning we made the beds together and washed the dishes."

Abruptly, she vanished into a back room, returning outwardly with a bulging photograph album. It turned out to be what, in her heart, Helen Hernandez considers immutable proof of her son's innocence in this bizarre episode.

The book was filled with pictures Oscar had taken in Vietnam -- photos of children, Waifs, orphans, refugees who hung around with Oscar and Oscar's friends.

"He loved children," said Helen Hernandez, as Antonio nodded vigorous agreement. She looked suddenly grim, as if she had realized, maybe for the first time, how seriously important that point might eventually become.

"I haven't visited him yet," she said, self-consciously admitting she was "afraid to see that he's really locked up in jail." She would probably just cry, she said.

But, she added, she's gotten past her initial hysteria with a dose of tranquilizers--and by having her telephone number changed. Like Mrs. Antelo, she was getting hate calls at a daily rate.

"I've been trying to get some message to get Mrs. Antelo," she said nervously, fidgeting the album in her lap. "But, I guess I'm afraid. I just don't know what to say to her. Except that I know how she must be feeling. And I cry for her child, too, just as I cry for Oscar."

Normally, 12 people live in the four-room household of Miguel Ramirez, 33, a disabled construction worker. At present, however, there are only 10 because his wife Rose is visiting an ailing brother in Mexico and his son Michael, 17, is in jail.

On a recent hot weekday morning, eight family members were scattered about the tiny squalid living room, dank with the sour odors of diapers, cooking foods and too many bodies packed too close together without benefit of even a fan.

There was Ramirez himself, a raw, grizzled man who sat in his undershirt in a corner chair, somehow projecting rock-solid stability in an otherwise incredibly fluid human scene unfolding before him.

Three of his four daughters--all mothers, all un-

married, and two of them nine months pregnant again--sat sprawled on the sagged, filthy chairs and couches. All were rendered inordinately ill-tempered by the miserable heat, they said.

And four of Ramirez's grandchildren--two boys and two girls, aged 2 to 4--crawled, ran and scrambled in a shrieking, laughing fury through the house, chasing a single raved dog and, more often than not, taking advantage of one of their own, too--a pathetic 4-year-old boy, the red-eyed victim of chicken pox.

#### Senior Daughter

On a couch, half covered by a sheet, Yolanda Ramirez, 24, the senior daughter, was shouting a Popeye cartoon blaring on the television. Now seven-months pregnant, for the third time, she was trying to resolve the question of a missing blouse with her sister Maria, 21, six months pregnant, who sat methodically rolling breakfast beans into tortillas, burrito style, at the end of the room.

A near-obese third daughter, Sylvia, mother of two of the rampaging children, sat bulging out of her tight shorts, fanning herself with a purple crochet doily which she had snatched from a screaming baby who had spun it wildly in the air long enough finally to knock the fire off her cigarette and get smacked for it.

"God, they'll all get the pox and what a mess that'll be," lamented Sylvia.

"Well, hell, they all gotta get it sometime," observed Yolanda sagely, demonstrating that, of the three women, she is by far the most philosophic.

"None of us are married," she said, looking downright amused at the question, "because the guys who knocked us up are all either bums or they don't have the jobs to support families."

So, she said, they all belong to Miguel Ramirez, the Dependent Children beneficiary -- including Ramirez himself who, for undisclosed reasons, hasn't been able to acquire welfare aid himself although he suffers from a severely arthritic back. Lately, too, he gambled, he's been suffering from a finger that was badly bitten off the other night in a bar fight.

"The guy really had some set of teeth," he chuckled, relishing the memory of "the little squabble."

But seriously, he said, he would like to tell the state to go shove its welfare.

"I want to work, but all I ever knew was hard labor. Now, who's going to hire a 53-year-old Mexican for a desk job? I can barely even read."

Without AFDC aid, he added, "we'd all probably starve." As it is, he's \$1,000 behind in his house payments so, sooner or later, they'll all probably be out on the street anyway.

Nobody looked very alarmed.

Nobody looked, either, like they even remembered their brother Michael, until Ramirez suddenly reminded them.

"I don't even have the money for gas to go see my son," he said.

The mood in the room changed instantly to seriousness.

What concerned everybody present, it seemed, was not so much Mike's plight, but rather the effect it would have on his mother when she returns from Mexico, sometime later this week.

She has suffered from severe nervous disorders for years, they said. And when she finds out what happened to her son--the

seventh of her eight children--"just may pitch her over the edge."

"God, I wish we could get her to stay down there till this is over," lamented Sylvia, lighting another cigarette.

"Yeh, but if we try that, she'll just get suspicious something's wrong," observed Yolanda, always the realist.

Miguel Ramirez, who has a certain indisputable dignity born of uncompromising honesty, had grown somber in his corner.

"As you can see, it's mostly just a question of survival, like in a jungle, for Mexicans like us. We just live from day to day. That's why a lot of Chicanos hang on to their pride and get mad easy--it's all they got."

He shrugged, looking around at his daughters, who listened, suddenly silent.

Most of his kids had either been kicked out of school for making trouble or they had quit in disgust, he continued.

One son, 22, was in jail already, for undisclosed reasons. Only his oldest boy, 28, had even gotten out of the Norwalk barrio, although, Ramirez digressed, he had hopes for his youngest son, 15, who was "a good student and a hard worker."

#### One Thing Sure

Meantime, whatever his kids had done, Ramirez said, he knew one thing for sure.

"My son Mike would never hurt a kid or be part of a rotten thing like that. He may have been mean sometime, but he would not take it out on babies."

But, sighed Ramirez, it's out of his hands now. And the whole family expects the worst.

"They'll just figure he's a dirty Mexican capable of anything. What did the cops call it--a joy killing? They'll probably just lock him up for good, without thinking twice about it," said Yolanda, sneering cynically, pallidizing to the end.

11000 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
June 5, 1973

District Director  
Internal Revenue Service  
Post Office Box 391  
Los Angeles, California 90053

ATTN: LYNN SULLIVAN (Field Audit #1502)

Dear Sir:

Reference is made to our letter of July 25, 1972, relating to an investigation we were conducting at that time involving Della Coover, born September 1, 1920, Social Security Account Number 557-16-3963; and to the telephone call between Special Agent Gilbert G. Benjamin of this office and Lynn Sullivan, at your office located at 9150 East Flair Drive, El Monte, California, 91731, on Monday, June 4, 1973.

To aid in your investigation in this matter, there are enclosed two xerox duplications of articles which appeared in the "Los Angeles Free Press," issues of March 20 and June 19, 1970, bearing the byline of Della Rosa, which is believed to be another pseudonym utilized by Mrs. Coover.

This information is being furnished for whatever action may be appropriate.

Very truly yours,

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2AUM/ru

JOE D. JAMERSON  
Assistant Director in Charge

Enclosures 2

100-19949-21

SEARCHED \_\_\_\_\_

2 - Addressee (RM)  
1 - Los Angeles (100-19949)

INDEXED \_\_\_\_\_

GGB/cll  
(3)

SERIALIZED \_\_\_\_\_

FILED \_\_\_\_\_

RETAIN:

SSC-REQUEST , August 20, 1975

Part V, 2.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-26-00 BY SP2A/CJ/RW

# Office Memorandum

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : MR. TOLSON

FROM : J. P. MOHR

SUBJECT: APPLICANT INVESTIGATIONS

DATE: 12/21/49

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2ALM/ew

- Mr. Tolson
- Mr. Clegg
- Mr. Glavin
- Mr. Ladd
- Mr. Nichols
- Mr. Rosen
- Mr. Tracy
- Mr. Egan
- Mr. Gurnea
- Mr. Harbo
- Mr. Mohr
- Mr. Pennington
- Mr. Quinn Tamm
- Tele. Room
- Mr. Nease
- Miss Holmes
- Miss Gandy

The Director has inquired concerning the procedure which was followed in the Atomic Energy Act applicant case whereby the Washington Field Office was not alerted to the fact that Harold Ickes, whose name was given as a reference, should not be interviewed.

There is attached a memorandum dated December 20, 1949 from Mr. Rosen to Mr. Ladd with respect to the specific Atomic Energy case mentioned, namely Fred Ernest Schnepfe, who had given Harold Ickes as a reference on his PSQ or application form. From a reading of the attached memorandum which was prepared by Section Chief G. C. Callan of the Applicant Section, it is obvious that the Supervisors who handle applicant matters in the Investigative Division do not have any policy with respect to the interviewing of references, former employers, associates or others except where the Bureau has specifically indicated that certain individuals should not be contacted, such as Henry Steele Commager, personnel of CBS and the like. As a matter of fact, the present policy in effect at the Seat of Government concerning applicant investigations is to interview all references and the attached memorandum indicates that Harold Ickes had been interviewed in the past in connection with applicant investigations and has exhibited a cooperative attitude. It would seem, therefore, that no action should be taken with respect to the supervisory personnel at the Seat of Government concerning the referral of Harold Ickes' name to the Washington Field Office for interview in connection with the Atomic Energy Act case mentioned.

As you know, at the Executives Conference the Director's wishes with regard to interviewing persons who have demonstrated hostile attitudes toward the Bureau have been considered in the past and no instructions have been issued to the Supervisors at the Seat of Government or to the field concerning this matter except as to specific individuals whose names have been sent to the field in the recent past in an SAC Letter. This matter was called to the attention of the Executives Conference as recently as December 20, 1949 and the Conference felt it would be undesirable for the Bureau to embark upon a program of advising the field to not interview certain individuals in connection with various types of investigations conducted by the Bureau. The Executives Conference realized that the hostile attitude toward the Bureau stems not from our criminal investigative work but from the Bureau's investigative activity in the field of applicant investigations and the Loyalty Program. The Conference feels that the blacklisting of individuals is fundamentally bad and will ultimately result in extreme embarrassment to the Bureau. It is also felt it is extremely

COPY DESTROYED

RECORDED 62-72201

150 NOV 25 1961

difficult to draft a letter to all SAC's pointing up the problem to them and expecting them to adhere to any policy which will eliminate the difficulty which we have encountered heretofore.

I have discussed this matter with Mr. Carlson in some detail and he feels that we may be able to control to some extent the interviewing of persons hostile to the Bureau at the Seat of Government without furnishing a "black list" or statement of policy to the field. Mr. Carlson feels, and I agree with him, that the major portion of our difficulty stems from the Loyalty investigations and applicant investigations. Mr. Carlson and I therefore propose that the following procedure be instituted immediately at the Seat of Government in order to meet the objectives desired by the Director in connection with this matter:

1. The Crime Records Section shall be responsible for preparing and maintaining in a current status a list of those individuals known to be hostile to the Bureau. It is felt that it is imperative that a list be prepared because the judgment of individual Supervisors referring cases to the field will differ depending upon the extent of their day to day newspaper reading, radio listening and perusal of various and sundry periodicals. It would also mean that each Supervisor would have to either prepare his own list or endeavor to depend on a faulty memory. Furthermore, an individual may at one time appear to be hostile to the Bureau and subsequently his attitude may change and it may be very desirable to interview him.

2. This list shall be furnished to only those Supervisors at the Seat of Government who have the responsibility for assigning Loyalty or applicant cases to the field. This will include Supervisors in the Loyalty Section of the Security Division, the Applicant Section of the Investigative Division and those Supervisors in the Administrative Division handling Bureau applicant cases. This will mean that not more than 25 Supervisors at most at the Seat of Government will have possession of such a list. These Supervisors shall check all references and present and former employers against this list before referring the case to the field for investigation.

It should be realized that the procedure recommended will not provide against interviews with neighbors of the applicants or associates whose names are brought up during the course of the investigation. It is felt, however, that the bulk of the people who are interviewed in these cases are set out as references by the applicant and it would only be on a rare occasion that a person hostile to the Bureau will be interviewed on a neighborhood investigation or as an associate of the applicant.

# Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED

HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2ALM/RW

DATE: 1/4/50

TO : THE DIRECTOR

FROM : THE EXECUTIVES CONFERENCE

SUBJECT: *Method of conducting applicant investigations*

- Mr. Tolson
- Mr. Clegg
- Mr. Glavin
- Mr. Ladd
- Mr. Nichols
- Mr. Rosen
- Mr. Tracy
- Mr. Egan
- Mr. Gurnea
- Mr. Harbo
- Mr. Mohr
- Mr. Pennington
- Mr. Quinn Tamm
- Tele. Room
- Mr. Nease
- Miss Holmes
- Miss Gandy

The Executives Conference of January 4, 1950, consisting of Messrs. Tolson, Glavin, Harbo, Ladd, Rosen, Clegg, Carlson, Nease and Mohr, in accordance with the Director's instructions, considered the attached memorandum of December 21, 1949, with respect to the procedures in conducting applicant investigations and particularly the method suggested to avoid interviews with those individuals having a hostile or critical attitude toward the Bureau and its work.

It was pointed out to the Conference that apparently the hostility and criticism of the Bureau stem not from our normal day to day criminal investigative work but to a very slight extent to investigations in the Internal Security field and very specifically and definitely to applicant and Loyalty investigations. It was felt that if some procedure could be devised to avoid interviews with individuals in applicant type cases where the individuals have exhibited a hostile or critical attitude toward the Bureau that much could be accomplished to eliminate the difficulties experienced in the past. The Conference felt it would be undesirable to prepare a list of any sort which might be termed a "blacklist" to be distributed to all of the divisional offices. It was proposed that the following procedure be instituted immediately at the Seat of Government in order to meet the objectives desired by the Director in connection with this matter:

1. The Crime Records Section shall be responsible for preparing and maintaining in a current status a list of those individuals known to be hostile to the Bureau. It is felt that it is imperative that a list be prepared because the judgment of individual Supervisors referring cases to the field will differ depending upon the extent of their day to day newspaper reading, radio listening and perusal of various and sundry periodicals. It would also mean that each Supervisor would have to either prepare his own list or endeavor to depend on a faulty memory. Furthermore, an individual may at one time appear to be hostile to the Bureau and subsequently his attitude may change and it may be very desirable to interview him.

*Each name should be the subject of a memo.*

2. This list shall be furnished to only those Supervisors at the Seat of Government who have the responsibility for assigning Loyalty or applicant cases to the field. This will include Supervisors in the Loyalty Section of the Security Division, the Applicant Section of the Investigative Division and those Supervisors in the Administrative Division handling Bureau applicant cases. This will mean that not more than 25 Supervisors at most at the Seat of Government will have possession of such a list. These Supervisors shall check all references and present and former employers against this list before referring the case to the field for investigation.

RECORDED  
INDEXED

JAN 19 1950

LADD

It was pointed out that the procedure recommended will not provide against interviews with neighbors of the applicants or subjects under investigation in connection with the Loyalty Program nor would it provide against interviews of associates whose names are brought up during the course of the investigation. Likewise it would not provide against interviews with college professors whose names were not given by the applicant or the Loyalty subject as references, but who are contacted in the course of the ordinary investigation. It was felt, however, that the bulk of the people who are interviewed in these cases are set out as references by the applicant and it would only be on a rare occasion that a person hostile to the Bureau would be interviewed in a neighborhood investigation, as an associate or as a college professor.

It was also unanimously recommended by the Conference that in addition to the preparation of the list recommended and the checking at the Seat of Government by the indicated Supervisors, that where a specific individual has manifested hostility or unjust criticism against the Bureau that the specific field office or offices which would likely contact the individual be advised in writing in the form of a Personal and Confidential SAC letter. In these letters the SAC will be instructed that it is his responsibility to advise all of the Agents in the office of the undesirability of contacting the individual in question without prior Bureau authority. The field will be instructed that in addressing their communications to the Bureau requesting authority to contact such individuals, the letter or communication should not contain the phraseology that the interview will be conducted unless advised to the contrary but specific approval must be obtained from the Bureau before such a contact is made.

Should the Director agree with the recommendations of the Conference set forth in this memorandum, appropriate steps will be taken to inaugurate the policy recommended.

Respectfully,  
For the Conference

OK.  
1/2  
✓  
Clyde Tolson

CC - Mr. Clegg





PERSONAL ATTENTION  
SAC LETTER 66-78

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

In Reply, Please Refer to  
File No.


December 15, 1966

RE: COURTNEY A EVANS  
PERSON NOT TO BE CONTACTED

On December 10, 1966, Senator Robert F. Kennedy released to the press a copy of a letter to him dated February 17, 1966, from former ASSISTANT Director Courtney A. Evans. In direct contradiction to official memoranda prepared by Evans for Bureau files during the early 1960's, his February 17, 1966, letter to Kennedy stated that Evans "did not discuss the use of "microphones by the FBI with Kennedy during his tenure as Attorney General--nor did Evans "know of any written material that was sent to you" (Kennedy) "at any time concerning" microphone surveillances.

In view of Evans' obvious lack of integrity, disregard for the truth and duplicity toward the FBI, he should not be contacted without prior Bureau approval.

Very truly yours,

  
John Edgar Hoover  
Director

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED  
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 10-20-00 BY SP2ALM/pw

