

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM

IDENTIFICATION FORM

-----  
AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : FBI

RECORD NUMBER : 124-10185-10201

RECORDS SERIES :

SV

AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 66-1480-11TH NR THRU 24TH NR

-----  
DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR :

FROM :

TO :

TITLE :

Released under the John F. Kennedy  
Assassination Records Collection Act of  
1992 (44 USC 2107 Note). Case#:NW  
65994 Date: 11-01-2021

DATE : 00/00/00

PAGES : 0

SUBJECTS :

NAR

DOCUMENT TYPE :

CLASSIFICATION : U

RESTRICTIONS : NOT ASSASSINATION RELATED

CURRENT STATUS : P

DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 07/29/94

OPENING CRITERIA :

INDEFINITE

COMMENTS :

-----  
[R] - ITEM IS RESTRICTED

Date: August 2, 2021

From: National Archives and Records Administration

Subject: Reconstructed FBI File SV 66-1480, 11th NR-24th NR

To: The File

This memorandum briefly summarizes the status of missing original Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) case files or portions of case files in the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection (JFK Collection) and documents the National Archives and Records Administration's (NARA) efforts to reconstruct these records, where possible, from duplicate copies of documents located in other FBI files.

As the JFK Collection was first compiled and reviewed in the 1990s, the Assassination Records Review Board and the FBI designated some records as "not believed relevant" (NBR) or "not assassination related" (NAR). The FBI retained custody of the NBR/NAR records and postponed their transfer to NARA until a later date. Every document or group of documents ("serials"), however, received an indexed Record Identification Form (RIF) and FBI inventory sheet for insertion into the JFK Collection.

In September 2011, several years prior to the 2017 re-review and transfer of the NBR/NAR material to the National Archives, a flood severely damaged thousands of feet of records at the FBI's Alexandria Records Center in Alexandria, Virginia. In June 2012, NARA approved the FBI's request for emergency destruction of 10,000 cubic feet of records that posed significant airborne health hazards. Among the damaged records were FBI field office files that contained postponed JFK Collection material designated as "pertaining to a matter unrelated to the JFK Assassination Investigation" or "not assassination related."

This compilation represents NARA's efforts to reconstruct the original file or portions of the file, as completely as possible, with duplicate copies of documents located in the FBI field office and headquarters files within the JFK Collection. Each reconstructed file or compilation contains a Record Identification Form, an explanatory cover memo, existing administrative documents available within the JFK Collection, and copies of identified duplicate documents. The table below summarizes the status of FBI file SV 66-1480, 11th NR through 24th NR.

RIF Number	FBI File Number	List of Serials From Inventory Sheet	List of Identified Serials at NARA	Reconstructed Status (None, Partial, Complete)
124-10185-10201	SV 66-1480	11th NR-24th NR	11th NR-17th NR, 21st-22nd NR	Partial

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
POSTPONEMENT INFORMATION SHEET (JFK MATERIALS)

173 Page(s) withheld entirely at this location in the file.  
One or more of the following statements, where indicated,  
explain this deletion (these deletions).

Deletions were made pursuant to the postponement rationale indicated below with no segregable material available for disclosure. All references relate to Section 6 of the "President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992."

- Subsection 1A (intelligence agent's identity)
- Subsection 1B (intelligence source or method)
- Subsection 1C (other matter relating to military defense, intelligence operations or the conduct of foreign relations)
- Subsection 2 (living person who provided confidential information)
- Subsection 3 (unwarranted invasion of privacy)
- Subsection 4 (cooperating individual or foreign government, currently requiring protection)
- Subsection 5 (security or protective procedure, currently or expected to be utilized)

Information pertained to a matter unrelated to the JFK Assassination investigation.

For your information: \_\_\_\_\_

The following number is to be used for reference regarding this page (these pages):

SV 66-1480

XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXX

JFK Inventory Sheet  
(COMMITTEE FILES)

File #: SV 66-1480 - - - Section #: 1 Re: CHURCH COMM.

Serial Number	Document Date	Document Type	Document From	Document To	3rd Agy	Direct Dupes	Other	ACTUAL PERT.	Rev.	Rel.	With-held	FBI Ref	Duplicate	Location	Postponements
	03/24/75	TT	HQ	ALL SACS		1		1	0					NAR	
	03/25/75	TT	SV	HQ		1		1	0					NAR	
	05/02/75	TT	HQ	ALL SACS		2		2	0					NAR	
	05/20/75	TT	HQ	ALL SACS		1		1	0					NAR	
	05/28/75	MEMO	HQ	ALL EMPLOY		8		8	0					NAR	
	09/04/75	TT	HQ	ALL SACS		3		3	6	0				NAR	
	09/05/75	TT	HQ	AX		7		7	14	0				NAR	
	09/07/75	TT	SV	HQ		1		1	2	0				NAR	
	10/09/75	TT	HQ	ALL SACS		2		2	0					NAR	
	10/21/75	STATEMENT	HQ			22		22	22	22				NONE	
	11/21/75	RS	HQ	SV		1		1	0					NAR	
	11/20/75	NEWS ARTIC	NY			1		1	0					NAR	
	12/05/75	RS	HQ	SV		1		1	0					NAR	
	12/02/75	TRANSCRIPT	CHURCH COM			61		61	0					NAR	
	12/04/75	RS	HQ	SV		1		1	0					NAR	
	12/02/75	TESTIMONY	CHURCH COM			14		14	0					NAR	

Serial Number	Document Date	Document Type	Document From	Document To	3rd Agency	Other	Direct Dupes	ACTUAL PERT.	Rev.	Rel.	With- held	FBI Ref 3rd Agency	Duplicate Location	Postponements
	12/10/75	TT	HQ	ALL SACS		4	4	0						MAR
	12/05/75	RS	HQ	SV		1	1	0						MAR
	12/09/75	NEWS ARTIC	SV			1	1	0						MAR
	12/06/75	NEWS ARTIC	SV			1	1	0						MAR
	12/30/75	RS	HQ	SV		1	1	0						MAR
	12/10/75	TRANSCRIPT	CHURCH COM			77	77	0						MAR
	12/05/75	LET	THIRD PART	ALL SACS		1	1	0						MAR
	12/05/75	LET	THIRD PART			8	8	0						MAR

Page: 2

Grand Totals.....

End of Report.....

0	221	11	232	22	22	0
---	-----	----	-----	----	----	---

TO: SAC:

- Albany
- Albuquerque
- Alexandria
- Anchorage
- Atlanta
- Baltimore
- Birmingham
- Boston
- Buffalo
- Butte
- Charlotte
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Cleveland
- Columbia
- Dallas
- Denver
- Detroit
- El Paso
- Honolulu
- Houston
- Indianapolis
- Jackson
- Jacksonville
- Kansas City
- Knoxville
- Las Vegas
- Little Rock
- Los Angeles
- Louisville
- Memphis
- Miami
- Milwaukee
- Minneapolis
- Mobile
- Newark
- New Haven
- New Orleans
- New York City
- Norfolk

- Oklahoma City
- Omaha
- Philadelphia
- Phoenix
- Pittsburgh
- Portland
- Richmond
- Sacramento
- St. Louis
- Salt Lake City
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- San Juan
- Savannah
- Seattle
- Springfield
- Tampa
- Washington Field
- Quantico

TO LEGAT:

- Beirut
- Bern
- Bonn
- Brasilia
- Buenos Aires
- Caracas
- Hong Kong
- London
- Madrid
- Manila
- Mexico City
- Ottawa
- Paris
- Rome
- Singapore
- Tel Aviv
- Tokyo

RE: SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE  
ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Date 11/21/75

- For information     Retention optional     For appropriate action     Surep, by \_\_\_\_\_
- The enclosed is for your information. If used in a future report,  conceal all sources,  paraphrase contents.
- Enclosed are corrected pages from report of SA \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks:

Enclosed for your information is a copy of an article by Mr. William Safire entitled "Mr. Church's Cover-Up" that appeared in the November 20, 1975, issue of "The New York Times."

Enc. (1)  
Bufile  
Grfile

~~11/21/75~~

SEARCHED <u>1/27</u>	INDEXED _____
SERIALIZED <u>2/2</u>	FILED _____
NOV 24 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

62-236F-11B

# Mr. Church's Cover-Up

By William Safire

WASHINGTON, Nov. 19—On Oct. 10, 1963, the then-Attorney General of the United States put his personal signature on a document that launched and legitimized one of the most horrendous abuses of Federal police power in this century.

In Senator Frank Church's subcommittee hearing room this week, the authorized wiretapping and subsequent unauthorized bugging and attempted blackmailing of Martin Luther King Jr. is being gingerly examined, with the "investigation" conducted in such a way as not to unduly embarrass officials of the Kennedy or Johnson Administrations.

With great care, the committee has focused on the F.B.I. Yesterday, when the committee counsel first set forth the result of shuffling through press clips, it seemed as if no Justice Department had existed in 1962; today, an F.B.I. witness pointed out that it was Robert Kennedy who authorized the wiretap of Dr. King, and that "the President of the United States and the Attorney General specifically discussed their concern of Communist influence with Dr. King."

But the Church committee showed no zest for getting further to the Kennedy root of this precedent to Watergate eavesdropping. If Senator Church were willing to let the chips fall where they may, he would call some knowledgeable witnesses into the glare of the camera lights and ask them some questions that have gone unasked for thirteen years.

For example, he could call Nicholas Katzenbach, Attorney General Kennedy's deputy and successor, and ask what he knows of the Kennedy decision to wiretap Dr. King. Who at Justice concurred in the recommendation? How does the F.B.I. know the President was consulted or informed?

After Mr. Katzenbach assumed office, and the wiretapping continued, he was told by angry newsmen that the F.B.I. was leaking scurrilous information about Dr. King. Why did he wait for four months, and for a thousand telephonic interceptions, to discontinue the officially approved tap?

Of course, this sort of testimony would erode Senator Church's political base. That is why we do not see former Assistant F.B.I. director Carlisle (Deke) DeLoach, Lyndon Johnson's personal contact with the F.B.I. in the witness chair. What did President Johnson know about the character-as-assassination plot and when did he know it? What conversations took place between Mr. DeLoach and President Johnson on the tapping of Dr. King, or about the use of the F.B.I. in any other intrusions into the lives of political figures?

The committee is not asking embarrassing questions even when answers are readily available. A couple of weeks ago, at an open hearing, an F.B.I. man inadvertently started to blurt out an episode about newsmen who were wiretapping in 1962 with the apparent knowledge of Attorney General Kennedy. The too-willing witness was promptly shooshed into silence, and told that such information would be developed only in executive session. Nobody raised an eyebrow.

That pattern of containment by the Church committee is vividly shown by the handling of the buggings at the 1964 Republican and Democratic con-

## ESSAY

ventions which were ordered by Lyndon Johnson. Such invasions of political headquarters were worse than the crime committed at Watergate, since they involved the use of the F.B.I., but the Church investigators seem to be determined not to probe too deeply.

If F.B.I. documents say that reports were made to specific Johnson aides, why are those men not given the same opportunity to publicly tell their story so avidly given the next President's men? If Lyndon Johnson committed this impeachable high crime of using the F.B.I. to spy on political opponents, who can be brought forward to tell us all about it?

But that would cause embarrassment to Democrats, and Senator Church wants to embarrass professional employees of investigatory agencies only. A new sense of Congressional decorum exists, far from the sense of outrage expressed in the Senate Watergate committee's hearing room. When it is revealed that the management of NBC News gave press credentials to L.B.J.'s spies at the 1964 convention, everybody blushes demurely—and nobody demands to know which network executive made what decision under what pressure.

I have been haranguing patient readers for years about the double standard applied to Democratic and Republican political crimes, and had hoped the day would come when the hardball precedents set by the Kennedy and Johnson men would be laid before the public in damning detail.

Obviously, Democrat Frank Church is not the man to do it. His jaw-shaking indignation is all too selective; the trail of high-level responsibility for the crimes committed against Dr. King and others is evidently going to be allowed to cool.

Duty. You'd think that after all the natica has been through in the past few years our political leaders would have learned that the one thing that brings you down is the art of covering up.

✓ SAC - RL  
✓ ASAS  
✓ Supp  
✓ Supp  
✓ Supp

FILE IN  
SUBSTANTIVE  
FILE  
RL

62-2368-11A  
62-2885-4

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
NOV 24 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

THE NEW YORK TIMES  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20th, 1975  
PAGE C-41

TO: SAC:

- Albany
- Albuquerque
- Alexandria
- Anchorage
- Atlanta
- Baltimore
- Birmingham
- Boston
- Buffalo
- Butte
- Charlotte
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Cleveland
- Columbia
- Dallas
- Denver
- Detroit
- El Paso
- Honolulu

- Houston
- Indianapolis
- Jackson
- Jacksonville
- Kansas City
- Knoxville
- Las Vegas
- Little Rock
- Los Angeles
- Louisville
- Memphis
- Miami
- Milwaukee
- Minneapolis
- Mobile
- Newark
- New Haven
- New Orleans
- New York City
- Norfolk

- Oklahoma City
- Omaha
- Philadelphia
- Phoenix
- Pittsburgh
- Portland
- Richmond
- Sacramento
- St. Louis
- Salt Lake City
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- San Juan
- Savannah
- Seattle
- Springfield
- Tampa
- Washington Field
- Quantico

TO LEGAT:

- Bern
- Bonn
- Brasilia
- Buenos Aires
- Caracas
- Hong Kong
- London
- Madrid
- Manila
- Mexico City
- Ottawa
- Paris
- Rome
- Tel Aviv
- Tokyo

RE: TESTIMONY OF ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR--  
 DEPUTY ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR JAMES B. ADAMS  
 BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON  
 12/2/75

Date December 5, 1975

- For information     Retention optional     For appropriate action     Surep, by \_\_\_\_\_
- The enclosed is for your information. If used in a future report,  conceal all sources,  paraphrase contents.
- Enclosed are corrected pages from report of SA \_\_\_\_\_ dated \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks:

Re Bureau R/S of 12/4/75 which provided excerpts of Mr. Adams' testimony.

Attached for your information and assistance, is the complete transcript of above-referenced testimony.

Enc. (1)  
Bufile  
Urfile

**UNEDITED TRANSCRIPT**

*W/ 62-2368-16*



Vol. 15

# The United States Senate

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations  
With Respect to Intelligence Activities

INTELLIGENCE INVESTIGATION

## UNEDITED TRANSCRIPT

Tuesday, December 2, 1975

Washington, D. C.

*lead*

62-2368-16

~~66-2882~~

000-

SENSTUDY  
FILE

HANDLE AS  
SAC LETTER  
RW done PJ  
12/76

WARD & PAUL  
410 FIRST STREET, S. E.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

(202) 544-6000

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>BB</i>	FILED <i>BB</i>
DEC 1 1975	
SI - ALBANY	

*RW*

11 Senator Tower.. The next witnesses to appear before the  
12 Committee are Mr. James Adams, Assistant to the Director-  
13 Deputy Associate Director, Investigation, responsible for all  
14 investigative operations; Mr. W. Raymond Wannall, Assistant  
15 Director, Intelligence Division, responsible for internal  
16 security and foreign counterintelligence investigations; Mr.  
17 John A. Mintz, Assistant Director, Legal Counsel Division;  
18 Joseph G. Deegan, Section Chief, extremist investigations;  
19 Mr. Robert L. Schackelford, Section Chief, subversive  
20 investigations; Mr. Homer A. Newman, Jr., Assistant to Section  
21 Chief, supervises extremist informants; Mr. Edward P. Grigala,  
22 Unit Chief, supervises subversive informants; Joseph G. Kelley,  
23 Assistant Section Chief, Civil Rights Section, General Investi-  
24 gative Division.

25 Gentlemen, will you all rise and be sworn.

1 . Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give  
2 before this Committee is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing  
3 but the truth, so help you God?

4 Mr. Adams. I do.

5 Mr. Wannall. I do.

6 Mr. Mintz. I do.

7 Mr. Deegan. I do.

8 Mr. Schackelford. I do.

9 Mr. Newman. I do.

10 Mr. Grigalus. I do.

11 Mr. Kelley. I do.

12 Senator Tower. It is intended that Mr. Wannall will be  
13 the principal witness, and we will call on others as questioning  
14 might require, and I would direct each of you when you do  
15 respond, to identify yourselves, please, for the record.

16 I think that we will spend just a few more minutes to allow  
17 the members of the Committee to return from the floor.

18 (A brief recess was taken.)

19 Senator Tower. The Committee will come to order.

20 Mr. Wannall, according to data, informants provide '83  
21 percent of your intelligence information.

22 Now, will you provide the Committee with some information  
23 on the criteria for the selection of informants?

24

25

1 TESTIMONY OF W. RAYMOND WANNALL, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,  
2 INTELLIGENCE DIVISION, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
3 ACCOMPANIED BY: JAMES B. ADAMS, ASSISTANT TO THE  
4 DIRECTOR-DEPUTY ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR (INVESTIGATION);  
5 JOHN A. MINTZ, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, LEGAL COUNSEL  
6 DIVISION; JOSEPH G. DEEGAN, SECTION CHIEF; ROBERT L.  
7 SCHACKELFORD, SECTION CHIEF; HOMER A. NEWMAN, JR.,  
8 ASSISTANT TO SECTION CHIEF; EDWARD P. GRIGALUS, UNIT  
9 CHIEF; AND JOSEPH G. KELLEY, ASSISTANT SECTION CHIEF,  
10 CIVIL RIGHTS SECTION, GENERAL INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

11 Mr. Wannall. Mr. Chairman, that is not FBI data that you  
12 have quoted. That was prepared by the General Accounting  
13 Office.

14 Senator Tower. That is GAO.

15 Mr. Wannall. Based on a sampling of about 93 cases.

16 Senator Tower. Would that appear to be a fairly accurate  
17 figure.

18 Mr. Wannall. I have not seen any survey which the FBI  
19 itself has conducted that would confirm that, but I think that  
20 we do get the principal portion of our information from live  
21 sources.

22 Senator Tower. It would be a relatively high percentage  
23 then?

24 Mr. Wannall. I would say yes. And your question is  
25 criteria?

1 Senator Tower. What criteria do you use in the selection  
2 of informants?

3 Mr. Wannall. Well, the criteria vary with the needs. In  
4 our cases relating to extremist matters, surely in order to get  
5 an informant who can meld into a group which is engaged in a  
6 criminal type activity, you're going to have a different set  
7 of criteria. If you're talking about our internal security  
8 matters, I think we set rather high standards. We do require  
9 that a preliminary inquiry be conducted which would consist  
10 principally of checks of our headquarters indices, our field  
11 office indices, checks with other informants who are operating  
12 in the same area, and in various established sources such as  
13 local police departments.

14 Following this, if it appears that the person is the type  
15 who has credibility, can be depended upon to be reliable, we  
16 would interview the individual in order to make a determination  
17 as to whether or not he will be willing to assist the FBI  
18 in discharging its responsibilities in that field.

19 Following that, assuming that the answer is positive, we  
20 would conduct a rather in depth investigation for the purpose  
21 of further attempting to establish credibility and reliability.

22 Senator Tower. How does the Bureau distinguish between  
23 the use of informants for law enforcement as opposed to  
24 intelligence collection?

25 Is the guidance different, or is it the same, or what?

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

WARD &amp; PAUL

410 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

1 Mr. Wannall. Well, Mr. Adams can probably best address  
2 the use of informants on criminal matters since he is over  
3 the operational division on that.

4 Mr. Adams. You do have somewhat of a difference in the fact  
5 that a criminal informant in a law enforcement function, you  
6 are trying to develop evidence which will be admissible in  
7 court for prosecution, whereas with intelligence, the informant  
8 alone, your purpose could either be prosecution or it could be  
9 just for purposes of pure intelligence.

10 The difficulty in both is retaining the confidentiality  
11 of the individual and protecting the individual, and trying to,  
12 through use of the informant, obtain evidence which could be  
13 used independently of the testimony of the informant so that  
14 he can continue operating as a criminal informant.

15 Senator Tower. Are these informants ever authorized to  
16 function as provocateurs?

17 Mr. Adams. No, sir, they're not. We have strict regula-  
18 tions against using informants as provocateurs. This gets  
19 into that delicate area of entrapment which has been addressed  
20 by the courts on many occasions and has been concluded by the  
21 courts that providing an individual has a willingness to engage  
22 in an activity, the government has the right to provide him the  
23 opportunity. This does not mean, of course, that mistakes don't  
24 occur in this area, but we take whatever steps we can to  
25 avoid this. Even the law has recognized that informants can

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

WARD & PAUL

410 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

1 engage in criminal activity, and the courts have held that,  
 2 especially the Supreme Court in the Newark County Case, that  
 3 the very difficulty of penetrating an ongoing operation, that  
 4 an informant himself can engage in criminal activity, but  
 5 because there is lacking this criminal intent to violate a  
 6 law, we stay away from that. Our regulations fall short of that.

7 If we have a situation where we felt that an informant  
 8 has to become involved in some activity in order to protect  
 9 or conceal his use as an informant, we go right to the United  
 10 States Attorney or to the Attorney General to try to make sure  
 11 we are not stepping out of bounds insofar as the use of our  
 12 informants.

13 Senator Tower. But you do use these informants and do  
 14 instruct them to spread dissension among certain groups that  
 15 they are informing on, do you not?

16 Mr. Adams. We did when we had the COINTELPRO programs,  
 17 which were discontinued in 1971, and I think the Klan is probably  
 18 one of the best examples of a situation where the law was  
 19 in effect at the time. We heard the term States Rights used  
 20 much more then than we hear it today. We saw in the Little  
 21 Rock situation the President of the United States, in sending  
 22 in the troops, pointing out the necessity to use local law  
 23 enforcement. We must have local law enforcement, to use the  
 24 troops only as a last resort.

25 And then you have a situation like this where you do try

smn 21

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

WARD &amp; PAUL

410 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

1 to preserve the respective roles in law enforcement. You have  
2 historical problems with the Klan coming along. We had  
3 situations where the FBI and the Federal Government was almost  
4 powerless to act. We had local law enforcement officers in  
5 some areas participating in Klan violence.

6 The instances mentioned by Mr. Rowe, every one of those,  
7 he saw them from the lowest level of the informant. He didn't  
8 see what action was taken with that information, as he pointed  
9 out in his testimony. Our files show that this information was  
10 reported to the police departments in every instance. We  
11 also knew that in certain instances the information, upon being  
12 received, was not being acted upon. We also disseminated  
13 simultaneously through letterhead memoranda to the Department  
14 of Justice the problem, and here, here we were, the FBI, in a  
15 position where we had no authority in the absence of instruction  
16 from the Department of Justice, to make an arrest.

17 Sections 241 and 242 don't cover it because you don't have  
18 evidence of a conspiracy, and it ultimately resulted in  
19 a situation where the Department called in United States  
20 Marshals who do have authority similar to local law enforcement  
21 officials.

22 So, historically, in those days, we were just as frus-  
23 trated as anyone else was, and when we got information from  
24 someone like Mr. Rowe, good information, reliable information,  
25 and it was passed on to those who had the responsibility to



1 do something about it, it was not always acted upon, as he  
2 indicated.

3 Senator Tower. None of these cases, then, there was  
4 adequate evidence of conspiracy to give you jurisdiction to  
5 act?

6 Mr. Adams. The Departmental rules at that time, and still  
7 require Departmental approval where you have a conspiracy.  
8 Under 241, it takes two or more persons acting together. You  
9 can have a mob scene, and you can have blacks and whites  
10 belting each other, but unless you can show that those that  
11 initiated the action acted in concert in a conspiracy, you have  
12 no violation.

13 Congress recognized this, and it wasn't until 1968  
14 that they came along and added Section 245 to the civil rights  
15 statute, which added punitive measures against an individual  
16 that didn't have to be a conspiracy. But this was a problem  
17 that the whole country was grappling with: the President of  
18 the United States, Attorney General. We were in a situation  
19 where we had rank lawlessness taking place, as you know from  
20 a memorandum we sent you that we sent to the Attorney General.  
21 The accomplishments we were able to obtain in preventing  
22 violence, and in neutralizing the Klan -- and that was one  
23 of the reasons.

24 Senator Tower. What was the Bureau's purpose in con-  
25 tinuing or urging the continued surveillance of the Vietnam

smn 23

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

1 Veterans Against the War?

2 Was there a legitimate law enforcement purpose, or was the  
3 intent to halter political expression?

4 Mr. Adams. We had information on the Vietnam Veterans  
5 Against the War that indicated that there were subversive  
6 groups involved. They were going to North Vietnam and meeting  
7 with the Communist forces. They were going to Paris, attending  
8 meetings paid for and sponsored by the Communist Party, the  
9 International Communist Party. We feel that we had a very valid  
10 basis to direct our attention to the VVAW.

11 It started out, of course, with Gus Hall in 1967, who was  
12 head of the Communist Party, USA, and the comments he made,  
13 and what it finally boiled down to was a situation where it  
14 split off into the Revolutionary Union, which was a Maoist  
15 group, and the hard-line Communist group, and at that point  
16 factionalism developed in many of the chapters, and they closed  
17 those chapters because there was no longer any intent to follow  
18 the national organization.

19 But we had a valid basis for investigating it, and we  
20 investigated chapters to determine if there was affiliation  
21 and subservience to the national office.

22 Senator Tower. Mr. Hart?

23 Senator Hart of Michigan. But in the process of chasing  
24 after the Veterans Against the War, you got a lot of information  
25 that clearly has no relationship to any Federal criminal

WARD &amp; PAUL

410 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

1 statute.

2 Mr. Adams. I agree, Senator.

3 Senator Hart of Michigan. Why don't you try to shut that  
4 stuff off by simply telling the agent, or your informant?

5 Mr. Adams. Here is the problem that you have with that.  
6 When you're looking at an organization, do you report only the  
7 violent statements made by the group or do you also show that  
8 you may have one or two violent individuals, but you have  
9 some of these church groups that were mentioned, and others,  
10 that the whole intent of the group is not in violation of the  
11 statutes. You have to report the good, the favorable along  
12 with the unfavorable, and this is a problem. We wind up with  
13 information in our files. We are accused of being vacuum  
14 cleaners, and you are a vacuum cleaner. If you want to know the  
15 real purpose of an organization, do you only report the  
16 violent statements made and the fact that it is by a small  
17 minority, or do you also show the broad base of the organization  
18 and what it really is?

19 And within that is where we have to have the guidelines  
20 we have talked about before. We have to narrow down, because  
21 we recognize that we do wind up with too much information in  
22 our files.

23 Senator Hart of Michigan. But in that vacuuming process,  
24 you are feeding into Departmental files the names of people  
25 who are, who have been engaged in basic First Amendment

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

WARD & PAUL

410 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

1 exercises, and this is what hangs some of us up.

2 Mr. Adams. It hangs me up. But in the same files I  
3 imagine every one of you has been interviewed by the FBI, either  
4 asking you about the qualifications of some other Senator  
5 being considered for a Presidential appointment, being inter-  
6 viewed concerning some friend who is applying for a job.

7 Were you embarrassed to have that in the files of the  
8 FBI?

9 Now, someone can say, as reported at our last session, that  
10 this is an indication, the mere fact that we have a name in our  
11 files has an onerous impression, a chilling effect. I agree.  
12 It can have, if someone wants to distort what we have in our  
13 files, but if they recognize that we interviewed you because  
14 of considering a man for the Supreme Court of the United  
15 States, and that isn't distorted or improperly used, I don't  
16 see where any harm is served by having that in our files.

17 Senator Hart of Michigan. But if I am Reverend Smith  
18 and the vacuum cleaner picked up the fact that I was helping  
19 the veterans, Vietnam Veterans Against the War, and two years  
20 later a name check is asked on Reverend Smith and all your  
21 file shows is that he was associated two years ago with a group  
22 that was sufficient enough, held sufficient doubtful patriotism  
23 to justify turning loose a lot of your energy in pursuit on  
24 them --

25 Mr. Adams. This is a problem.

