

File #:

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

62-AL-2368

Serial Scope:

1 thru 23

DO NOT
DESTROY
FCIPA N/A

NR046 WA CODE

8:48PM NITEL 3-24-75 DEB

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS WITH RESPECT TO INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES HAS MADE AN INITIAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION FROM THE FBI. AMONG THE ITEMS REQUESTED IS A BREAKDOWN OF FIELD AGENT PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO INTERNAL SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE MATTERS.

ACCORDINGLY, WITHIN FOUR EIGHT HOURS EACH SAC SHOULD SUTEL TO FBIHQ, ATTENTION: BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SECTION, SETTING FORTH SEPARATELY THE NUMBER OF SACS, ASACS, SUPERVISORS AND AGENTS ASSIGNED TO INTERNAL SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE MATTERS. PERCENTAGES OF AN AGENTS TIME, WHEN NOT ASSIGNED FULL-TIME TO THESE ACTIVITIES, SHOULD BE USED IF APPROPRIATE, PARTICULARLY IN THE SUPERVISORY CATEGORIES. THIS INFORMATION SHOULD BE BROKEN DOWN SEPARATELY BETWEEN INTERNAL SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE. YOUR RESPONSE SHOULD BE LIMITED TO AGENT PERSONNEL ONLY.

END

*1cc
dest.
rec*

*done
rec
Open
66 bad
re info matter
JJD*

62-2368-1

66-2885

SEARCHED <i>rec</i>	INDEXED <i>rec</i>
SERIALIZED <i>rec</i>	FILED <i>rec</i>
MAR 24 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	
<i>Stoops</i>	

F B I

Date: 3/26/75

004

Transmit the following in CODED
(Type in plaintext or code)

Via TELETYPE NITEL
(Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI *4% PAW*
FROM: SAC, ALBANY
ATTN: BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SECTION.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES
RE BUREAU TELETYPE TO ALL SACS DATED MARCH 24, 1975.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS SET FORTH IN REFERENCED
BUREAU TELETYPE, THE FOLLOWING IS ALBANY DIVISION'S RESPONSE:

1 FIELD SUPERVISOR ASSIGNED TO INTERNAL SECURITY MATTERS
AND SPENDS 40 PERCENT OF SUPERVISORY TIME. 23 AGENTS ASSIGNED
ON PART-TIME BASIS TO INTERNAL SECURITY MATTERS AND THE PERCENTAGE
OF TIME SPENT IS AS FOLLOWS:

8 AGENTS AT 5 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT 10 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT
15 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT 20 PERCENT; 1 AGENT AT 30 PERCENT; 1
AGENT AT 35 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT 45 PERCENT; 1 AGENT AT 50 PERCENT;
1 AGENT AT 60 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT 75 PERCENT; 1 AGENT AT
85 PERCENT.

1 FIELD SUPERVISOR ASSIGNED TO COUNTERINTELLIGENCE
MATTERS AND SPENDS 40 PERCENT OF SUPERVISORY TIME. 23 AGENTS
ASSIGNED ON A PART-TIME BASIS TO COUNTERINTELLIGENCE MATTERS AND
THE PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT BY THESE AGENTS ON ~~62-2368-2~~

17-ALBANY
GLS/mma
(1)

1cc dest. [unclear]
[Signature]

SEARCHED
SERIALIZED
INDEXED
FILED
MAY 1 1975
FBI - ALBANY

Approved: *[Signature]*
Special Agent in Charge

Sent *[Signature]* Per *[Signature]*

62-2368-1A

F B I

Date:

Transmit the following in _____
(Type in plaintext or code)

Via _____
(Priority)

PAGE 2

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE MATTERS IS AS FOLLOWS:

6 AGENTS AT 5 PERCENT; 5 AGENTS AT 10 PERCENT;
4 AGENTS AT 15 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT 30 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS
AT 35 PERCENT; 1 AGENT AT 45 PERCENT; 2 AGENTS AT 60 PERCENT;
1 AGENT AT 85 PERCENT.

END.

Approved: _____ Sent _____ M Per _____
Special Agent in Charge

NR074 WA CODE

1936((((((((((((((((((((((PM NITEL 5-2-75 MSE

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR (62-116395)

PERSONAL ATTENTION

SENSTUDY 75

CAPTIONED MATTER PERTAINS TO BUREAU'S HANDLING OF REQUESTS FROM SENATE AND HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEES TO STUDY GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS WITH RESPECT TO INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES. IN CONNECTION WITH WORK OF THESE COMMITTEES, STAFF MEMBERS MAY SEEK TO INTERVIEW CURRENT AND FORMER FBI EMPLOYEES.

RECENTLY, THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE (SSC) STAFF HAS INTERVIEWED SEVERAL FORMER EMPLOYEES AND IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT MANY MORE SUCH PERSONNEL WILL BE CONTACTED.

THE FBI HAS PLEDGED FULL COOPERATION WITH THE COMMITTEE AND WE WISH TO ASSIST AND FACILITATE ANY INVESTIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO THE FBI. HOWEVER, WE DO HAVE AN OBLIGATION TO INSURE THAT SENSITIVE SOURCES AND METHODS AND ONGOING SENSITIVE INVESTIGATIONS ARE FULLY

*cc destroyed
5/1/75
CR*

*Done
62-DEAD
RIC*

62-2368-1B

SEARCHED <i>RV</i>	INDEXED <i>RV</i>
SERIALIZED <i>RV</i>	FILED <i>RV</i>
MAY - 1 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	

STOOPS

ADVISE ALL EMPLOYEES

*Put in weekly memo for 5/8/75
5/31/75*

PAGE TWO

PROTECTED. SHOULD ANY FORMER EMPLOYEE CONTACT YOUR OFFICE AND HAVE ANY QUESTION REGARDING HIS OBLIGATION NOT TO DIVULGE INFORMATION OBTAINED BY VIRTUE OF HIS PAST FBI EMPLOYMENT, HE SHOULD BE INSTRUCTED TO CONTACT LEGAL COUNSEL, FBIHQ, BY COLLECT CALL. YOUR CONVERSATIONS WITH FORMER EMPLOYEES MUST BE IN KEEPING WITH OUR PLEDGE. IT IS BELIEVED SUCH A PROCEDURE WOULD INSURE PROPER PROTECTION AND ALSO FACILITATE THE WORK OF THE SSC.

THE ABOVE PROCEDURE ALSO APPLIES TO CURRENT EMPLOYEES OF YOUR OFFICE. HOWEVER, CONTACT WITH THE LEGAL COUNSEL SHOULD BE HANDLED THROUGH THE SAC. //

END

HOLD

4/9/75

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
SENSTUDY 75

Members:

Democrats

Frank Church - Idaho, Chairman

Gary Hart - Colorado

Philip A. Hart - Michigan

Walter D. Huddleston - Kentucky

Walter F. Mondale - Minnesota

Robert Morgan - North Carolina (Freshman)

Republicans

Howard R. Baker, Jr. - Tennessee, Vice Chairman

Barry M. Goldwater - Arizona

Charles M. C. Mathias, Jr. - Maryland

Richard S. Schweiker - Pennsylvania

John G. Tower - Texas

all SEA's
Bing
Burl
Utica
Synacuse
Plattsburgh
Alen
Montplier
Watertown
Rutland
Ithaca
ASAC
Desk #4
Desk #5
Dead

62-2368-2

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
APR 11 1975	
FBI - NEW YORK	

[Handwritten signature]

HOUSE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INTELLIGENCE
AGENCIES

Members:

Democrats

Lucian N. Nedzi - Michigan, Chairman

Ronald V. Dellums - California

Don Edwards - California

Robert N. Giamo - Connecticut

James V. Stanton - Ohio

Michael J. Harrington - Massachusetts

Morgan F. Murphy - Illinois

Republicans

Robert McClory - Illinois

David C. Treen - Louisiana

Robert W. Kasten, Jr. - Wisconsin

NR 335 LA CODE

4:10PM NITEL 5-22-75 PAV

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR (62-116395)

PERSONAL ATTENTION

SENSTUDY - 75.

REBUTEL MAY 2, 1975.

IN CONNECTION WITH WORK OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEES, ITS REPRESENTATIVES MAY CONTACT YOUR OFFICE FOR INFORMATION.

IN ONE RECENT INSTANCE, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE TELEPHONICALLY INQUIRED AS TO IDENTITY OF SAC IN A PARTICULAR OFFICE DURING 1973.

IN HANDLING SUCH INQUIRIES INSURE ESTABLISHING BONA FIDES OF REPRESENTATIVE BY SHOW OF CREDENTIALS ON PERSONAL CONTACT OR, IF TELEPHONIC CONTACT, BY TELEPHONING BACK TO COMMITTEE. UNLESS INFORMATION IS OF A PUBLIC NATURE! AS IN THE INSTANCE CITED ABOVE, OBTAIN FBIHQ CLEARANCE PRIOR TO SUPPLYING ANY INFORMATION. FBIHQ MUST BE EXPEDITIOUSLY ADVISED OF ALL INFORMATION FURNISHED.

END

62-2368-2A

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
MAY 20 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	

Incorporated into Shero memo 5/20/75 mkt

1 cc det kee



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

May 28, 1975

MEMORANDUM TO ALL EMPLOYEES

RE: INTERVIEWS OF FBI EMPLOYEES

All employees are advised that Congress is conducting an inquiry into activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Congressional staff members are conducting interviews of former and current FBI employees. This Bureau has pledged its cooperation with the Congress.

You are reminded of the FBI Employment Agreement (copy attached) with which you agreed to comply during your employment in the FBI and following termination of such employment.

Also, you are reminded of Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 16.22 (copy attached), which reads as follows:

"No employee or former employee of the Department of Justice shall, in response to a demand of a court or other authority, produce any material contained in the files of the Department or disclose any information relating to material contained in the files of the Department, or disclose any information or produce any material acquired as part of the performance of his official duties or because of his official status without prior approval of the appropriate Department official or the Attorney General in accordance with Section 16.24."

Also, you are reminded of Department of Justice Order Number 116-56, dated May 15, 1956, (copy attached) which, among other things, requires an employee upon the completion of his testimony to prepare a memorandum outlining his testimony.

Our cooperative efforts, of course, must be consistent with the above cited authority. Therefore, if you are contacted for purpose of interview or testimony you are to request approval as required by the Employment Agreement and await authorization before furnishing information, testimony, or record material.

Enclosures (3)

Clarence M. Kelley 62-2368-3

Clarence M. Kelley
Director

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>DD</i>	FILED <i>DD</i>
JUN 16 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	



EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

As consideration for employment in the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), United States Department of Justice, and as a condition for continued employment, I hereby declare that I intend to be governed by and I will comply with the following provisions:

(1) That I am hereby advised and I understand that Federal law such as Title 18, United States Code, Sections 793, 794, and 798; Order of the President of the United States (Executive Order 11652); and regulations issued by the Attorney General of the United States (28 Code of Federal Regulations, Sections 16.21 through 16.26) prohibit loss, misuse, or unauthorized disclosure or production of national security information, other classified information and other nonclassified information in the files of the FBI;

(2) I understand that unauthorized disclosure of information in the files of the FBI or information I may acquire as an employee of the FBI could result in impairment of national security, place human life in jeopardy, or result in the denial of due process to a person or persons who are subjects of an FBI investigation, or prevent the FBI from effectively discharging its responsibilities. I understand the need for this secrecy agreement; therefore, as consideration for employment I agree that I will never divulge, publish, or reveal either by word or conduct, or by other means disclose to any unauthorized recipient without official written authorization by the Director of the FBI or his delegate, any information from the investigatory files of the FBI or any information relating to material contained in the files, or disclose any information or produce any material acquired as a part of the performance of my official duties or because of my official status. The burden is on me to determine, prior to disclosure, whether information may be disclosed and in this regard I agree to request approval of the Director of the FBI in each such instance by presenting the full text of my proposed disclosure in writing to the Director of the FBI at least thirty (30) days prior to disclosure. I understand that this agreement is not intended to apply to information which has been placed in the public domain or to prevent me from writing or speaking about the FBI but it is intended to prevent disclosure of information where disclosure would be contrary to law, regulation or public policy. I agree the Director of the FBI is in a better position than I to make that determination;

(3) I agree that all information acquired by me in connection with my official duties with the FBI and all official material to which I have access remains the property of the United States of America, and I will surrender upon demand by the Director of the FBI or his delegate, or upon separation from the FBI, any material relating to such information or property in my possession;

(4) That I understand unauthorized disclosure may be a violation of Federal law and prosecuted as a criminal offense and in addition to this agreement may be enforced by means of an injunction or other civil remedy.

I accept the above provisions as conditions for my employment and continued employment in the FBI. I agree to comply with these provisions both during my employment in the FBI and following termination of such employment.

(Signature)

(Type or print name)

Witnessed and accepted in behalf of the Director, FBI, on

_____, 19____, by _____

(Signature)



Office of the Attorney General
Washington, D. C. 20530

January 18, 1973

ORDER NO. 501-73

RULES AND REGULATIONS

**Title 28—JUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION**

Chapter I—Department of Justice

[Order 501-73]

PART 16—PRODUCTION OR DISCLOSURE OF MATERIAL OR INFORMATION

Subpart B—Production or Disclosure in Response to Subpenas or Demands of Courts or Other Authorities

This order delegates to certain Department of Justice officials the authority to approve the production or disclosure of material or information contained in Department files, or information or material acquired by a person while employed by the Department. It applies where a subpoena, order or other demand of a court or other authority, such as an administrative agency, is issued for the production or disclosure of such information.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, and 5 U.S.C. 301, Subpart B of Part 16 of Chapter I of Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, is revised, and its provisions renumbered, to read as follows:

Subpart B—Production or Disclosure in Response to Subpenas or Demands of Courts or Other Authorities

- Sec.
- 16.21 Purpose and scope.
- 16.22 Production or disclosure prohibited unless approved by appropriate Department official.
- 16.23 Procedure in the event of a demand for production or disclosure.
- 16.24 Final action by the appropriate Department official or the Attorney General.
- 16.25 Procedure where a Department decision concerning a demand is not made prior to the time a response to the demand is required.
- 16.26 Procedure in the event of an adverse ruling.

AUTHORITY: 28 U.S.C. 509, 510 and 5 U.S.C. 301.

Subpart B—Production or Disclosure in Response to Subpenas or Demands of Courts or Other Authorities

§ 16.21 Purpose and scope.

(a) This subpart sets forth the procedures to be followed when a subpoena, order, or other demand (hereinafter referred to as a "demand") of a court or

other authority is issued for the production or disclosure of (1) any material contained in the files of the Department, (2) any information relating to material contained in the files of the Department, or (3) any information or material acquired by any person while such person was an employee of the Department as a part of the performance of his official duties or because of his official status.

(b) For purposes of this subpart, the term "employee of the Department" includes all officers and employees of the United States appointed by, or subject to the supervision, jurisdiction, or control of, the Attorney General of the United States, including U.S. attorneys, U.S. marshals, and members of the staffs of those officials.

§ 16.22 Production or disclosure prohibited unless approved by appropriate Department official.

No employee or former employee of the Department of Justice shall, in response to a demand of a court or other authority, produce any material contained in the files of the Department or disclose any information relating to material contained in the files of the Department, or disclose any information or produce any material acquired as part of the performance of his official duties or because of his official status without prior approval of the appropriate Department official or the Attorney General in accordance with § 16.24.

§ 16.23 Procedure in the event of a demand for production or disclosure.

(a) Whenever a demand is made upon an employee or former employee of the Department for the production of material or the disclosure of information described in § 16.21(a), he shall immediately notify the U.S. attorney for the district where the issuing authority is located. The U.S. attorney shall immediately request instructions from the appropriate Department official, as designated in paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) The Department officials authorized to approve production or disclosure under this subpart are:

(1) In the event that the case or other matter which gave rise to the demanded material or information is or, if closed, was within the cognizance of a division of the Department, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of that division. This authority may be redelegated to Deputy Assistant Attorneys General.

(2) In instances of demands that are not covered by paragraph (b) (1) of this section:

(i) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if the demand is one made on an employee or former employee of that Bureau for information or if the demand calls for the production of material from the files of that Bureau, and

(ii) The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, if the demand is one made on an employee or former employee of that Bureau for information or if the demand calls for the production of material from the files of that Bureau.

(3) In instances of demands that are not covered by paragraph (b) (1) or (2) of this section, the Deputy Attorney General.

(c) If oral testimony is sought by the demand, an affidavit, or, if that is not feasible, a statement by the party seeking the testimony or his attorney, setting forth a summary of the testimony desired, must be furnished for submission by the U.S. attorney to the appropriate Department official.

§ 16.24 Final action by the appropriate Department official or the Attorney General.

(a) If the appropriate Department official, as designated in § 16.23(b), approves a demand for the production of material or disclosure of information, he shall so notify the U.S. attorney and such other persons as circumstances may warrant.

(b) If the appropriate Department official, as designated in § 16.23(b), decides not to approve a demand for the production of material or disclosure of information, he shall immediately refer the demand to the Attorney General for decision. Upon such referral, the Attorney General shall make the final decision and give notice thereof to the U.S. attorney and such other persons as circumstances may warrant.

§ 16.25 Procedure where a Department decision concerning a demand is not made prior to the time a response to the demand is required.

If response to the demand is required before the instructions from the appropriate Department official or the Attorney General are received, the U.S. attorney or other Department attorney designated for the purpose shall appear with the employee or former employee of the Department upon whom the demand has been made, and shall furnish the court or other authority with a copy of the regulations contained in this subpart and inform the court or other authority that the demand has been, or is being, as the case may be, referred for the prompt consideration of the appropriate Department official and shall respectfully request the court or authority to stay the demand pending receipt of the requested instructions.

§ 16.26 Procedure in the event of an adverse ruling.

If the court or other authority declines to stay the effect of the demand in response to a request made in accordance with § 16.25 pending receipt of instructions, or if the court or other authority rules that the demand must be complied with irrespective of instructions not to produce the material or disclose the information sought, in accordance with § 16.24, the employee or former employee upon whom the demand has been made shall respectfully decline to comply with the demand. "United States ex rel Touhy v. Ragen," 340 U.S. 462.

Dated: January 11, 1973.

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General.

[FR Doc.73-1071 Filed 1-17-73;8:45 am]

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

WASHINGTON, D. C.

May 15, 1956

ORDER NO. 116-56

It is the policy of the Department of Justice to extend the fullest possible cooperation to congressional committees requesting information from departmental files, interviews with department employees, testimony of department personnel, or testimony of Federal prisoners. The following procedures are prescribed in order to effectuate this policy on a basis which will be mutually satisfactory to the congressional committees and to the Department. [This order supersedes the Deputy Attorney General's Memorandum No. 5, dated March 23, 1953, and his Memorandum No. 97, dated August 5, 1954. It formalizes the Attorney General's press release of November 5, 1953, establishing procedures to permit committees of the Congress and their authorized representatives to interview and to take sworn testimony from Federal prisoners. It supplements Order No. 3229 (Revised) dated January 13, 1953, and Order No. 3464, Supplement No. 4 (Revised) dated January 13, 1953 (with Memorandum of "Authorization Under Order No. 3464 Supplement No. 4 (Revised)" dated January 13, 1953), insofar as said orders have reference to procedures to be followed in the Department's relations with congressional committees. In support of this order, reference should be had to the President's letter dated May 17, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Attorney General's Memorandum which accompanied it.]

A. REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION FROM DEPARTMENT FILES

1. Congressional committee requests for the examination of files or other confidential information should be reduced to writing, signed by the chairman of the committee, and addressed to the Deputy Attorney General, who is responsible for the coordination of our liaison with Congress and congressional committees. The request shall state the specific information sought as well as the specific objective for which it is sought. The Deputy Attorney General will forward the request to the appropriate division where a reply will be prepared and returned for the Deputy Attorney General's signature and dispatch to the chairman of the committee.

2. If the request concerns a closed case, i. e., one in which there is no litigation or administrative action pending or contemplated, the file may be made available for review in the Department, in the presence of the official or employee having custody thereof. The following procedure shall be followed in such cases:

a. The reply letter will advise the committee that the file is available for examination and set forth the name, telephone extension number, and room number of the person who will have custody of the file to be reviewed;

b. Before making the file available to the committee representative all reports and memoranda from the FBI as well as investigative reports from any other agency, will be removed from the file and not be made available for examination; provided however that if the committee representative states that it is essential that information from the FBI reports and memoranda be made available, he will be advised that the request will be considered by the Department. Thereafter a summary of the contents of the FBI reports and memoranda involved will be prepared which will not disclose investigative techniques, the identity of confidential informants, or other matters which might jeopardize the investigative operations of the FBI. This summary will be forwarded by the division to the FBI with a request for advice as to whether the FBI has any objection to examination of such summary by the committee representative. The file will not be physically relinquished from the custody of the Department. If the committee representative desires to examine investigative reports from other government agencies, contained in the files of the Department, he will be advised to direct his request to the agency whose reports are concerned.

3. If the request concerns an open case, i. e., one which litigation or administrative action is pending or contemplated, the file may not be made available for examination by the committee's representative. The following procedure shall be followed:

a. The reply letter should advise the committee that its request concerns a case in which litigation or administrative action is pending or contemplated, and state that the file cannot be made available until the case is completed; and

b. Should briefly set forth the status of the case in as much detail as is practicable and prudent without jeopardizing the pending contemplated litigation or administrative action.

B. REQUESTS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL

1. Requests for interviews with departmental personnel regarding any official matters within the Department should be reduced to writing, signed by the chairman of the committee, and addressed to the Deputy Attorney General. When the approval of the Deputy Attorney General is given, the employee is expected to discuss such matters freely and cooperatively with the representative, subject to the limitations prescribed in A respecting open cases and data in investigative reports;

2. Upon the completion of the interview with the committee representative the employee will prepare a summary of it for the file, with a copy routed to his division head and a copy routed to the Deputy Attorney General.

C. EMPLOYEES TESTIFYING BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

1. When an employee is requested to testify before a congressional committee regarding official matters within the Department the Deputy Attorney General shall be promptly informed. When the Deputy Attorney General's approval is given the employee is expected to testify freely subject to limitations prescribed in A respecting open cases and data in investigative reports;

2. An employee subpoenaed to testify before a congressional committee on official matters within the Department shall promptly notify the Deputy Attorney General. In general he shall be guided in testifying by Order 3229 (Revised) and the President's letter of May 17, 1954, cited at the beginning of this Order.

3. Upon the completion of his testimony the employee will prepare a memorandum outlining his testimony with a copy routed to his division head and a copy routed to the Deputy Attorney General.

D. REQUESTS OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES FOR THE TESTIMONY OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

Because of the custodial hazards involved and the extent to which their public testimony may affect the discipline and well-being of the institution, it is the policy of the Department not to deliver Federal prisoners outside the penal institution in which they are incarcerated for the purpose of being interviewed or examined under oath by congressional committees. However, when it appears that no pending investigation or legal proceeding will be adversely affected thereby and that the public interest will not be otherwise adversely affected, Federal prisoners may be interviewed or examined under oath by congressional committees in the institution in which they are incarcerated under the following procedures, and with the specific advance approval of the Deputy Attorney General.

1. Arrangements for interviewing and taking of sworn testimony from a Federal prisoner by a committee of the Congress or the authorized representatives of such a committee shall be made in the form of a written request by the chairman of the committee to the Deputy Attorney General.

2. Such written request shall be made at least ten (10) days prior to the requested date for the interview and the taking of testimony and shall be accompanied by written evidence that authorization for the interview or the taking of sworn testimony was approved by vote of the committee. Such request shall contain a statement of the purpose and the subjects upon which the prisoner will be interrogated as well as the names of all persons other than the representatives of the Department of Justice who will be present.

3. A member of the interested committee of the Congress shall be present during the entire time of the interrogation.

4. The warden of the penal institution in which the Federal prisoner is incarcerated shall, at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the time at which the interview takes place, advise the Federal prisoner concerned of the proposed interview or taking of sworn testimony; and shall further advise that he is under the same, but no greater obligation to answer than any other witness who is not a prisoner.

5. The warden of the penal institution shall have complete authority in conformity with the requirements of security and the maintenance of discipline to limit the number of persons who will be present at the interview and taking of testimony.

6. The warden or his authorized representative shall be present at the interview and at the taking of testimony and the Department of Justice shall have the right to have one of its representatives present throughout the interview and taking of testimony.

7. The committee shall arrange to have a stenographic transcript made of the entire proceedings at committee expense and shall furnish a copy of the transcript to the Department of Justice.

E. OBSERVERS IN ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE HEARINGS

In order that the Department may be kept currently advised in matters within its responsibility, and in order that the Deputy Attorney General may properly coordinate the Department's liaison with Congress and its committees, each division that has an observer in attendance at a congressional hearing, will have the observer prepare a written summary of the proceeding which should be sent to the division head and a copy routed to the Deputy Attorney General.

/s/ Herbert Brownell, Jr.

Attorney General

NR003 WA CODE

1:45AM NITEL 6-28-75 TJT

TO ATLANTA

KNOXVILLE

BIRMINGHAM

LOS ANGELES

ALBANY

TAMPA

JACKSONVILLE

CHICAGO

FROM DIRECTOR (62-116395)

PERSONAL ATTENTION

SENSTUDY 75

REBUTEL MAY 2, 1975.

INQUIRIES MADE OF BUREAU BY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE (SSC) CONCERNING A NUMBER OF PRESENT AND FORMER FBI EMPLOYEES, INCLUDING THEIR CURRENT WHEREABOUTS, SUGGESTS THEY MAY BE INTERVIEWED BY SSC STAFF CONCERNING BUREAU'S FORMER INVESTIGATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. SET OUT BELOW ARE NAMES AND LAST KNOWN ADDRESSES OF FORMER BUREAU EMPLOYEES AND OFFICE OF ASSIGNMENT OF INCUMBENTS, ALL OF WHOM SSC HAS INQUIRED ABOUT.

EACH OF THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES IS TO BE IMMEDIATELY CONTACTED AND ALERTED THAT HE MIGHT BE APPROACHED BY THE SSC STAFF ABOUT THE KING INVESTIGATION. THEY SHOULD BE TOLD THAT

Ice alert

*ASAC adv
6/28
JH*

Dead 62-2368-4

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
JUN 27 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	
SAC	TR
ASAC	

PAGE TWO

IN THE EVENT THEY ARE INTERVIEWED AND DURING THE COURSE OF SAME, QUESTIONS ARE ASKED WHICH RELATE TO SENSITIVE BUREAU OPERATIONS (SOURCES, METHODS, TECHNIQUES, THIRD AGENCY RULE AND ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS), THEY MAY REQUEST THAT AN FBI AGENT BE PRESENT. BUREAU WILL PROVIDE AGENT ON REQUEST OF INTERVIEWEE. AS A PRELUDE TO INTERVIEW, THE FORMER EMPLOYEE MAY, AFTER BEING CONTACTED BY SSC STAFF, CONTACT BUREAU'S LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION BY COLLECT CALL FOR FULL INFORMATION TO ASSIST HIM, INCLUDING OBLIGATIONS AS TO CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED AS FBI EMPLOYEE. IT IS EMPHASIZED THAT BUREAU'S OFFER OF ASSISTANCE IS NOT INTENDED TO IMPEDE SSC WORK BUT IS DONE AS COOPERATIVE GESTURE AND TO SAFEGUARD SENSITIVE BUREAU INFORMATION. CONTACTS WITH THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES TO BE HANDLED PERSONALLY BY SAC OR ASAC. IN EVENT THIS NOT FEASIBLE FOR JUST CAUSE, TO BE HANDLED BY A SENIOR SUPERVISOR.

INCUMBENT EMPLOYEES TO BE ADVISED THAT IF CONTACTED BY SSC STAFF FOR INTERVIEW, LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION TO BE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFIED THROUGH SAC.

IMMEDIATELY AFTER CONTACT, RESULTS SHOULD BE FURNISHED

PAGE THREE

BUREAU BY TELETYPE IN ABOVE CAPTION. IF A FORMER EMPLOYEE IS NO LONGER IN YOUR TERRITORY OR TEMPORARILY AWAY, SET OUT LEAD TO OTHER OFFICE IMMEDIATELY WITH COPY TO FBI HEADQUARTERS.

ATLANTA: INCUMBENTS - DONALD P. BURGESS, RICHARD E. FUGATT, EDMUND F. HAGGERTY, O. RICHARD HAMILTON, CHARLES T. HAYNES, WILBUR W. SEITZER, ROBERT W. THOMSON. FORMER - MARION E. CHEEK, 1613 GAIL AVENUE, ALBANY, GEORGIA 31705; CHARLES T. HARDING, 2243 PINECLIFF DRIVE, NORTHEAST, ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30345.

BIRMINGHAM: LAWRENCE T. GURLEY, 1340 WESTMINISTER PLACE, BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA 35235.

ALBANY: HENRY G. ROWSE, JR., 39 NORTH MAIN STREET, - *Burlington RA*
ENOSBURG FALLS, VERMONT 05450.

JACKSONVILLE: WILLIAM LEE BOLYARD - INCUMBENT.

KNOXVILLE: W. JOHN BENTON - INCUMBENT.

LOS ANGELES: JAMES M. KELLOGG - INCUMBENT.

TAMPA: JAMES E. MCMAHON, 3110 COCOS ROAD, TAMPA, FLORIDA 33618.

CHICAGO: JOHN BASSETT - INCUMBENT.

END

GMM FBI ALBANY FOR 3 TELS

ALBANY CLR

F B I

Date: 6/28/75

001

Transmit the following in CODE
(Type in plaintext or code)

Via TELETYPE NITEL
(Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (62-116395) *LRP*

FROM: SAC, ALBANY (62-2368)

SENSTUDY 75

RE BUTEL JUNE 28, 1975.

ON JUNE 28, 1975, FORMER SA HENRY G. ROWSE, JR., WAS CONTACTED BY ASAC JOHN J. HINCHCLIFFE AND ADVISED ~~THE~~ CONTENTS RE BUTEL. ROWSE STATED THAT SHOULD HE BE CONTACTED BY SCC, HE WILL CONTACT BUREAU'S LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION. ROWSE CURRENTLY RESIDING C/O P.O. BOX 65, SHELDON, VT., 05483, TELEPHONE NO. 802-848-7418, OR 73 HIGHLAND AVE., RICHFORD, VT., 05476.

JER:lvv

62-2368-5

SEARCHED	
SERIALIZED	<i>BB</i>
INDEXED	
FILED	<i>BB</i>

ASAC *[Signature]*

Approved: *REK*
Special Agent in Charge

Sent 3:47 P M Per *RVV*

NR051 WA CODE

9:37PM NITEL JULY 29, 1975 MSY

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR

PERSONAL ATTENTION

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REQUEST RE SENSITIVE INVESTIGATIVE
TECHNIQUES.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, NOTING THE DEPARTMENT IS REVIEWING
ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED UNDER PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY FOR
USE OF WARRANTLESS ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE FOR FOREIGN
INTELLIGENCE, INCLUDING COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PURPOSES, REQUESTED
A REVIEW OF ALL OTHER ACTIVITIES WHICH ARE OR CAN BE CONDUCTED
BY THE BUREAU INVOLVING NONCONSENSUAL, WARRANTLESS INTRUSION
UPON REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY; NONELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING
UPON CONVERSATIONS THOUGHT BY THE PARTICIPANTS TO BE PRIVATE;
INTERCEPTION OR OTHER RECEIPT NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE SENDER
OR RECEIVER OF THE CONTENTS OF WIRE, RADIO OR WRITTEN
COMMUNICATIONS; AND ALL OTHER ACTIVITIES, WHETHER OR NOT
INVOLVING ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE OR PHYSICAL INTRUSION, THAT
MIGHT BE CALLED INTO QUESTION OR SHOULD BE REVIEWED.

*1cc 66-2617
Elsner*

62 2567-6

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
DB	DB
JUL 30 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

[Signature]

PAGE TWO

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL REQUESTED A DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPES OF SUCH ACTIVITIES NOW BEING CONDUCTED BY THE BUREAU, AND ALSO ANY ADDITIONAL TYPES WHICH THE BUREAU CONSIDERS ITSELF AUTHORIZED TO CONDUCT. IN ADDITION, A REPORT ON ANY SUCH PAST ACTIVITIES WAS ALSO REQUESTED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

CANVASS YOUR PERSONNEL FOR ANY SUCH TYPES OF ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN YOUR OFFICE AND NOTE WHETHER USED IN ORGANIZED CRIME, GENERAL CRIMINAL, FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE, OR DOMESTIC SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS.

SUTEL BY CODED AND APPROPRIATELY CLASSIFIED NITEL,
ATTENTION INTD.

ALL LEGATS ADVISED SEPARATELY.

END

LVV FBI ALBANY

CLR TKS

NR009 WA CODE

6:10PM NITEL 8-26-75 LXS

TO ALBANY

BALTIMORE

MIAMI

PHILADELPHIA

TAMPA

FROM DIRECTOR (62-116395)

PERSONAL ATTENTION

SENSTUDY 75

REBUTEL MAY 2, 1975.

INQUIRIES MADE OF BUREAU BY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE (SSC) CONCERNING BELOW-LISTED FORMER FBI EMPLOYEES SUGGESTS THEY MAY BE INTERVIEWED BY SSC STAFF. WHILE SUBJECT OF INTERVIEWS HAS NOT BEEN DISCUSSED BY SSC, INTERVIEWS WILL LIKELY PERTAIN TO THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES' DUTIES WHILE IN THE INTERNAL SECURITY AND/OR SUBVERSIVE CONTROL SECTIONS AND MAY ALSO RELATE TO THE FORMER BUREAU'S INVESTIGATIONS OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., COMMUNIST INFLUENCES IN RACIAL MATTERS AND RELATED MATTERS. SET OUT BELOW ARE LAST KNOWN ADDRESSES OF THESE FORMER BUREAU

62-2368-7

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
AUG 26 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

PAGE TWO

EMPLOYEES.

EACH OF THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES IS TO BE IMMEDIATELY CONTACTED AND ALERTED THAT HE MIGHT BE APPROACHED BY THE SSC STAFF. THEY SHOULD BE TOLD THAT IN THE EVENT THEY ARE INTERVIEWED AND DURING COURSE OF SAME, QUESTIONS ARE ASKED WHICH RELATE TO SENSITIVE BUREAU OPERATIONS (SOURCES, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES, ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS, AND THIRD AGENCY RULE, INCLUDING IDENTITIES OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES), THEY MAY REQUEST AN FBI AGENT BE PRESENT. BUREAU WILL PROVIDE AGENT ON REQUEST OF INTERVIEWEE. AS A PRELUDE TO INTERVIEW, THE FORMER EMPLOYEE MAY, AFTER BEING CONTACTED BY SSC STAFF, CONTACT BUREAU'S LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION BY COLLECT CALL FOR FULL INFORMATION TO ASSIST HIM, INCLUDING OBLIGATIONS AS TO CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED AS FBI EMPLOYEE. IT IS EMPHASIZED THAT BUREAU'S OFFER OF ASSISTANCE IS NOT INTENDED TO IMPEDE SSC WORK BUT IS DONE AS COOPERATIVE GESTURE AND TO SAFEGUARD SENSITIVE BUREAU INFORMATION. CONTACTS WITH THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES TO BE HANDLED PERSONALLY BY SAC OR ASAC. IN EVENT THIS NOT FEASIBLE FOR JUST CAUSE, TO BE HANDLED BY A SENIOR SUPERVISOR.

PAGE THREE

IMMEDIATELY AFTER CONTACT, RESULTS SHOULD BE FURNISHED BUREAU BY TELETYPE IN ABOVE CAPTION. IF A FORMER EMPLOYEE NO LONGER IN YOUR TERRITORY OR TEMPORARILY AWAY, SET OUT LEAD TO OTHER OFFICE IMMEDIATELY WITH COPY TO FBI HEADQUARTERS.

ALBANY: JOHN H. KLEINKAUF, 1153 CULLEN AVENUE, SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK 12309; EMPLOYED AS DIRECTOR OF SECURITY AND SAFETY, UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK 12308.

BALTIMORE: JAMES F. BLAND, 4310 ROSEDALE AVENUE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20014.

MIAMI: FREDERICK F. FOX, 1450 WEST BISCAYNE CANAL ROAD, MIAMI, FLORIDA 33161.

PHILADELPHIA: MRS. KATHLEENFZOGAN, SPOUSE OF SA RICHARD E. LOGAN, ASSIGNED PHILADELPHIA OFFICE.

TAMPA: PAUL L. COX, U.S.N.A.T.O., P. O. BOX 1418, SARASOTA, FLORIDA 33578.

BEST INFORMATION BUREAU HAS CONCERNING COX'S WHEREABOUTS IS THAT HE IS CURRENTLY ON A LENGTHLY TRIP WITH A MOTOR TRAILER THROUGH CANADA AND THE MID-WEST. INDICATED ADDRESS BELIEVED TO BE A TRAILER COURT CONTACT POINT FOR MAILING PURPOSES. BUREAU DOES NOT DESIRE EXTENSIVE INVESTIGATION TO LOCATE COX AND

NR009 WA CODE

6:10PM NITEL 8-26-75 LXS

TO ALBANY

BALTIMORE

MIAMI

PHILADELPHIA

TAMPA

FROM DIRECTOR (62-116395)

PERSONAL ATTENTION

SENSTUDY 75

REBUTEL MAY 2, 1975.

INQUIRIES MADE OF BUREAU BY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE (SSC) CONCERNING BELOW-LISTED FORMER FBI EMPLOYEES SUGGESTS THEY MAY BE INTERVIEWED BY SSC STAFF. WHILE SUBJECT OF INTERVIEWS HAS NOT BEEN DISCUSSED BY SSC, INTERVIEWS WILL LIKELY PERTAIN TO THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES' DUTIES WHILE IN THE INTERNAL SECURITY AND/OR SUBVERSIVE CONTROL SECTIONS AND MAY ALSO RELATE TO THE FORMER BUREAU'S INVESTIGATIONS OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., COMMUNIST INFLUENCES IN RACIAL MATTERS AND RELATED MATTERS. SET OUT BELOW ARE LAST KNOWN ADDRESSES OF THESE FORMER BUREAU

62-2368 -7

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
AUG 26 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

PAGE TWO

EMPLOYEES.

EACH OF THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES IS TO BE IMMEDIATELY CONTACTED AND ALERTED THAT HE MIGHT BE APPROACHED BY THE SSC STAFF. THEY SHOULD BE TOLD THAT IN THE EVENT THEY ARE INTERVIEWED AND DURING COURSE OF SAME, QUESTIONS ARE ASKED WHICH RELATE TO SENSITIVE BUREAU OPERATIONS (SOURCES, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES, ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS, AND THIRD AGENCY RULE, INCLUDING IDENTITIES OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES), THEY MAY REQUEST AN FBI AGENT BE PRESENT. BUREAU WILL PROVIDE AGENT ON REQUEST OF INTERVIEWEE. AS A PRELUDE TO INTERVIEW, THE FORMER EMPLOYEE MAY, AFTER BEING CONTACTED BY SSC STAFF, CONTACT BUREAU'S LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION BY COLLECT CALL FOR FULL INFORMATION TO ASSIST HIM, INCLUDING OBLIGATIONS AS TO CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED AS FBI EMPLOYEE. IT IS EMPHASIZED THAT BUREAU'S OFFER OF ASSISTANCE IS NOT INTENDED TO IMPEDE SSC WORK BUT IS DONE AS COOPERATIVE GESTURE AND TO SAFEGUARD SENSITIVE BUREAU INFORMATION. CONTACTS WITH THESE FORMER EMPLOYEES TO BE HANDLED PERSONALLY BY SAC OR ASAC. IN EVENT THIS NOT FEASIBLE FOR JUST CAUSE, TO BE HANDLED BY A SENIOR SUPERVISOR.

PAGE THREE

IMMEDIATELY AFTER CONTACT, RESULTS SHOULD BE FURNISHED BUREAU BY TELETYPE IN ABOVE CAPTION. IF A FORMER EMPLOYEE NO LONGER IN YOUR TERRITORY OR TEMPORARILY AWAY, SET OUT LEAD TO OTHER OFFICE IMMEDIATELY WITH COPY TO FBI HEADQUARTERS.

ALBANY: JOHN H. KLEINKAUF, 1153 CULLEN AVENUE, SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK 12309; EMPLOYED AS DIRECTOR OF SECURITY AND SAFETY, UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK 12308.

BALTIMORE: JAMES F. BLAND, 4310 ROSEDALE AVENUE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20014.

MIAMI: FREDERICK F. FOX, 1450 WEST BISCAYNE CANAL ROAD, MIAMI, FLORIDA 33161.

PHILADELPHIA: MRS. KATHLEENFZOGAN, SPOUSE OF SA RICHARD E. LOGAN, ASSIGNED PHILADELPHIA OFFICE.

TAMPA: PAUL L. COX, U.S.N.A.T.O., P. O. BOX 1418, SARASOTA, FLORIDA 33578.

BEST INFORMATION BUREAU HAS CONCERNING COX'S WHEREABOUTS IS THAT HE IS CURRENTLY ON A LENGTHLY TRIP WITH A MOTOR TRAILER THROUGH CANADA AND THE MID-WEST. INDICATED ADDRESS BELIEVED TO BE A TRAILER COURT CONTACT POINT FOR MAILING PURPOSES. BUREAU DOES NOT DESIRE EXTENSIVE INVESTIGATION TO LOCATE COX AND

8/25/75

SACs CONFERENCE

Senate Select Committee (SSC) Staff Interviews - Privileged Areas

In connection with the staff interviews there has been general agreement between the SSC, the Department and the Bureau that there are four main privileged areas and that current and ex-FBI employees need not answer questions which fall into these areas which are as follows:

- (1) Information which indentifies or may identify FBI sources.
- (2) Information which may adversely affect ongoing FBI investigations.
- (3) Information concerning sensitive methods and techniques.
- (4) Information obtained from third agencies, including foreign intelligence agencies.

done

62-2368
~~66-2885-7A~~

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
AUG 26 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	
	<i>RIL</i>

F B I

Date:

8/27/75

006

Transmit the following in CODE

(Type in plaintext or code)

Via HITFL

(Priority)

TO DIRECTOR (62-116395) *SMD*

FROM SAC, ALBANY (62-2368)

SENSTUDY

REBUTEL AUGUST 26, 1975

ON AUGUST 27, 1975 JOHN H. KLEINKAUF WAS CONTACTED
BY ASAC ALBANY ADVISED COMMENTS RE BUTEL.

JJH; jjh

62-2368-8

[Handwritten initials in a box]

SAC *[Signature]*

Approved: *[Signature]*
Special Agent in Charge

Sent *11:36* PM Per *[Signature]*

NRC33 WA CODE

6:16PM 9/4/75 NITEL AJM

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR (62-116395)

PERSONAL ATTENTION **REK/HA**
✓
SENSTUDY 75

REBUTEL MAY 2, 1975.

PURPOSES OF INSTANT TELETYPE ARE TO (1) REITERATE THAT FBI HAS PLEDGED FULL COOPERATION WITH THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE (SSC) AND WISHES TO ASSIST AND FACILITATE ANY INVESTIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE SSC WITH RESPECT TO THE FBI; AND (2) SET FORTH NEW PROCEDURE RELATING TO SSC STAFF INTERVIEWS OF CURRENT AND FORMER FBI EMPLOYEES.

FOR INFORMATION OF THOSE OFFICES WHICH HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY HAD CURRENT OR FORMER EMPLOYEES IN ITS TERRITORY INTERVIEWED BY THE SSC, THE BUREAU FREQUENTLY LEARNS FROM THE SSC OR OTHERWISE THAT FORMER EMPLOYEES ARE BEING CONSIDERED FOR INTERVIEW BY THE SSC STAFF. INSTRUCTIONS ARE ISSUED FOR THE FIELD OFFICE TO CONTACT THE FORMER EMPLOYEE TO ALERT HIM AS TO POSSIBLE INTERVIEW, REMIND HIM OF HIS CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT WITH THE BUREAU AND SUGGEST THAT IF HE IS CONTACTED FOR

ASAC _____
GILBERT _____
KEEFE _____
LONERGAN _____

icc
dzt

(Last)

62-2368-9

SEARCHED <i>SP</i>	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>BB</i>	FILED <i>PS</i>
SEP 4 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

RCR

PAGE TWO

INTERVIEW, HE MAY CONTACT THE LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION BY COLLECT CALL FOR FURTHER INFORMATION. IN THE USUAL CASE, AS CIRCUMSTANCES UNFOLD, THE FORMER EMPLOYEE IS TOLD (1) THAT HE HAS A RIGHT TO LEGAL COUNSEL, BUT THAT THE BUREAU CANNOT PROVIDE SAME; (2) THAT THE BUREAU HAS WAIVED THE CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT FOR THE INTERVIEW WITHIN SPECIFIED PARAMETERS; AND (3) THAT THERE ARE FOUR PRIVILEGED AREAS IN WHICH HE IS NOT REQUIRED TO ANSWER QUESTION. THESE AREAS ARE RELATING TO INFORMATION WHICH MAY (A) IDENTIFY BUREAU SOURCES; (B) REVEAL SENSITIVE METHODS/TECHNIQUES; (C) REVEAL IDENTITIES OF THIRD AGENCIES, INCLUDING FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES, OR INFORMATION FROM SUCH AGENCIES; AND (D) ADVERSELY AFFECT ONGOING BUREAU INVESTIGATIONS.

HERETOFORE, BUREAU HAS OFFERED INTERVIEWEES CONSULTATION PRIVILEGES WHEREBY A BUREAU SUPERVISOR WOULD BE AVAILABLE NEARBY, ALTHOUGH NOT ACTUALLY AT INTERVIEW, SO INTERVIEWEE MIGHT CONSULT WITH HIM SHOULD QUESTIONS ARISE AS TO PARAMETERS OF INTERVIEW OR PRIVILEGED AREAS. THE CONSULTANT DID NOT ACT AS A LEGAL ADVISOR.

EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY, BUREAU WILL NO LONGER PROVIDE

PAGE THREE

ON-THE-SCENE PERSONNEL FOR CONSULTATION PURPOSES TO ASSIST EITHER CURRENT OF FORMER EMPLOYEES. PROSPECTIVE INTERVIEWEES SHOULD BE TOLD THAT, IF THEY DESIRE ASSISTANCE OF THIS NATURE DURING AN INTERVIEW, THEY MAY CONTACT EITHER PERSONALLY (IF INTERVIEW IS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.) OR BY COLLECT CALL, THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE INTELLIGENCE DIVISION, MR. W. R. WANNALL, OR, IN HIS ABSENCE, SECTION CHIEF W. O. CREGAR.

THIS CHANGE IN PROCEDURE SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED AS LESSENING THE ASSISTANCE WE ARE FURNISHING TO CURRENT AND FORMER EMPLOYEES.

FOR YOUR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, I AM WORKING WITH THE DEPARTMENT IN EXPLORING AVENUES TO ARRANGE LEGAL REPRESENTATION, WHEN NECESSARY, FOR CURRENT AND FORMER EMPLOYEES WITHOUT EXPENSE TO THEM. YOU WILL BE KEPT ADVISED OF DEVELOPMENTS IN THIS REGARD.

END

LVV FBI ALBANY

CLR

NR045 WA PLAIN

732PMNITEL 10/9/75 GHS

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR

INTERVIEWS OF FBI EMPLOYEES BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

BY MEMORANDUM TO ALL EMPLOYEES DATED MAY 28, 1975,
CAPTIONED "INTERVIEWS OF FBI EMPLOYEES," ALL EMPLOYEES WERE
ADVISED OF THE NECESSITY OF SECURING FBI HEADQUARTERS APPROVAL
PRIOR TO SUBMITTING TO INTERVIEWS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF CON-
GRESSIONAL COMMITTEES. THE NECESSITY OF SECURING THIS AP-
PROVAL IS PROMPTED BY THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT ALL EMPLOYEES
HAVE SIGNED.

YOU WERE ADVISED THAT CONGRESSIONAL STAFF MEMBERS
WERE CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS OF FORMER AND/OR CURRENT EMPLOYEES
AND THAT THIS BUREAU HAD PLEDGED ITS COOPERATION WITH CON-
GRESS. OUR COOPERATIVE EFFORTS, OF COURSE, MUST BE CONSISTENT
WITH BUREAU PROCEDURES.

RECENTLY, WE HAVE HAD ATTEMPTS BY CONGRESSIONAL
COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS TO INTERVIEW CURRENT EMPLOYEES WITHOUT
PRIOR CONTACT WITH FBI HEADQUARTERS. YOU ARE AGAIN REMINDED

*ICC
dest.*

62-2368-10

SEARCHED <i>JS</i>	INDEXED <i>JS</i>
SERIALIZED <i>JS</i>	FILED <i>JS</i>
OCT 9 - 1975	
FBI-ALBANY <i>RW</i>	

PAGE TWO

THAT IF A REPRESENTATIVE OF A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE SHOULD CONTACT A BUREAU EMPLOYEE, THAT EMPLOYEE SHOULD DECLINE TO RESPOND TO QUESTIONS POSED TO HIM AND ADVISE THE CONGRESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER OF THE NECESSITY OF RECEIVING FBI HEADQUARTERS APPROVAL BEFORE RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS.

END

LVV FBI ALBANY

ACK FOR THREE

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : ALL EMPLOYEES (62-2368)

FROM : SAC ROBERT E. KENT *RK*

SUBJECT: INTERVIEWS OF FBI EMPLOYEES
BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

DATE: 10/10/75

ReButel 10/9/75.

By memorandum to all employees dated May 28, 1975, captioned "Interviews of FBI Employees," all employees were advised of the necessity of securing FBI Headquarters approval prior to submitting to interviews by representatives of Congressional committees. The necessity of securing this approval is prompted by the employment agreement all employees have signed.

You were advised that Congressional staff members were conducting interviews of former and/or current employees and that this Bureau had pledged its cooperation with Congress. Our cooperative efforts, of course, must be consistent with Bureau procedures.

Recently, we have had attempts by Congressional committee staff members to interview current employees without prior contact with FBI Headquarters. You are again reminded that if a representative of a Congressional committee should contact a Bureau employee, that employee should decline to respond to questions posed to him and advise the Congressional staff member of the necessity of receiving FBI Headquarters approval before responding to questions.

All employees of the Albany Division are instructed that contacts received from representatives of Congressional committees should be immediately referred to the SAC without exception.

1 - Each Employee
① - 62-2368
1 - 66-11
REK: pac

Sent 10/14/75

Dead

62-2368-11

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>RS</i>	FILED <i>RS</i>
OCT 14 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	



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 Cartha (Deke) DeLoach, Lyndon Johnson's personal contact with the F.B.I. in the witness chair. What did President Johnson know about the character 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 jowl-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.

Duh. You'd think that after all the nation 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 - RK
✓ ASAS
✓ Supv
✓ Supv
✓ Supv
3 MB
[Handwritten signatures and initials]

FILE in
SENSITIVE
FILE
RK

62-2368-11A
166 2885-4

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED 1082	FILED PR
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:

- 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

[Handwritten signatures]

~~11-21-75~~

SEARCHED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INDEXED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SERIALIZED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FILED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NOV 24 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

62-236F-11B

NR050 WA PLAIN

10:34PM NITEL 12/10/75 GHS

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR

DIRECTOR'S APPEARANCE BEFORE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 10, 1975

A COPY OF THE STATEMENT I DELIVERED BEFORE THE SENATE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES TODAY HAS BEEN
SENT ALL OFFICES. FOR YOUR INFORMATION, THERE FOLLOWS A
SYNOPSIS ACCOUNT OF THE MAJOR AREAS OF THE COMMITTEE'S
QUESTIONS TO ME, TOGETHER WITH MY RESPONSES:

(1) REGARDING FBI INFORMANTS, QUESTIONS WERE ASKED
WHETHER COURT APPROVAL SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR FBI USE OF
INFORMANTS IN INVESTIGATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS (MY RESPONSE
WAS THAT THE CONTROLS WHICH EXIST TODAY OVER USE OF INFORMANTS
ARE SATISFACTORY); HOW CAN FBI KEEP INFORMANTS OPERATING
WITHIN PROPER LIMITS SO THEY DO NOT INVADE RIGHTS OF OTHER
PERSONS (MY RESPONSE WAS THAT RELIANCE MUST BE PLACED ON THE
INDIVIDUAL AGENTS HANDLING INFORMANTS AND THOSE SUPERVISING
THE AGENTS' WORK, THAT INFORMANTS WHO VIOLATE THE LAW CAN BE

- ✓ ASAC _____
- ✓ GILBERT _____
- ✓ KEEFE _____
- ✓ LONERGAN _____

JERSEY FILE

Dead

62-7361-12

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
DEC 10 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	

PAGE TWO

PROSECUTED -- AS CAN ANY AGENT WHO COUNSELS AN INFORMANT TO COMMIT VIOLATIONS); AND DID FORMER KLAN INFORMANT GARY ROWE TESTIFY ACCURATELY WHEN HE TOLD THE COMMITTEE ON DECEMBER 2 THAT HE INFORMED FBI OF PLANNED ACTS OF VIOLENCE BUT FBI DID NOT ACT TO PREVENT THEM (MY RESPONSE WAS THAT ROWE'S TESTIMONY WAS NOT ACCURATE).

(2) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING IMPROPER CONDUCT BY FBI EMPLOYEES, I STATED THAT ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF LAW BY FBI PERSONNEL SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED BY THE FBI OR OTHER APPROPRIATE AGENCY; THAT THE INSPECTION DIVISION HAS CONDUCTED INQUIRIES REGARDING ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT; THAT AN OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY HAS JUST BEEN ESTABLISHED IN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, AND WE WILL ADVISE THAT OFFICE OF OUR MAJOR INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING FBI EMPLOYEES, FOR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF LAW, REGULATIONS, OR STANDARDS OF CONDUCT; THAT I WOULD RESERVE COMMENT REGARDING POSSIBLE CREATION OF A NATIONAL INSPECTOR GENERAL TO CONSIDER MATTERS OF MISCONDUCT BY EMPLOYEES OF ANY FEDERAL AGENCY.

PAGE THREE

(3) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING HARASSMENT OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., I STATED THAT THE PERSONS WHO ISSUED THE ORDERS WHICH RESULTED IN SUCH HARASSMENT SHOULD FACE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR IT, RATHER THAN THOSE UNDER THEM WHO CARRIED OUT SUCH ORDERS IN GOOD FAITH; THAT THE FBI STILL HAS RECORDINGS RESULTING FROM ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCES OF KING; THAT WE RETAIN RECORDINGS FOR TEN YEARS BUT WE ALSO HAVE AGREED TO A REQUEST FROM THE SENATE NOT TO DESTROY INFORMATION IN OUR FILES WHILE CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRIES ARE BEING CONDUCTED; THAT I HAVE NOT REVIEWED THE KING TAPES; THAT IF THE COMMITTEE REQUESTED TO REVIEW THE KING TAPES, THE REQUEST WOULD BE REFERRED TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(4) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING WHETHER IT WOULD BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO SEPARATE THE FBI CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES AND OUR INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS, I STATED THAT WE HAVE FOUND THE TWO AREAS TO BE COMPATIBLE, AND I FEEL THE FBI IS DOING A SPLENDID JOB IN BOTH AREAS.

(5) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ADEQUACY OF CONTROLS ON REQUESTS FROM THE WHITE HOUSE AND FROM OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR FBI INVESTIGATIONS OR FOR INFORMATION

PAGE FOUR

FROM OUR FILES, I STATED THAT WHEN SUCH REQUESTS ARE MADE ORALLY, THEY SHOULD BE CONFIRMED IN WRITING; THAT WE WOULD WELCOME ANY LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES THE CONGRESS FEELS WOULD PROTECT THE FBI FROM THE POSSIBILITY OF PARTISAN MISUSE.

A FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WILL BE FURNISHED TO EACH OFFICE AS SOON AS IT IS AVAILABLE.

ALL LEGATS ADVISED SEPARATELY.

END

PLS ACK FOR 2 TELS

LVV FBI ALBANY

ACK FOR TWO CLR

TKS

NR050 WA PLAIN

10:34PM NITEL 12/10/75 GHS

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR

DIRECTOR'S APPEARANCE BEFORE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 10, 1975

A COPY OF THE STATEMENT I DELIVERED BEFORE THE SENATE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES TODAY HAS BEEN
SENT ALL OFFICES. FOR YOUR INFORMATION, THERE FOLLOWS A
SYNOPSIS ACCOUNT OF THE MAJOR AREAS OF THE COMMITTEE'S
QUESTIONS TO ME, TOGETHER WITH MY RESPONSES:

(1) REGARDING FBI INFORMANTS, QUESTIONS WERE ASKED
WHETHER COURT APPROVAL SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR FBI USE OF
INFORMANTS IN INVESTIGATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS (MY RESPONSE
WAS THAT THE CONTROLS WHICH EXIST TODAY OVER USE OF INFORMANTS
ARE SATISFACTORY); HOW CAN FBI KEEP INFORMANTS OPERATING
WITHIN PROPER LIMITS SO THEY DO NOT INVADE RIGHTS OF OTHER
PERSONS (MY RESPONSE WAS THAT RELIANCE MUST BE PLACED ON THE
INDIVIDUAL AGENTS HANDLING INFORMANTS AND THOSE SUPERVISING
THE AGENTS' WORK, THAT INFORMANTS WHO VIOLATE THE LAW CAN BE

62-2368-12

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>AB</i>	FILED <i>AB</i>
DEC 10 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

RC

PAGE TWO

PROSECUTED -- AS CAN ANY AGENT WHO COUNSELS AN INFORMANT TO COMMIT VIOLATIONS); AND DID FORMER KLAN INFORMANT GARY ROWE TESTIFY ACCURATELY WHEN HE TOLD THE COMMITTEE ON DECEMBER 2 THAT HE INFORMED FBI OF PLANNED ACTS OF VIOLENCE BUT FBI DID NOT ACT TO PREVENT THEM (MY RESPONSE WAS THAT ROWE'S TESTIMONY WAS NOT ACCURATE).

(2) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING IMPROPER CONDUCT BY FBI EMPLOYEES, I STATED THAT ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF LAW BY FBI PERSONNEL SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED BY THE FBI OR OTHER APPROPRIATE AGENCY; THAT THE INSPECTION DIVISION HAS CONDUCTED INQUIRIES REGARDING ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT; THAT AN OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY HAS JUST BEEN ESTABLISHED IN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, AND WE WILL ADVISE THAT OFFICE OF OUR MAJOR INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL, INCLUDING FBI EMPLOYEES, FOR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF LAW, REGULATIONS, OR STANDARDS OF CONDUCT; THAT I WOULD RESERVE COMMENT REGARDING POSSIBLE CREATION OF A NATIONAL INSPECTOR GENERAL TO CONSIDER MATTERS OF MISCONDUCT BY EMPLOYEES OF ANY FEDERAL AGENCY.

PAGE THREE

(3) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING HARASSMENT OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., I STATED THAT THE PERSONS WHO ISSUED THE ORDERS WHICH RESULTED IN SUCH HARASSMENT SHOULD FACE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR IT, RATHER THAN THOSE UNDER THEM WHO CARRIED OUT SUCH ORDERS IN GOOD FAITH; THAT THE FBI STILL HAS RECORDINGS RESULTING FROM ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCES OF KING; THAT WE RETAIN RECORDINGS FOR TEN YEARS BUT WE ALSO HAVE AGREED TO A REQUEST FROM THE SENATE NOT TO DESTROY INFORMATION IN OUR FILES WHILE CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRIES ARE BEING CONDUCTED; THAT I HAVE NOT REVIEWED THE KING TAPES; THAT IF THE COMMITTEE REQUESTED TO REVIEW THE KING TAPES, THE REQUEST WOULD BE REFERRED TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(4) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING WHETHER IT WOULD BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO SEPARATE THE FBI CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES AND OUR INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS, I STATED THAT WE HAVE FOUND THE TWO AREAS TO BE COMPATIBLE, AND I FEEL THE FBI IS DOING A SPLENDID JOB IN BOTH AREAS.

(5) IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ADEQUACY OF CONTROLS ON REQUESTS FROM THE WHITE HOUSE AND FROM OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR FBI INVESTIGATIONS OR FOR INFORMATION

PAGE FOUR

FROM OUR FILES, I STATED THAT WHEN SUCH REQUESTS ARE MADE ORALLY, THEY SHOULD BE CONFIRMED IN WRITING; THAT WE WOULD WELCOME ANY LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES THE CONGRESS FEELS WOULD PROTECT THE FBI FROM THE POSSIBILITY OF PARTISAN MISUSE.

A FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WILL BE FURNISHED TO EACH OFFICE AS SOON AS IT IS AVAILABLE.

ALL LEGATS ADVISED SEPARATELY.

END

PLS ACK FOR 2 TELS

LVV FBI ALBANY

ACK FOR TWO CLR

TKS



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

FOR RELEASE
10 A.M., EST
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1975

STATEMENT OF

CLARENCE M. KELLEY

DIRECTOR

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

U. S. SENATE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DECEMBER 10, 1975

62-2368-13

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>hec</i>	FILED <i>hec</i>
DEC 12 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	



I welcome the interest which this Committee has shown in the FBI and most particularly in our operations in the intelligence and internal security fields.

I share your high regard for the rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Throughout my 35-year career in law enforcement you will find the same insistence, as has been expressed by this Committee, upon programs of law enforcement that are themselves fully consistent with law.

I also have strongly supported the concept of legislative oversight. In fact, at the time my appointment as Director of the FBI was being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee two and one-half years ago, I told the members of that Committee of my firm belief in Congressional oversight.

This Committee has completed the most exhaustive study of our intelligence and security operations that has ever been undertaken by anyone

outside the FBI other than the present Attorney General. At the outset, we pledged our fullest cooperation and promised to be as candid and forthright as possible in responding to your questions and complying with your requests.

I believe we have lived up to those promises.

The members and staff of this Committee have had unprecedented access to FBI information.

You have talked to the personnel who conduct security-type investigations and who are personally involved in every facet of our day-to-day intelligence operations.

You have attended numerous briefings by FBI officials who have sought to familiarize the Committee and its staff with all major areas of our activities and operations in the national security and intelligence fields.

In brief, you have had a firsthand examination of these matters that is unmatched at any time in the history of the Congress.

As this Committee has stated, these hearings have, of necessity, focused largely on certain errors and abuses. I credit this Committee for its forthright recognition that the hearings do not give a full or balanced account of the FBI's record of performance.

It is, perhaps, in the nature of such hearings to focus on abuses to the exclusion of positive accomplishments of the organization.

The Counterintelligence Programs which have received the lion's share of public attention and critical comment constituted an infinitesimal portion of our overall work.

A Justice Department Committee which was formed last year to conduct a thorough study of the FBI's Counterintelligence Programs has reported that in the five basic ones it found 3,247 Counterintelligence proposals were submitted to FBI Headquarters from 1956 to 1971. Of this total, 2,370 -- less than three-fourths -- were approved.

I repeat, the vast majority of those 3,247 proposals were being devised, considered, and many were rejected, in an era when the FBI was handling an average of 700,000 investigative matters per year.

Nonetheless, the criticism which has been expressed regarding the Counterintelligence Programs is most legitimate and understandable.

The question might well be asked what I had in mind when I stated last year that for the FBI to have done less than it did under the circumstances then existing would have been an abdication of its responsibilities to the American people.

What I said then -- in 1974 -- and what I believe today, is that the FBI employees involved in these programs did what they felt was expected of them by the President, the Attorney General, the Congress, and the people of the United States.

Bomb explosions rocked public and private offices and buildings; rioters led by revolutionary extremists laid siege to military, industrial, and educational facilities; and killings, maimings, and other atrocities accompanied such acts of violence from New England to California..

The victims of these acts were human beings -- men, women, and children. As is the case in time of peril -- whether real or perceived -- they looked to their Government, their elected and appointed leadership, and to the FBI and other law enforcement agencies to protect their lives, their property, and their rights.

There were many calls for action from Members of Congress and others, but few guidelines were furnished. The FBI and other law enforcement agencies were besieged by demands...impatient demands...for immediate action.

FBI employees recognized the danger; felt they had a responsibility to respond; and, in good faith,

initiated actions designed to counter conspiratorial efforts of self-proclaimed revolutionary groups, and to neutralize violent activities.

In the development and execution of these programs, mistakes of judgment admittedly were made.

Our concern over whatever abuses occurred in the Counterintelligence Programs -- and there were some substantial ones -- should not obscure the underlying purpose of those programs.

We must recognize that situations have occurred in the past and will arise in the future where the Government may well be expected to depart from its traditional role -- in the FBI's case, as an investigative and intelligence-gathering agency -- and take affirmative steps which are needed to meet an imminent threat to human life or property.

In short, if we learn a murder or bombing is to be carried out NOW, can we truly meet our responsibilities by investigating only after the crime has occurred, or should we have the ability to prevent? I refer to those instances where there is a strong sense of urgency because of an imminent threat to human life.

Where there exists the potential to penetrate and disrupt, the Congress must consider the question of

whether or not such preventive action should be available to the FBI.

These matters are currently being addressed by a task force in the Justice Department, including the FBI, and I am confident that Departmental guidelines and controls can be developed in cooperation with pertinent Committees of Congress to insure that such measures are used in an entirely responsible manner.

Probably the most important question here today is what assurances can I give that the errors and abuses which arose under the Counterintelligence Programs will not occur again?

First, let me assure the Committee that some very substantial changes have been made in key areas of the FBI's methods of operations since I took the oath of office as Director on July 9, 1973.

Today we place a high premium on openness -- openness both within and without the service.

I have instituted a program of open, frank discussion in the decision-making process which insures that no future program or major policy decision will ever be adopted without a full and critical review of its propriety.

Participatory management has become a fact in the FBI.

I have made it known throughout our Headquarters and Field Divisions that I welcome all employees, regardless of position or degree of experience, to contribute their thoughts and suggestions, and to voice whatever criticisms or reservations they may have concerning any area of our operations.

The ultimate decisions in the Bureau are mine, and I take full responsibility for them. My goal is to achieve maximum critical analysis among our personnel without in any manner weakening or undermining our basic command structure.

The results of this program have been most beneficial...to me personally...to the FBI's disciplined performance...and to the morale of our employees.

In addition, since some of the mistakes of the past were occasioned by direct orders from higher authorities outside the FBI, we have welcomed Attorney General Edward Levi's guidance, counsel, and his continuous availability -- in his own words -- "as a 'lightning rod' to deflect improper requests."

Within days after taking office, Attorney General Levi instructed that I immediately report to him any

requests or practices which, in my judgment, were improper or which, considering the context of the request, I believed presented the appearance of impropriety.

I am pleased to report to this Committee as I have to the Attorney General that during my nearly two and one-half years as Director under two Presidents and three Attorneys General, no one has approached me or made overtures -- directly or otherwise -- to use the FBI for partisan political or other improper purposes.

I can assure you that I would not for a moment consider honoring any such request.

I can assure you, too, in my administration of the FBI I routinely bring to the attention of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General major policy questions, including those which arise in my continuing review of our operations and practices. These are discussed openly and candidly in order that the Attorney General can exercise his responsibilities over the FBI.

I am convinced that the basic structure of the FBI today is sound. But it would be a mistake to think that integrity can be assured only through institutional means.

Integrity is a human quality. It depends upon the character of the person who occupies the office of Director and every member of the FBI under him.

I am proud of the 19,000 men and women with whom it is my honor to serve today. Their dedication, their professionalism, their standards, and the self-discipline which they personally demand of themselves and expect of their associates are the Nation's ultimate assurance of proper and responsible conduct at all times by the FBI.

The Congress and the members of this Committee in particular have gained a great insight into the problems confronting the FBI in the security and intelligence fields -- problems which all too often we have been left to resolve without sufficient guidance from the Executive Branch or the Congress itself.

As in all human endeavors, errors of judgment have been made. But no one who is looking for the cause of our failures should confine his search solely to the FBI, or even to the Executive Branch.

The Congress itself has long possessed the mechanism for FBI oversight; yet, seldom has it been exercised.

An initial step was taken in the Senate in 1973 when the Committee on the Judiciary established a Subcommittee on FBI Oversight. Hearings had been

commenced, and we were fully committed to maximum participation with the members of that Subcommittee.

I laud their efforts. However, those efforts are of very recent origin in terms of the FBI's history.

One of the greatest benefits of the study this Committee has made is the expert knowledge you have gained of the complex problems confronting the FBI. But I respectfully submit that those benefits are wasted if they do not lead to the next step -- a step that I believe is absolutely essential -- a legislative charter, expressing Congressional determination of intelligence jurisdiction for the FBI.

Action to resolve the problems confronting us in the security and intelligence fields is urgently needed; and it must be undertaken in a forthright manner. Neither the Congress nor the public can afford to look the other way, leaving it to the FBI to do what must be done, as too often has occurred in the past.

This means too that Congress must assume a continuing role, not in the initial decision-making process but in the review of our performance.

I would caution against a too-ready reliance upon the Courts to do our tough thinking for us. Some proposals that have been advanced during these hearings would extend the role of the Courts into the early stages

of the investigative process and, thereby, would take over what historically have been Executive Branch decisions.

I frankly feel that such a trend, if unchecked, would seriously undermine the independence of the Judiciary and cast them in a role not contemplated by the authors of our Constitution. Judicial review cannot be a substitute for Congressional oversight or Executive decision.

The FBI urgently needs a clear and workable determination of our jurisdiction in the intelligence field, a jurisdictional statement that the Congress finds to be responsive to both the will and the needs of the American people.

Senators, first and foremost, I am a police officer -- a career police officer. In my police experience, the most frustrating of all problems that I have discovered facing law enforcement in this country -- Federal, state, or local -- is when demands are made of them to perform their traditional role as protector of life and property without clear and understandable legal bases to do so.

I recognize that the formulation of such a legislative charter will be a most precise and demanding task.

It must be sufficiently flexible that it does not stifle FBI effectiveness in combating the growing incidence of crime and violence across the United States. That charter must clearly address the demonstrated problems of the past; yet, it must amply recognize the fact that times change and so also do the nature and thrust of our criminal and subversive challenges.

The fact that the Department of Justice has commenced the formulation of operational guidelines governing our intelligence activities does not in any manner diminish the need for legislation. The responsibility for conferring jurisdiction resides with the Congress.

In this regard, I am troubled by some proposals which question the need for intelligence gathering, suggesting that information needed for the prevention of violence can be acquired in the normal course of criminal investigations.

As a practical matter, the line between intelligence work and regular criminal investigations is often difficult to describe. What begins as an intelligence investigation may well end in arrest and prosecution of the subject. But there are some fundamental differences between these

investigations that should be recognized -- differences in scope, in objective and in the time of initiation. In the usual criminal case, a crime has occurred and it remains only for the Government to identify the perpetrator and to collect sufficient evidence for prosecution. Since the investigation normally follows the elements of the crime, the scope of the inquiry is limited and fairly well defined.

By contrast, intelligence work involves the gathering of information, not necessarily evidence. The purpose may well be not to prosecute, but rather to thwart crime or to insure that the Government has enough information to meet any future crisis or emergency. The inquiry is necessarily broad because it must tell us not only the nature of the threat, but also whether the threat is imminent, the persons involved, and the means by which the threat will be carried out. The ability of the Government to prevent criminal acts is dependent on our anticipation of those unlawful acts. Anticipation, in turn, is dependent on advance information -- that is intelligence.

Certainly, reasonable people can differ on these issues. Given the opportunity, I am confident that the continuing need for intelligence work can be documented to the full satisfaction of the Congress. We

recognize that what is at stake here is not the interests of the FBI, but rather the interests of every citizen of this country. We recognize also that the resolution of these matters will demand extensive and thoughtful deliberation by the Congress. To this end, I pledge the complete cooperation of the Bureau with this Committee or its successor in this important task.

In any event, you have my unqualified assurance as Director that we will carry out both the letter and the spirit of such legislation as the Congress may enact.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

FOR RELEASE
10 A.M., EST
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1975

STATEMENT OF

CLARENCE M. KELLEY

DIRECTOR

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

U. S. SENATE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DECEMBER 10, 1975

Lead

*QED
SEND CC TO
ALL AGENTS
RIC*

*Copy sent
to all
agents
12/20/75
AF*

*SAC CC
DELETED*

*SENSITIVE
FILE*

62-2368-13

SEARCHED <i>lee</i>	INDEXED <i>rec</i>
SERIALIZED <i>lee</i>	FILED <i>rec</i>
DEC 12 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	



I welcome the interest which this Committee has shown in the FBI and most particularly in our operations in the intelligence and internal security fields.

I share your high regard for the rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Throughout my 35-year career in law enforcement you will find the same insistence, as has been expressed by this Committee, upon programs of law enforcement that are themselves fully consistent with law.

I also have strongly supported the concept of legislative oversight. In fact, at the time my appointment as Director of the FBI was being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee two and one-half years ago, I told the members of that Committee of my firm belief in Congressional oversight.

This Committee has completed the most exhaustive study of our intelligence and security operations that has ever been undertaken by anyone

outside the FBI other than the present Attorney General. At the outset, we pledged our fullest cooperation and promised to be as candid and forthright as possible in responding to your questions and complying with your requests.

I believe we have lived up to those promises.

The members and staff of this Committee have had unprecedented access to FBI information.

You have talked to the personnel who conduct security-type investigations and who are personally involved in every facet of our day-to-day intelligence operations.

You have attended numerous briefings by FBI officials who have sought to familiarize the Committee and its staff with all major areas of our activities and operations in the national security and intelligence fields.

In brief, you have had a firsthand examination of these matters that is unmatched at any time in the history of the Congress.

As this Committee has stated, these hearings have, of necessity, focused largely on certain errors and abuses. I credit this Committee for its forthright recognition that the hearings do not give a full or balanced account of the FBI's record of performance.

It is, perhaps, in the nature of such hearings to focus on abuses to the exclusion of positive accomplishments of the organization.

The Counterintelligence Programs which have received the lion's share of public attention and critical comment constituted an infinitesimal portion of our overall work.

A Justice Department Committee which was formed last year to conduct a thorough study of the FBI's Counterintelligence Programs has reported that in the five basic ones it found 3,247 Counterintelligence proposals were submitted to FBI Headquarters from 1956 to 1971. Of this total, 2,370 -- less than three-fourths -- were approved.

I repeat, the vast majority of those 3,247 proposals were being devised, considered, and many were rejected, in an era when the FBI was handling an average of 700,000 investigative matters per year.

Nonetheless, the criticism which has been expressed regarding the Counterintelligence Programs is most legitimate and understandable.

The question might well be asked what I had in mind when I stated last year that for the FBI to have done less than it did under the circumstances then existing would have been an abdication of its responsibilities to the American people.

What I said then -- in 1974 -- and what I believe today, is that the FBI employees involved in these programs did what they felt was expected of them by the President, the Attorney General, the Congress, and the people of the United States.

Bomb explosions rocked public and private offices and buildings; rioters led by revolutionary extremists laid siege to military, industrial, and educational facilities; and killings, maimings, and other atrocities accompanied such acts of violence from New England to California.

The victims of these acts were human beings -- men, women, and children. As is the case in time of peril -- whether real or perceived -- they looked to their Government, their elected and appointed leadership, and to the FBI and other law enforcement agencies to protect their lives, their property, and their rights.

There were many calls for action from Members of Congress and others, but few guidelines were furnished. The FBI and other law enforcement agencies were besieged by demands...impatient demands...for immediate action.

FBI employees recognized the danger; felt they had a responsibility to respond; and, in good faith,

initiated actions designed to counter conspiratorial efforts of self-proclaimed revolutionary groups, and to neutralize violent activities.

In the development and execution of these programs, mistakes of judgment admittedly were made.

Our concern over whatever abuses occurred in the Counterintelligence Programs -- and there were some substantial ones -- should not obscure the underlying purpose of those programs.

We must recognize that situations have occurred in the past and will arise in the future where the Government may well be expected to depart from its traditional role -- in the FBI's case, as an investigative and intelligence-gathering agency -- and take affirmative steps which are needed to meet an imminent threat to human life or property.

In short, if we learn a murder or bombing is to be carried out NOW, can we truly meet our responsibilities by investigating only after the crime has occurred, or should we have the ability to prevent? I refer to those instances where there is a strong sense of urgency because of an imminent threat to human life.

Where there exists the potential to penetrate and disrupt, the Congress must consider the question of

whether or not such preventive action should be available to the FBI.

These matters are currently being addressed by a task force in the Justice Department, including the FBI, and I am confident that Departmental guidelines and controls can be developed in cooperation with pertinent Committees of Congress to insure that such measures are used in an entirely responsible manner.

Probably the most important question here today is what assurances can I give that the errors and abuses which arose under the Counterintelligence Programs will not occur again?

First, let me assure the Committee that some very substantial changes have been made in key areas of the FBI's methods of operations since I took the oath of office as Director on July 9, 1973.

Today we place a high premium on openness -- openness both within and without the service.

I have instituted a program of open, frank discussion in the decision-making process which insures that no future program or major policy decision will ever be adopted without a full and critical review of its propriety.

Participatory management has become a fact in the FBI.

I have made it known throughout our Headquarters and Field Divisions that I welcome all employees, regardless of position or degree of experience, to contribute their thoughts and suggestions, and to voice whatever criticisms or reservations they may have concerning any area of our operations.

The ultimate decisions in the Bureau are mine, and I take full responsibility for them. My goal is to achieve maximum critical analysis among our personnel without in any manner weakening or undermining our basic command structure.

The results of this program have been most beneficial...to me personally...to the FBI's disciplined performance...and to the morale of our employees.

In addition, since some of the mistakes of the past were occasioned by direct orders from higher authorities outside the FBI, we have welcomed Attorney General Edward Levi's guidance, counsel, and his continuous availability -- in his own words -- "as a 'lightning rod' to deflect improper requests."

Within days after taking office, Attorney General Levi instructed that I immediately report to him any

requests or practices which, in my judgment, were improper or which, considering the context of the request, I believed presented the appearance of impropriety.

I am pleased to report to this Committee as I have to the Attorney General that during my nearly two and one-half years as Director under two Presidents and three Attorneys General, no one has approached me or made overtures -- directly or otherwise -- to use the FBI for partisan political or other improper purposes.

I can assure you that I would not for a moment consider honoring any such request.

I can assure you, too, in my administration of the FBI I routinely bring to the attention of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General major policy questions, including those which arise in my continuing review of our operations and practices. These are discussed openly and candidly in order that the Attorney General can exercise his responsibilities over the FBI.

I am convinced that the basic structure of the FBI today is sound. But it would be a mistake to think that integrity can be assured only through institutional means.

Integrity is a human quality. It depends upon the character of the person who occupies the office of Director and every member of the FBI under him.

I am proud of the 19,000 men and women with whom it is my honor to serve today. Their dedication, their professionalism, their standards, and the self-discipline which they personally demand of themselves and expect of their associates are the Nation's ultimate assurance of proper and responsible conduct at all times by the FBI.

The Congress and the members of this Committee in particular have gained a great insight into the problems confronting the FBI in the security and intelligence fields -- problems which all too often we have been left to resolve without sufficient guidance from the Executive Branch or the Congress itself.

As in all human endeavors, errors of judgment have been made. But no one who is looking for the cause of our failures should confine his search solely to the FBI, or even to the Executive Branch.

The Congress itself has long possessed the mechanism for FBI oversight; yet, seldom has it been exercised.

An initial step was taken in the Senate in 1973 when the Committee on the Judiciary established a Subcommittee on FBI Oversight. Hearings had been

commenced, and we were fully committed to maximum participation with the members of that Subcommittee.

I laud their efforts. However, those efforts are of very recent origin in terms of the FBI's history.

One of the greatest benefits of the study this Committee has made is the expert knowledge you have gained of the complex problems confronting the FBI. But I respectfully submit that those benefits are wasted if they do not lead to the next step -- a step that I believe is absolutely essential -- a legislative charter, expressing Congressional determination of intelligence jurisdiction for the FBI.

Action to resolve the problems confronting us in the security and intelligence fields is urgently needed; and it must be undertaken in a forthright manner. Neither the Congress nor the public can afford to look the other way, leaving it to the FBI to do what must be done, as too often has occurred in the past.

This means too that Congress must assume a continuing role, not in the initial decision-making process but in the review of our performance.

I would caution against a too-ready reliance upon the Courts to do our tough thinking for us. Some proposals that have been advanced during these hearings would extend the role of the Courts into the early stages

of the investigative process and, thereby, would take over what historically have been Executive Branch decisions.

I frankly feel that such a trend, if unchecked, would seriously undermine the independence of the Judiciary and cast them in a role not contemplated by the authors of our Constitution. Judicial review cannot be a substitute for Congressional oversight or Executive decision.

The FBI urgently needs a clear and workable determination of our jurisdiction in the intelligence field, a jurisdictional statement that the Congress finds to be responsive to both the will and the needs of the American people.

Senators, first and foremost, I am a police officer -- a career police officer. In my police experience, the most frustrating of all problems that I have discovered facing law enforcement in this country -- Federal, state, or local -- is when demands are made of them to perform their traditional role as protector of life and property without clear and understandable legal bases to do so.

I recognize that the formulation of such a legislative charter will be a most precise and demanding task.

It must be sufficiently flexible that it does not stifle FBI effectiveness in combating the growing incidence of crime and violence across the United States. That charter must clearly address the demonstrated problems of the past; yet, it must amply recognize the fact that times change and so also do the nature and thrust of our criminal and subversive challenges.

The fact that the Department of Justice has commenced the formulation of operational guidelines governing our intelligence activities does not in any manner diminish the need for legislation. The responsibility for conferring jurisdiction resides with the Congress.

In this regard, I am troubled by some proposals which question the need for intelligence gathering, suggesting that information needed for the prevention of violence can be acquired in the normal course of criminal investigations.

As a practical matter, the line between intelligence work and regular criminal investigations is often difficult to describe. What begins as an intelligence investigation may well end in arrest and prosecution of the subject. But there are some fundamental differences between these

investigations that should be recognized -- differences in scope, in objective and in the time of initiation. In the usual criminal case, a crime has occurred and it remains only for the Government to identify the perpetrator and to collect sufficient evidence for prosecution. Since the investigation normally follows the elements of the crime, the scope of the inquiry is limited and fairly well defined.

By contrast, intelligence work involves the gathering of information, not necessarily evidence. The purpose may well be not to prosecute, but rather to thwart crime or to insure that the Government has enough information to meet any future crisis or emergency. The inquiry is necessarily broad because it must tell us not only the nature of the threat, but also whether the threat is imminent, the persons involved, and the means by which the threat will be carried out. The ability of the Government to prevent criminal acts is dependent on our anticipation of those unlawful acts. Anticipation, in turn, is dependent on advance information -- that is intelligence.

Certainly, reasonable people can differ on these issues. Given the opportunity, I am confident that the continuing need for intelligence work can be documented to the full satisfaction of the Congress. We

recognize that what is at stake here is not the interests of the FBI, but rather the interests of every citizen of this country. We recognize also that the resolution of these matters will demand extensive and thoughtful deliberation by the Congress. To this end, I pledge the complete cooperation of the Bureau with this Committee or its successor in this important task.

In any event, you have my unqualified assurance as Director that we will carry out both the letter and the spirit of such legislation as the Congress may enact.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS MADE BY
ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR --
DEPUTY ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR JAMES B. ADAMS
TESTIFYING BEFORE THE
SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
PERTAINING TO THE KU KLUX KLAN,
GARY ROWE, FORMER FBI INFORMANT, AND
PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS OF THE FBI
TO PREVENT VIOLENCE

Read

DECEMBER 2, 1975

*Copies
HANT
12/11/75
HANDLE AS SAC
LETTER - FOR ALL
AGENTS: *done 12/10 PA*
SENSTUDY
FILE
RC*

102-2368-14

SEARCHED <i>✓</i>	INDEXED <i>✓</i>
SERIALIZED <i>✓</i>	FILED <i>✓</i>
DEC - 8 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

QUESTION: You do use informants and do instruct them to spread dissention among certain groups that they are informing on, do you not?

MR. ADAMS: We did when we had the COINTEL programs which were discontinued in 1971, and I think the Klan is probably one of the best examples of a situation where the law was ineffective at the time. We heard the term, State's Rights used much more than we hear today. We saw with the Little Rock situation the President of the United States sending in the troops pointing out the necessity to use local law enforcement. We must have local law enforcement use the troops only as a last resort. When you have a situation like this where you do try to preserve the respective roles in law enforcement, you have historical problems.

 With the Klan coming along, we had situations where the FBI and the Federal Government was almost powerless to act. We had local law enforcement officers in some areas participating in Klan violence. The incidents mentioned by Mr. Rowe--everyone of those he saw them from the lowest level--the informant. He didn't see what action was taken with that information as he pointed out during his testimony. Our files show that this information was reported to the police departments in every instance.

 We also know that in certain instances the information upon being received was not being acted upon. We also disseminated simultaneously through letterhead

memorandum to the Department of Justice the problem. And here we were--the FBI--in a position where we had no authority in the absence of an instruction from the Department of Justice to make an arrest. Section 241 and 242 don't cover it because you don't have evidence of a conspiracy. It ultimately resulted in a situation where the Department called in U. S. Marshals who do have authority similar to local law enforcement officials.

So historically, in those days, we were just as frustrated as anyone else was, that when we got information from someone like Mr. Rowe--good information, reliable information--and it was passed on to those who had the responsibility to do something about it, it was not always acted upon as he indicated.

QUESTION: In none of these cases, then, there was adequate evidence of conspiracy to give you jurisdiction to act.

MR. ADAMS: The Departmental rules at that time, and still do, require Departmental approval where you have a conspiracy. Under 241, it takes two or more persons acting together. You can have a mob scene and you can have blacks and whites belting each other, but unless you can show that those that initiated the action acted in concert, in a conspiracy, you have no violation.

Congress recognized this and it wasn't until 1968 that they came along and added Section 245 to the Civil Rights Statute which added punitive measures against an

individual. There didn't have to be a conspiracy. This was a problem that the whole country was grappling with--the President of the United States, Attorneys General--we were in a situation where we had rank lawlessness taking place. As you know from the memorandum we sent you that we sent to the Attorney General the accomplishments we were able to obtain in preventing violence and in neutralizing the Klan and that was one of the reasons.

QUESTION:A local town meeting on a controversial social issue might result in disruption. It might be by hecklers rather than by those holding the meeting. Does this mean that the Bureau should investigate all groups organizing or participating in such meetings because they may result in violent government disruption?

MR ADAMS: No sir, and we don't....

QUESTION: Isn't that how you justify spying on almost every aspect of the peace movement?

MR. ADAMS: No sir. When we monitor demonstrations, we monitor demonstrations where we have an indication that the demonstration itself is sponsored by a group that we have an investigative interest in, a valid investigative interest in, or where members of one of these groups are participating where there is a potential that they might change the peaceful nature of the demonstration.

This is our closest question of trying to draw guidelines to avoid getting into an area of infringing on the 1st Amendment right, yet at the same time, being

aware of groups such as we have had in greater numbers in the past than we do at the present time. We have had periods where the demonstrations have been rather severe and the courts have said that the FBI has the right, and indeed the duty, to keep itself informed with respect to the possible commission of crime. It is not obliged to wear blinders until it may be too late for prevention. Now that's a good statement if applied in a clear-cut case.

Our problem is where we have a demonstration and we have to make a judgment call as to whether it is one that clearly fits the criteria of enabling us to monitor the activities. That's where I think most of our disagreements fall.

QUESTION: In the Rowe Case, in the Rowe testimony that we just heard, what was the rationale again for not intervening when violence was known about. I know we have asked this several times--I'm still having trouble understanding what the rationale, Mr. Wannall, was in not intervening in the Rowe situation when violence was known.

MR. WANNALL: Senator Schweiker, Mr. Adams did address himself to that and if you have no objections, I'll ask that he be the one to answer the question.

MR. ADAMS: The problem we had at the time, and it is the problem today, we are an investigative agency; we do not have police powers even like the U. S. Marshals do. The Marshals

since about 1795 I guess, or some period like that, had authorities that almost border on what a sheriff has. We are the investigative agency of the Department of Justice, and during these times the Department of Justice had us maintain the role of an investigative agency.

We were to report on activities. We furnished the information to the local police who had an obligation to act. We furnished it to the Department of Justice in those areas where the local police did not act. It resulted finally in the Attorney General sending 500 U. S. Marshals down to guarantee the safety of people who were trying to march in protest of their civil rights.

This was an extraordinary measure because it came at a time of Civil Rights versus Federal Rights and yet there was a breakdown in law enforcement in certain areas of the country. This doesn't mean to indict all law enforcement agencies in the South at the time either, because many of them did act upon the information that was furnished to them. But we have no authority to make an arrest on the spot because we would not have had evidence that was a conspiracy available. We could do absolutely nothing in that regard. In Little Rock the decision was made, for instance, that if any arrests need to be made, the Army should make them. And next to the Army, the U. S. Marshals should make them--not the FBI, even though we developed the violations. We have over the years as you know at the

Time there were many questions raised. Why doesn't the FBI stop this? Why don't you do something about it? Well, we took the other route and effectively destroyed the Klan as far as committing acts of violence and, of course, we exceeded statutory guidelines in that area.

QUESTION: What would be wrong, just following up on your point there, Mr. Adams, with setting up a program since it is obvious to me that a lot of our informers are going to have preknowledge of violence of using U. S. Marshals on some kind of long-range basis to prevent violence?

MR. ADAMS: We do. We have them in Boston in connection with the busing incident. We are investigating the violations under the Civil Rights Act, but the Marshals are in Boston. They are in Louisville, I believe, at the same time and this is the approach that the Federal Government finally recognized.

QUESTION: On an immediate and fairly contemporary basis that kind of help can be sought instantly as opposed to waiting till it gets to a Boston state. I realize a departure from the past and not saying it isn't, but it seems to me we need a better remedy than we have.

MR ADAMS: Well, fortunately we are at a time where conditions have subsided in the country even from the 60's and the 70's, or 50's and 60's. We report to the Department of Justice on potential trouble spots around the country as we learn of them so that the Department will be aware of them. The planning

for Boston, for instance, took place a year in advance, with state officials, city officials, the Department of Justice and the FBI sitting down together saying "How are we going to protect the situation in Boston"? I think we have learned a lot from the days back in the early 60's. But, the Government had no mechanics which protected people at that time.

QUESTION: Next I would like to ask, back in 1965, I guess during the height of the effort to destroy the Klans as you put it a few moments ago, I believe the FBI has released figures that we had something like 2,000 informers of some kind or another infiltrating the Klan out of roughly 10,000 estimated membership.

MR. ADAMS: That's right.

QUESTION: I believe these are FBI figures or estimates. That would mean that 1 out of every 5 members of the Klan at that point was an informant paid by the Government and I believe the figure goes on to indicate that 70 percent of the new members in the Klan that year were FBI informants. Isn't that an awful overwhelming quantity of people to put in an effort such as that? I'm not criticizing that we shouldn't have informants in the Klan and know what is going on to revert violence but it just seems to me that the tail is sort of wagging the dog. For example today we supposedly have only 1594 total informants, both domestic informants and potential informants. Yet, here we have 2,000 in just the Klan alone.

MR. ADAMS: Well, this number of 2,000 did include all racial matters and informants at that particular time and I think the figures

we tried to reconstruct as to the actual number of Klan informants in relation to Klan members was around 6 percent, I think after we had read some of the testimony on it. Isn't that right, Bill? Now the problem we had on the Klan is the Klan had a group called the Action Group. This was the group if you remember from Mr. Rowe's testimony that he was left out of in the beginning. He attended the open meetings and heard all the hoorahs and this type of information but he never knew what was going on because each one had an Action Group that went out and considered themselves in the missionary field. Theirs was the violence. In order to penetrate those you have to direct as many informants as you possibly can against it. Bear in mind that I think the newspapers, the President, Congress, everyone, was concerned about the murder of the three civil rights workers, the Lemul Penn case, the Violet Liuzzo case, the bombings of the church in Birmingham. We were faced with one tremendous problem at that time.

QUESTION: I acknowledge that.

MR. ADAMS: Our only approach was through informants. Through the use of informants we solved these cases. The ones that were solved. There were some of the bombing cases we never solved. They're extremely difficult, but, these informants as we told the Attorney General and as we told the President, we moved informants like Mr. Rowe up to the top leadership. He was the bodyguard to the head man. He was in a position where he could see that this could continue forever unless we could

create enough disruption that these members will realize that if I go out and murder three civil rights, even though the Sheriff and other law enforcement officers are in on it, if that were the case, and in some of that was the case, that I will be caught, and that's what we did, and that's why violence stopped because the Klan was insecure and just like you say 20 percent, they thought 50 percent of their members ultimately were Klan members, and they didn't dare engage in these acts of violence because they knew they couldn't control the conspiracy any longer.

QUESTION: I just have one quick question. Is it correct that in 1971 we were using around 6500 informers for a black ghetto situation?

MR ADAMS: I'm not sure if that's the year. We did have a year where we had a number like that of around 6000 and that was the time when the cities were being burned. Detroit, Washington, areas like this, we were given a mandate to know what the situation is, where is violence going to break out next. They weren't informants like an individual that is penetrating an organization. They were listening posts in the community that would help tell us that we have another group here that is getting ready to start another fire fight or something.

QUESTION: ... Without going into that subject further of course we have had considerable evidence this morning where no attempt was made to prevent crime when you had information that it was going to occur. I am sure there were instances where you have.

MR. ADAMS: We disseminated every single item which he reported to us.

QUESTION: To a police department which you knew was an accomplice to the crime.

MR. ADAMS: Not necessarily knew.

QUESTION: Your informant told you that, hadn't he?

MR. ADAMS: The informant is on one level. We have other informants and we have other information.

QUESTION: You were aware that he had worked with certain members of the Birmingham Police in order...

MR. ADAMS: That's right. He furnished many other instances also.

QUESTION: So you really weren't doing a whole lot to prevent that incident by telling the people who were already a part of it.

MR. ADAMS: We were doing everything we could lawfully do at the time and finally the situation was corrected when the Department agreeing that we had no further jurisdiction, sent the U.S. Marshals down to perform certain law enforcement functions.

QUESTION: ...This brings up the point as to what kind of control you can exercise over this kind of informant and to this kind of organization and to what extent an effort is made to prevent these informants from engaging in the kind of thing that you were supposedly trying to prevent.

MR. ADAMS: A good example of this was Mr. Rowe who became active in an Action Group and we told him to get out or we were no longer using him as an informant in spite of the information he had furnished in the past. We have cases, Senator where we have had

QUESTION: But you also told him to participate in violent activities

MR. ADAMS: We did not tell him to participate in violent activities.

QUESTION: That's what he said.

MR. ADAMS: I know that's what he says, but that's what lawsuits are all about is that there are two sides to issues and our Agent handlers have advised us, and I believe have advised your staff members, that at no time did they advise him to engage in violence.

QUESTION: Just to do what was necessary to get the information.

MR. ADAMS: I do not think they made any such statement to him along that line either and we have informants who have gotten involved in the violation of a law and we have immediately converted their status from an informant to the subject and have prosecuted I would say off hand, I can think of around 20 informants that we have prosecuted for violating the laws once it came to our attention and even to show you our policy of disseminating information on violence in this case during the review of the matter the Agents have told me that they found one case where an Agent had been working 24 hours a day and he was a little late in disseminating the information to the police department. No violence occurred but it showed up in a file review and he was censured for his delay in properly notifying local authorities. So we not only have a policy, I feel that we do follow reasonable safeguards in order to carry it out, including periodic review of all informant files.

QUESTION: Mr. Rowe's statement is substantiated to some extent with an acknowledgment by the Agent in Charge that if he were going

to be a Klansman and he happened to be with someone and they decided to do something, he couldn't be an angel. These are words of the Agent. And be a good informant. He wouldn't take the lead but the implication is that he would have to go along or would have to be involved if he was going to maintain his liability as a ---

MR. ADAMS: There is no question that an informant at times will have to be present during demonstrations, riots, fistfights that take place but I believe his statement was to the effect that, and I was sitting in the back of the room and I do not recall it exactly, but that some of them were beat with chains and I did not hear whether he said he beat someone with a chain or not but I rather doubt that he did, because it is one thing being present, it is another thing taking an active part in a criminal action.

QUESTION: It's true. He was close enough to get his throat cut apparently.

QUESTION: How does the collection of information about an individual's personal life, social, sex life and becoming involved in that sex life or social life is a requirement for law enforcement or crime prevention.

MR. ADAMS: Our Agent handlers have advised us on Mr. Rowe that they gave him no such instruction, they had no such knowledge concerning it and I can't see where it would be of any value whatsoever.

QUESTION: You don't know of any such case where these instructions
 were given to an Agent or an informant?

MR. ADAMS: To get involved in sexual activity? No Sir.

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: HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE
SELECT COMMITTEE

Date December 4, 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:

For your assistance in responding to local press inquiries, attached is a copy of unedited excerpted remarks by Assistant to the Director--Deputy Associate Director James B. Adams while testifying before the Senate Select Committee on 12/2/75, concerning anti-FBI allegations made by Gary Rowe, former FBI informant.

Rowe's by file

Enc. (1)

BUfile

Urfile

62-8368-14A

SEARCHED <i>me</i>	INDEXED <i>me</i>
SERIALIZED <i>me</i>	FILED <i>me</i>
DEC - 8 1975	
FBI-ALBANY	

A

In our opinion

FBI betrayed nation's trust

A disgusting tale is unfolding before the Senate Intelligence Subcommittee:

It is a story of the FBI in the 1960s and early '70s using its awesome power to subvert traditional constitutional rights of citizens.

FBI threats and intimidation of the late Dr. Martin Luther King are getting the headlines, but as Senator Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.) says, "Lots of people named Jones and Smith, who never came close to a Nobel Prize (which Dr. King received in 1964) have had their First Amendment rights trampled on."

A couple of examples:

The FBI would send anonymous letters intended to break up marriages of dissenters, or it would send similar letters to colleges and/or newspapers aimed at getting speakers the FBI didn't like barred from using campus facilities.

James B. Adams, deputy associate FBI director, conceded that the FBI had "no statutory authority" for its harassment activities. That's certainly an understatement.

The current hearings point up the need for tighter control over the FBI. We should never again have a situation where the FBI director can "run amuck," free from control from the Attorney General and Congress. That's exactly what happened during the last years of J. Edgar Hoover's tenure.

The FBI — and Hoover — served the nation well for many years.

But that is not, and should never be, a license to be above the law.

If our law enforcement agencies cannot stay within both the letter and spirit of the law, our "nation of laws" may soon become a nation of thugs.

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

THE DAILY STAR
ONEONTA, N. Y.

PAGE 4

Date: 11/22/75

Edition:

Author:

Editor:

Title:

Character:

or

Classification: ~~100-18761~~

Submitting Office: ALBANY

Being Investigated

100-18761

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>BB</i>	FILED <i>BP</i>
NOV 24 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	

Copy Bow

*1cc in
of 90-945*

62-2368-15

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

41/62-2368-16

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

~~*66-2885*~~

300-

SENSITIVE FILE

*HANDLE AS SAC LETTER
RH - done by 12/7/75*

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

(202) 544-6000

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED <i>DB</i>	FILED <i>DB</i>
DEC 11 1975	
FBI - ALBANY	

RH

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 Invest-
24 gative Division.

25 Gentlemen, will you all rise and be sworn.

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

WARD & PAUL

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

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?

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

WARD & PAUL

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 & 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 & 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

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.

1 Senator Hart of Michigan. This is what should require
2 us to rethink this whole business.

3 Mr. Adams. Absolutely.

4 And this is what I hope the guidelines committees as well
5 as the Congressional input are going to address themselves to.

6 Senator Hart of Michigan. We've talked about a wide range
7 of groups which the Bureau can and has had informant penetration
8 and report on. Your manual, the Bureau manual's definition
9 of when an extremist or security investigation may be under-
10 taken refers to groups whose activity either involves violation
11 of certain specified laws, or which may result in the violation
12 of such law, and when such an investigation is opened, then
13 informants may be used.

14 Another guideline says that domestic intelligence
15 investigations now must be predicated on criminal violations.
16 The agent need only cite a statute suggesting an investigation
17 relevant to a potential violation. Even now, with an improved,
18 upgraded effort to avoid some of these problems, we are back
19 again in a world of possible violations or activities which
20 may result in illegal acts.

21 Now, any constitutionally protected exercise of the
22 right to demonstrate, to assemble, to protest, to petition,
23 conceivably may result in violence or disruption of a local
24 town meeting, when a controversial social issue might result
25 in disruption. It might be by hecklers rather than those holding

1 the meeting.

2 Does this mean that the Bureau should investigate all
3 groups organizing or participating in such a meeting because
4 they may result in violence, disruption?

5 Mr. Adams. No, sir.

6 Senator Hart of Michigan. Isn't that how you justify
7 spying on almost every aspect of the peace movement?

8 Mr. Adams. No, sir. When we monitor demonstrations, we
9 monitor demonstrations where we have an indication that the
10 demonstration itself is sponsored by a group that we have an
11 investigative interest in, a valid investigative interest in,
12 or where members of one of these groups are participating where
13 there is a potential that they might change the peaceful
14 nature of the demonstration.

15 But this is our closest question of trying to draw
16 guidelines to avoid getting into an area of infringing on the
17 First Amendment rights of people, yet at the same time being
18 aware of groups such as we have had in greater numbers in the
19 past than we do at the present time. But we have had periods
20 where the demonstrations have been rather severe, and the
21 courts have said that the FBI has a right, and indeed a duty,
22 to keep itself informed with respect to the possible commission
23 of crime. It is not obliged to wear blinders until it may be
24 too late for prevention.

25 And that's a good statement if applied in a clearcut

Phone (Area 202) 544-5000

end 5

WARD & PAUL

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

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

case. Our problem is where we have a demonstration and we have to make a judgment call as to whether it is one that clearly fits the criteria of enabling us to monitor the activities, and that's where I think most of our disagreements fall.

Phone (Area 202) 544-6007

WARD & PAUL

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

1 Senator Hart of Michigan. Let's assume that the rule
2 for opening an investigation on a group is narrowly drawn. The
3 Bureau manual states that informants investigating a subversive
4 organization should not only report on what that group is
5 doing but should look at and report on activities in which
6 the group is participating.

7 There is a Section 87B3 dealing with reporting on
8 connections with other groups. That section says that the
9 field office shall "determine and report on any significant
10 connection or cooperation with non-subversive groups." Any
11 significant connection or cooperation with non-subversive
12 groups.

13 Now let's look at this in practice. In the spring of
14 1969 there was a rather heated national debate over the
15 installation of the anti-ballistic missile system. Some of us
16 remember that. An FBI informant and two FBI confidential
17 sources reported on the plan's participants and activities
18 of the Washington Area Citizens Coalition Against the ABM,
19 particularly in open public debate in a high school auditorium,
20 which included speakers from the Defense Department for the
21 ABM and a scientist and defense analyst against the ABM.

22 The informants reported on the planning for the meeting,
23 the distribution of materials to churches and schools,
24 participation by local clergy, plans to seek resolution on the
25 ABM from nearby town councils. There was also information on

1 plans for a subsequent town meeting in Washington with the
2 names of local political leaders who would attend.

3 Now the information, the informant information came as
4 part of an investigation of an allegedly subversive group
5 participating in that coalition. Yet the information dealt
6 with all aspects and all participants. The reports on the
7 plans for the meeting and on the meeting itself were disseminated
8 to the State Department, to military intelligence, and to the
9 White House.

10 How do we get into all of that?

11 Mr. Adams. Well --

12 Senator Hart of Michigan. Or if you were to rerun it,
13 would you do it again?

14 Mr. Adams. Well, not in 1975, compared to what 1969
15 was. The problem we had at the time was where we had an
16 informant who had reported that this group, this meeting was
17 going to take place and it was going to be the Daily World,
18 which was the east coast communist newspaper that made comments
19 about it. They formed an organizational meeting. We took
20 a quick look at it. The case apparently was opened in May 28,
21 1969 and closed June 5 saying there was no problem with this
22 organization.

23 Now the problem we get into is if we take a quick look
24 and get out, fine. We've had cases, though, where we have
25 stayed in too long. When you're dealing with security it is like

Phone (Area 202) 544-6000

1 Soviet espionage where they can put one person in this country
 2 and they supported him with total resources of the Soviet
 3 Union, false identification, all the money he needs, communi-
 4 cations networks, satellite assistance, and everything, and
 5 you're working with a paucity of information.

6 The same problem exists to a certain extent in domestic
 7 security. You don't have a lot of black and white situations.
 8 So someone reports something to you which you feel, you take
 9 a quick look at and there's nothing to it, and I think that's
 10 what they did.

11 Senator Hart of Michigan. You said that was '69. Let
 12 me bring you up to date, closer to current, a current place
 13 on the calendar.

14 This one is the fall of last year, 1975. President
 15 Ford announced his new program with respect to amnesty, as
 16 he described it, for draft resisters. Following that there
 17 were several national conferences involving all the groups
 18 and individuals interested in unconditional amnesty.

19 Now parenthetically, while unconditional amnesty is
 20 not against -- while unconditional amnesty is not yet the law,
 21 we agreed that advocating it is not against the law either.

22 Mr. Adams. That's right.

23 Senator Hart of Michigan. Some of the sponsors were
 24 umbrella organizations involving about 50 diverse groups around
 25 the country. FBI informants provided advance information on

WARD & PAUL

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

