# File #:

62-40-116464

# Serial Scope:

EBF 307

W. Romand Warnell

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### HEARINGS

#### BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

on .

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

FBI SURVEILLANCE

ACTIVITIES

Tuesday, November 18, 1975
Washington, D. C.

Volume 27

Official Reporters to Committees

ENCLOSURE 62 -116464 357

## $\underline{\mathtt{C}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{C}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{N}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{T}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{E}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{N}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{T}} \, \, \underline{\mathtt{S}}$

2	STATEMENT OF	PAGE
3	James B. Adams,	
Ą	Assistant to the Director, FBI,	
5	accompanied by W. Raymond Wannall, Assistant Director,	
6	FBI Intelligence Division, R. L. Shackelford,	
7	Section Chief David Ryan,	
8	Special Agent Hugh Mallet,	
9	Special Agent	4120
10	Arthur Murtagh, Retired FBI Special Agent	4177
11	Robert Hardy,	<i>.</i>
12	Former FBI Informant	4190
13	Peter Camejo Representative of the	
14	Socialist Workers Party	4205
15	Kathy Sledge-Lovgren.  Member of the Socialist Workers Party	4214
16	Robert George Silverman,	
17	President, Peer Enterprises, Ltd.	4218
18		:
19	Further testimony of:	
20	W. Raymond Wannali, Assistant Director,	4242
21	FBI Intelligence Division	42.40
22		
23	:	
24		
25		
2004		

#### FBI SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES

Tuesday, November 18, 1975

Rudolph

e.

3

li.

5.7

Ğ

7

53

E

şQ.

E Y

12

**13** 

14

15

16

17

88

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

House of Representatives,

Select Committee on Intelligence,

Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 2154 Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Otis G. Pike (Chairman), presiding.

Present: Representatives Pike (Chairman), Dellums, Stanton, Murphy, Milford, Hayes, Lehman, McClory, Trean, Kasten, and Johnson.

Also Present. A. Searle Field, Staff Director;

Aaron B. Donner, Counsel; and Peter Hughes, Committee staff.

ŝ

Chairman Pike. The committee will come to order.

2

3

.

4

. **5** 

6

8

7

8

10

13

828

15

96

17

18

**.** ...

\*\*\*

23

22

23

2A

25

Today we have a rather interesting hearing in the realm of risk. We are interested, all of us, of course, in preserving our national security.

One of the agencies greatly responsible for that is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In the course of doing so, the role of government sometimes lays a rather heavy hand on the lives of citizens. So what we are going to be looking at today is what the FBI does, what its role is.

Then we will be looking at some of the people whose lives it has touched. I think we have a large number of witnesses today: Mr. James B. Adams, the Assistant to the Director of the FBI, Mr. W. Raymond Wannall, the Assistant Director for FBI Intelligence, will be the FBI witnesses. I propose we gethe FBI testimony first and ask them any questions that we wish to ask the FBI. We will probably not complete any more than that in the morning session.

In the afternoon I propose we go to some of the testimony from the individuals. I would simply ask that the FBI people do stay around during the afternoon session so that in the event they want to offer any rebuttal or in the event that other questions arise which should be addressed to them, that would be possible. Is that a reasonable request?

Mr. Adams. We do have one problem. We have testimony scheduled all day tomorrow before the Senate and both of

these coming so close together does put somewhat of a burden on us in preparing for both. I think we can work something out where we will have someone available.

Chairman Pike. I would simply request that somebody responsible and knowledgeable from the FBI be here this afternoon in order to respond to the questions of the Members and if they desire, to the statements of the other witnesses and the statements of the other witnesses will be made available to you.

Mr. McClory. Will the Chairman yield?
Chairman Pike. Certainly, Mr. McClory.

Mr. McClory. I want to state, Mr. Chairman, that I certainly welcome the testimony we are to receive here from the FBI and from the others that are scheduled to appear before the committee and to state very affirmatively that in my opinion we have a great Federal Bureau of Investigation which does an extremely important job for us. While we may be touching upon some abuses or excesses in the course of this hearing, I don't want that to be interpreted as any diminution of my respect for this law enforcement agency.

I do want to say, too, that I feel that the staff
has put together a very important bit of testimony here
this morning, has organized a very good hearing for us.
I have encouraged this. I have wanted it. It has taken

. 7

FO

a little while to schedule it. But I welcome a review of this aspect of our intelligence activity-and hope that out of it we can in this area as well as other areas of the intelligence activity, find some means by which we can improve the efficiency, the effectiveness, the coordination and other aspects of the entire intelligence community for the benefit of our nation.

Thank you very much.

Chairman Pike. The FBI statement will be presented by Mr. James B. Adams. You may proceed.

ઇ

Ş

:3

20.

.22

18.

STATEMENT OF JAMES B. ADAMS, ASSISTANT TO THE

DIRECTOR, FBI; ACCOMPANIED BY W. FAYMOND WANNALL,

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, FBI INTELLIGENCE DIVISION;

R. L. SHACKELFORD, SECTION CHIEF; DAVID RYAN,

SPECIAL AGENT, AND HUGH MALLET, SPECIAL AGENT

Mr. Adams. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today

to discuss the FBI's domestic intelligence responsibilities.

I think that it would be appropriate for me to begin my presentation by outlining in general terms the purposes of FBI domestic intelligence investigations. To add the historical perspective necessary to fully understand the FBI's role in this field over the years, I will briefly describe for you the circumstances under which the FBI was assigned its present domestic intelligence responsibilities and how the Bureau, in response to ever-changing threats to internal security, has fulfilled these responsibilities.

It must be recognized that the FBI's domestic intelligence function, as it exists today, derives from the Attorney
General's dual responsibility to enforce congressional enactments
and perform other duties which have been delegated to him by
the President. These other duties include rendering policy

2A

recommendations to the President with respect to matters affecting internal security, administering aspects of the Government's employee security program, and making determinations relative to the deployment of the military by the President, should such action be necessary to quell civil disturbances.

Because the FBI's investigative responsibilities follow the contours of those entrusted to the Attorney General, the Bureau's domestic intelligence investigations are, of necessity, broader than investigations strictly designed to collect evidence for criminal proceedings. The FBI's domestic intelligence responsibilities have a distinct anticipatory, or preventive, purpose, requiring continuing investigative activity in cases wherein criminal conduct remains a future possibility.

investigations is to obtain information concerning activities which are intended to undermine or overthrow the Government of the United States, incite domestic violence or rioting, or deprive individuals of their civil rights. The FBI investigates these threats to domestic security both to develop evidence for legal proceedings and to provide the Attorney General with information upon which to make assessments and policy recommendations pertaining to specific, nonpenal aspects of the Nation's domestic security program which are administered by the Department of Justice.

The FBI's domestic intelligence function today has its origin in instructions issued by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as early as 1934.

On May 8, 1934, President Roosevelt ordered the FBI to conduct an intelligence-type investigation to determine whether there was a connection between the Nazi movement in the United States and German diplomatic and other official representatives in this country. This investigation of the Nazi movement was conducted along the specified quidelines set by the President and was not expanded to include other groups or movements.

However, on August 24 and August 25, 1936, President Roosevelt instructed former FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to obtain what Mr. Hoover characterized as "general intelligence information" concerning "subversive activities in the United States, particularly Fascism and Communism."

In response to President Roosevelt's request, FBI
Director Hoover issued instructions for the development of an
investigative program which would be responsive to the requirement imposed upon the Bureau by the President. The investigative
program undertaken by the FBI pursuant to these instructions
is being continued today in accordance with directives embodied
in Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 0.85, which
sets forth the general functions of the FBI.

By 1938, the FBI had developed the broad outlines of a domestic intelligence investigative program to fulfill the President's request for information about subversive activities in the United States. By letter, dated October 20, 1938, then Attorney General Homer Cummings forwarded to President Roosevelt a memorandum from FBI Director Hoover, outlining how the President's 1936 instructions were being implemented by the Bureau.

At this time, President Roosevelt was informed that the FBI was investigating subversive activities and that the results of its investigations were being broken down for ready reference by subject matter, including, "Maritime; government; industry (steel, automobile, coal mining, and miscellaneous); general strike; armed forces; educational institutions; Fascisti; Nazi; organized labor; Negroes, youth; strikes; newspaper field; and miscellaneous."

On November 2, 1938, President Roosevelt advised that he approved of Director Hoover's plan. The investigative program in the field of domestic intelligence which President Roosevelt had instructed the FBI to begin in 1936, and the general scope of which he approved in 1938, was reaffirmed in subsequent years by succeeding Presidents.

Almost from its inception, the FFI's domestic intelligence role was recognized as a functional element in the overall United States national security effort, and appropriate mechanisms were devised to integrate the FBI's investigations in this field with the activities of the military services. Pursuant to a Presidential Directive, dated

June 26, 1939, the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference was formed as an independent committee with FBI Director Hoover as its Chairman. The purpose of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference was to coordinate the FBI's foreign and domestic security investigations with the activities of the military intelligence agencies and to facilitate the exchange of information of mutual interest.

When the Congress established the National Security Council to achieve national policy-level coordination of United States security programs, overall policy supervision of intelligence investigations conducted by the FBI as a member agency of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference was transferred to the National Security Council.

The National Security Council retained policy-level supervisory responsibility for FBI domestic intelligence programs until President Kennedy ordered this responsibility transferred to the office of the Attorney General, where it has remained since 1964.

With the historical origins of the FBI's domestic intelligence responsibilities in mind, let us review how the FBI has fulfilled these responsibilities over the years in response to ever-changing threats to the domestic security of the United States.

Between 1936 and 1938, as the FBI moved to develop

a domestic intelligence investigative program in response to

the President's 1936 instructions, the world situation

steadily worsened as Adolf Hitler rose to power in Germany,

Italy turned to Fascism, and Japan moved toward an expansionist

policy in the Pacific. In the United States concern was growing

over the danger of potential espionage, sabotage, and subversion.

In 1940, the Congress passed the Smith Act, which was directed against communist subversion. During World War II, of course, the main priorities of the FBI were directed towards thwarting espionage and sabotage efforts intended to undermine the war effort.

After World War II, as the Iron Curtain descended across Europe and the wartime alliance with the Soviet Union changed to cold war, the problem of domestic communism became of grave concern to the American people. Passage of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954, represented congressional expressions of this concern.

The FBI reacted too, and the Bureau's investigation of communist activity in this country led to the exposure of the conspiratorial nature of international communism.

The decade of the 1950's brought new threats to our free society as night riders of the Ku Klux Klan sought to terrorize citizens through bombings, burnings, and other acts of violence.

As the Klan's threat to the national welfare grew to a general pattern of organized violence, the FBI moved to provide all-out assistance, including close checks on the activities of Klan members suspected of involvement in criminal activities.

The FBI's intensive investigation of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan echoed the strong determination of our Nation's elected representatives to oppose the type of discrimination that the Klan practiced in its most violent form. During this period Congress enacted the Civil Rights Acts of 1948, 1964, and 1968.

The 1960's brought other forms of threats to the Nation to which both the FBI and the Congress reacted. Rioting in our cities was described as the most difficult intelligence problem in the Department of Justice by the Attorney General in 1968. Congress responded to this wave of violence in that year with the passage of Antiriot Laws. The President of the

United States, in appointing a Special Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder, stated that public officials had "an immediate" obligation "to end disorder" using every means at . . . (their) command." The President warned "if your response to these tragic events is only business—as—usual, you invite not only disaster but dishonor."

In response to this new threat to public order, the FBI conducted extensive investigations of extremist activities, which had, by 1967, become a severe national problem. During the first nine months of 1967, racial violence in 67 cities cost 85 lives, injured 3,200 Americans, and resulted in property damage of over \$100,000,000.

During the late 1960's, college campuses also experienced a "rising tide of intimidation and violence," in the words of University of Wisconsin faculty members.

College and university activities were frequently halted by seizures of buildings, detention of faculty and administrative officials, and other outrages. During the 1968-1969 academic year, there were demonstrations on over 200 college campuses, many involving arson, bombings, and other violence.

In 1970, the Congress passed a series of laws aimed at the control of bombings across the country. In September of that year, the President's Commission on Campus

Unrest, noted, "It is an undoubted fact that on some campuses there are men and women who plot, all too often successfully, to burn and bomb, and sometimes to maim and kill. The police must attempt to determine whether or not such a plot is in progress, and, if it is, they must attempt to thwart it."

In response to these threats, FBI Special Agents were already conducting investigations to identify individuals and organizations posing a threat of violence. Organizations whose members' activities were exceptionally violent were the subjects of intensive investigations.

New forms of violence which represent threats to our domestic security have emerged as others pass into obscurity.

Today, the FBI faces new, complex, challenges in combating such activities. For example, the Bureau must face the problem of terrorism, or violent criminal activity designed to intimidate for political purposes. From 1971 through 1974 there were 641 reported terrorist incidents, including such acts as bombings, firebombings, ambushes, and police killings.

Violence of this kind has confronted the FBI with the task of investigating small, highly secret and mobile groups of criminals styling themselves in the image of the guerrilla soldier, who have adopted his jargon of urban warfare and his revolutionary political ideology. Some of these groups have become expert in fashioning false identifications. Their tactics include kidnapings, hijackings, bombings, assassinations, and armed robberies to finance further revolutionary activities. Unfortunately, the law enforcement officer, our first line of defense against such groups and the most visible symbol of Government, is frequently the first target of their violence. Self-styled urban guerrillas have been linked to the murder of 43 police officers in this country since 1971, and another 152 officers have been wounded in related incidents.

You should be aware that terrorists have vowed to "bring the fireworks" to our Nation's Bicentennial celebration next year. I believe some will try who are perfectly capable of fulfilling this threat.

Last January, 4 persons died and 53 others were injured in a bomb explosion at the historic Fraunces Tavern in New York City. Responsibility for this explosion was claimed by a group calling itself the Armed Forces of Puerto Rican Liberation.

Many feel that this savage act in New York could be a prelude to more devastation as July 4, 1976, approaches. The American people may rightfully expect their public officials to anticipate and prevent such violence.

The FBI has no desire to oppose legitimate dissent. Nevertheless, it is our grave responsibility to investigate domestic violence of this kind. It is a difficult assignment, but one which the FBI will continue to perform vigorously with whatever lawful resources are available to it.

Most Americans are genuinely concerned with such threats to our domestic security and recognize the need of their Government, through the exercise of its law enforcement power, to respond. You should also be aware, however, that there are others who have as their ultimate goal the overthrow of our political institutions and economic system. These individuals publicly state that they consider terrorist activity (quote) counterproductive (quote) in today's political climate. Nevertheless, they by no means renounce its use at the right moment to attain their objective.

As I indicated to you at the beginning of my remarks, we in the FBI appreciate the opportunity to offer our observations concerning intelligence investigations by the Bureau designed to protect the domestic security of the Nation. It is our hope that out of the current congressional assessment of the FBI and its proper role, the American people will be assured that their Nation's law enforcement and domestic security interests will be protected effectively and in a manner consistent with the policies declared by their elected officials.

Permit me to conclude my remarks by stating my hope that out of improved communications between the FBI and the Congress, a balanced picture of the Bureau's domestic intelligence role will emerge which, in addition to identifying any weaknesses in its past performance, also recognizes its accomplishments and preserves for the FBI the necessary flexibility to successfully fulfill domestic security responsibilities of ever-increasing complexity.

In this connection, I should reiterate our willingness to report to the Congress concerning our performance in this field and adherence to rules established for us. It is our view that establishment of a joint Senate-House oversight committee would greatly facilitate this process and avoid duplication of testimony and the proliferation of highly sensitive information.

Nevertheless, whatever mechanism is eventually established to maintain communications between the FBI and the Congress, I am sure that we can all agree on the necessity of preserving the Bureau's ability to function effectively as a deterrent to criminal violence by those who seek to undermine our Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer your questions.

4132

Î

. . . .

2

3

3

7

6

10

£ \$

\$3

13

953

16

77

18

ið

20

27

. 22

23

24

29

Chairman Pike. Thank you very much, Mr. Adams.

I think we can all agree on the necessity of preserving the Bureau's ability to function effectively as a deterrent to criminal violence. I think we can also all agree on the desirability of having a balanced picture of the Bureau's domestic activities. I think at this time our next witness would be in order, a retired FBT man who spent 20 years with the Bureau. I would like to ask Mr. Arthur Murtagh to take the stand at this particular point and give his testimony.

Mr. McClory. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we conclude with the examination or questioning of these witnesses and excuse them?

Now I understand there was some effort earlier to effect a panel here of representatives of the FBI and dissenters and persons that were subjected to investigation and so on.

Chairman Pike. The gentleman is correct. There was an effort to establish such a panel.

Mr. McClory. Yes, and the FBI expressed their unwillingness to participate in a panel.

Chairman Pike. That is correct.

Mr. McClory. I think if we now proceed to call other witnesses that we will be violating the basis upon which the FBI has come here this morning.

Chairman Pike. Do you have any objection to having

a retired FBT man testify at this particular point, Mr.

Adams, before we go into the questioning? I will do it your

way.

Mr. Adams. Yes, I do.

Chairman Pike. Then we will not have the retired FBI man testify at this time.

Mr. Adams, you refer to the ever-changing threats.

I would agree with you that the threats are indeed ever- changing.

The question is how much our tec'niques change and how much our procedures change to meet these ever-changing threats. You have been investigating the Socialist Workers Party of the United States of America, as I understand it, for 30 years, now.

Do you find that their threat is today the same threat that it was 30 years ago?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir.

Chairman Pike. What is that threat?

Mr. Adams. Well, the threat is in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the government by revolutionary means and that basic philosophy is one that brings it within the investigative purview of the FBI.

Chairman Pike. The FBI position is that this party advocates the overthrow of the United States of America by revolutionary means, is that correct?

Mr. Adams. Yes.

Chairman Pike. During that 30 years of surveillance

18

40

20

21

22

23

and investigation, how many members of the Socialist Workers

Party have ever been indicted and tried for advocating

the revolutionary overthrow of the United States of America?

Mr. Adams. There were some earlier in 1940 under the Smith Act. There were 18 under the Smith Act of 1940. Their trials would have been in 1941 or somewhere in that period.

Chairman Pike. So, since 1941 there have been no indictments or prosecutions of members of this party, is that correct?

Mr. Adams. To my knowledge.

Chairman Pike. Now, in the course of investigating the IPS-how long did you investigate them?

Mr. Adams. About five years.

Chairman Pike. In the course of that investigation, if I had made a phone call to the IPS, would my phone call to the IPS have been recorded? Just for the benefit of anybody who might not know, this is a very liberal group known as the Institute for Policy Studies, a relatively liberal group. I hate to characterize people.

Now, would my phone call to this group have been intercepted?

Mr. Adams. Mr. Chairman, I would say no to that question.

I believe this is a matter of a statement that has been made
by us publicly. I do have one problem, according to guidelines

A

· 57

22

23

24

given to us by the Department in connection with public testimony, when we get into activities specific activities of specific organizations or individuals where we do have matters in litigation or under criminal investigation that-

Chairman Pike. I'm not aware of any matter under nvestigation, or under criminal investigation in connection with the question which I am going to ask you next, but it is very specific. Was a phone call from my Administrative Assistant to the Institute for Policy Studies intercepted and recorded by the FBI?

Mr. Adams. I have no knowledge of any such interception.

Chairman Pike. If I had knowledge of such -- no, I
will withdraw that. Was a communication which was not necessarily
a phone call -- I believe it was a phone call, but not
necessarily a phone call -- from my Administrative Assistant
to the Institute for Policy Studies intercepted?

Mr. Adams. I don't have any information of such.
Do you?

Mr. Shackelford. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Adams. I have never heard the allegation. It has never been presented to me prior to this hearing by staff or anybody else.

Chairman Pike. I read to you from a document labeled "WFO-100-46784; WFT-4"-- and I don't know what WFT-4 means, you probably do -- "Advised that Mrs. Robert Gale Woolbert, Administrative Assistant to Congressman Otis G. Pike (D)

21 22 23

· ...

2

3

8

E

.53

10

3 2

12

13

14

23

16

33

18

19

20

99

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the Congressional District of New York, was asked by Byron Johnson, who is another former Congressman, to call Marcus Raskin and did so on 7-26-72. Johnson was running for the Fifth Congressional District of New York and wondered if Raskin would 'be willing to go around and round up a group of liberal anti-war folks for the evening of August 6 or 12.1"

Is it possible that the document from which I read does in fact represent an interception of a phone call from my Congressional office to the IPS?

Mr. Adams. It certainly doesn't sound like it to me.

The "4" would be a means of concealing the identity of an individual who furnished us information. It could refer to some other type of means, but normally not.

Chairman Pike. It was some other form of surveillance, is that what you are saying?

Mr. Adams. It sounds like a live individual who has furnished that information. Had I been aware of it, I could have checked and I will be glad to check at the request of the committee.

Chairman Pike. I have some mild interest in the subject. Mr. McClory.

Mr. McClory. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I wish to say I appreciate the cooperation which the FBI has given this committee in providing us with information that we require in order to carry on this investigation

XXX

ş 2 4

 $\mathbf{5}$ 

Ġ

7

8

9

10

59

12

13

84

15

16

37

I personally visited down at the FBI. I know that in addition to the information you provided at that time, much of the classified information, that you have cooperated subsequent to that time with additional material for the benefit of our committee and for this hearing.

The thing that concerned me then and concerns me now is whether or not in addition to the activities about which you have testified -- are there any private, sort of ad hoc activities which are carried on by the Director of the FPI, or any other personnel? I know that there were private files that were kept by a former Director of the FBI. Are there any such private files about individuals being kept now?

Mr. Adams. Similar to the official confidential files maintained by Mr. Hoover?

Mr. McClory. Yes.

Mr. Adams. No, sir, not in that context.

Mr. McClory. How about the release of information of the FBI? For instance, for a long time there existed a sort of arrangement whereby a President of the United States or others in the White House, just by a telephone call, could receive detailed information about whatever individual they sought information from the private files of the FBI. Has that practice been discontinued?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir. We testified in February concerning various abuses about the FBI. One was concerning certain

24

instances where the President or individuals acting for the President had requested information which on its face would appear to be improper although we did not know the full reason for the request.

I would say that the cleansing effect of Watergate has discontinued such practices. I know I have talked with Mr. Kelleyand the other members of the executive staff of the FBI. We collectively know of no such improper overtures having been made on the FBI since Mr. Felley has been Director.

Mr. McClory. It is a basic policy now of the FBI that any material in FBI files will not be used for political purposes, is that correct?

Mr. Adams. Absolutely.

Mr. McClory. I want to inquire about the Internal Security Index or the ADEX. How many people's names are on that list, how do they get there, and how do you get your name off that list?

Mr. Adams Basically the ADEX or Administrative Index is an index to investigations currently being conducted by the FBI where a determination has been made within the FBI that that individual is a threat to the internal security, a current threat at the present time. It is a very small list, relatively small. It involves approximately 1,250 names at the present time.

Mr. McClory. What is the longest length of time that

Ą

E

a name has been on that list?

Do you have names that have been on there for 30 or 40 years?

Mr. Adams. No, sir. The Administrative Index did not come into play until 1971. Prior to that time we had the Security Index, which was a listing which had a different purpose.

Mr. McClory. Does membership in the Socialist Workers
Party just automatically put you on the Index?

Mr. Adams. No, sir, it does not.

Mr. McClory. About how many members of that party would you have on the list, do you suppose?

Mr. Adams. I can give you that figure. I would prefer that any detailed description of targets and individuals be done in executive session.

Mr. McClory. Have you furnished that information already to the staff?

Mr. Adams. I do not know that we have a request.

Mr. McClory. If not, would you furnish that?

I would like to have the number. I don't have to know the names.

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir, I have no objection to furnishing it to them.

Mr. McClory. You mentioned in your statement that you are not only interested in subversive activity which implied

23

24

Ş. violence but also "undermining." What is the difference ć between the violent overthrow of the United States and 3 undermining the United States? Have you got two groups that Ą you are interested in? 5 Mr. Adams. No, sir, they are both working toward G the same end. It is all inherent in the same idea of 7 activity with the intent or design to overthrow the government 3 of the United States or any subdivision by force and violence. 9 Mr. McClory. My time is up. 10 Thank you very much. Si C Chairman Pike. Mr. Stanton. 12 Mr. Stanton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 Mr. Wannall, has the FBI ever participated in 94 burglaries in order to obtain information for their purposes 55 of investigation? 16 Mr. Wannall. I think Mr. Kelley at a news conference 13 in July acknowledged that the FBI had participated in 18 surreptitious entries to obtain information. 19 Mr. Stanton. Were they illegal activities? 20 Mr. Wannall. I'm not in a position to render an opinion. 21 The whole thing, as a matter of fact, is under study by the 22 Department of Justice at this time. 23 Mr. Stanton. Could you tell me, from 1945 until the

Mr. Wannall. We have made a very thorough study and have

present, how many instances occurred?

24

.

interviewed numerous individuals who might have been knowledgeable in that area. The figure that I recall that we have come up with is about a dozen and a half targets. However, there had been numerous entries against some of those targets. I think we have accounted for something in the neighborhood of 240 entries, none of which have taken place since April of 1968.

Mr. Stanton. Since April of 1968?

Mr. Wannall. In our domestic area.

Mr. Stanton. Do you know what illegal entry is under the law? Are you a lawyer?

Mr. Wannall. I think I understand what an illegal entry is, yes, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Do any of these fit that definition?

Mr. Wannall. I think in the definition, intent to commit a crime within the premises would be included. The entries that were made --

Mr. Stanton. Do you know what breaking and entering is under the State law of Maryland or Chio?

Mr. Wannall. Yes, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Do you have to have the intent to commit a crime to break and enter?

Mr. Wannall. I would say you probably do not have to have an intent to commit the crime on the premises.

Mr. Stanton. Intent is not an important element. In

23

24

other words, if you had the noblest intent in the world but if you are breaking and entering it is still a violation 2 of the state law, correct? Mr. Wannall. I would take your definition of it, 4 Mr. Congressman. F Mr. Stanton. I would like to have your definition. 6 would like to know what a prominent person in the FBI thinks of breaking and entering. Mr. Wannall. I can assure you there are no such 23 circumstances today. Mr. Stanton. That is not the question. The question is, 33 do you understand what breaking and entering is? 32 Mr. Wannall. Yes. 23 Mr. Stanton. Has the FBI illegally entered premises 74 in terms of seeking information? EF Mr. Wannall. The FBI has entered premises without the 16 knowledge of the owners of the premises for the purpose of 77 seeking information, yes, sir. 28 Mr. Stanton. 39 20

In other words, they are guilty of breaking and entering and violating the law of the states of this Union, is that correct?

Mr. Wannall. Again, I am not going to render an opinion that is in the hands of the Department of Justice at this time.

Mr. Stanton. Why did they get involved in breaking and entering?

20 23

29

22

Mr. Wannall. I think basically it had to do with the passage of the Internal Security Law of 1950, Title II. Congress directed the Justice Department to place itself 3 in a position, in the event of a national emergency, to take 4 off the streets individuals who might be placed in detention 5 camps. 6 Mr. Stanton. Is there anything in that act that allows the FBI to break and enter a dwelling? 8 . Mr. Wannall. No. sir. 9 Mr. Stanton. Then that is not justification for those 10 illegal entries, is it? 11 Mr. Wannall. The Act itself did not provide for such 12 t (period rather than question main breaking and entering? 13 14

. Mr. Stanton. So the fact of the matter is that the FBI cannot use that as a basis for illegally breaking and entering an inhabited dwelling.

Mr. Wannall, I know of no law which would permit the FBI to do that.

19

\$5

16

17

18

20.

21

- 22

23

24

4

2

3

5

4

6

B

9

10.

17

12.

*14.* 

15

16

.17

18

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Stanton. Then the FBI has been involved in illegal activities?

Mr. Wannall. The FBI has been involved in breaking and entering.

Mr. Stanton. Have they ever sought the Attorney

General's permission prior to 1972 for breaking and entering?

Mr. Wannall. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Stanton. Who was the person responsible prior to 1972 for approving a breaking and entering?

Mr. Wannall. These were approved at the highest level of the Bureau, normally the Director of the FBI.

Mr. Stanton. Then Mr. Hoover directed the activities.

He did not seek approval from the Attorney General?

Mr. Wannall. To my knowledge, he did not.

Mr. Stanton. In other words, Mr. Hoover felt that he had the power to violate the law of a State or of this country?

Mr. Wannall. Are you asking me what Mr. Hoover's opinion was?

Mr. Stanton. Yes. I am asking you if he approved illegal activities.

Mr. Wannall. He approved the breaking and entering, yes, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Do you think that in terms of the United States Government that for the purposes of the Bureau and for

`4 

£ 3

· 22.

purposes of this government that the activities of the Bureau are going to be improved by virtue of the fact that we have had exposure of some of the illegal activities of the Bureau?

In other words, do you feel that the examination of these questions publicly is going to be therapeutic for the Bureau?

Mr. Wannall. I think they will be, yes, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Thank you.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Adams, one of the problems we have, I think, with the FBI with regard to wiretapping -- and it is a practice that the FBI has not admitted to but about which we have some information that leads us to believe that it went on in the past and I am wondering if it has been stopped -- is this business of reliable informants.

We understand that the FBI will go into a town, say. Chicago where I am from; and they will get a local policeman or some local police force to do wiretapping for them. They pass this information on to a strike force then made up of a FBI agent, Justice representative, IRS agent. Then, when they go to court and they are asked where the evidence came from they can properly say we did not have anything to do with the wiretap.

Do you get any information that way that you classify

as reliable informanto?

Mr. Adams. Not that particular situation. If the Chicago Police Department is engaged in illegal wiretaps and it came to our attention, we would open an investigation under the interception-of-communication statute.

Mr. Murphy. We have been advised by Illinois Bell and they have admitted to the President's Commission on Wiretapping that they never reported in the last three or four years any illegal wiretap they came about except as to the customer whose line they found it on. They said they had no duty to report it to the Federal authorities.

I am wondering what your interpretation of their position would be?

Mr. Adams. You are talking about the telephone company?

Mr. Murphy. I am talking about the Illinois Bell

Telephone Company, the only subsidiary of AT&T which does not report wiretaps to Federal authorities or any authorities.

The rest of the system all does.

I am under the opinion that a citizen if he sees a crime or knows of a crime being committed, he has a duty to report it to the proper authorities.

Mr. Adams. I am a little hesitant to comment on their testimony not having read it or being familiar with the exact wording of the statement. But I do agree with you that when information comes to the attention of a citizen -- we urge this

sal` ≛

≹€ jar

?7

â

. 

8 4

**§**5

of anyone -- that this should be reported to proper law enforcement authorities.

Mr. Murphy. Let me ask you a question, Mr. Adams.

There was an inordinate number of ex-FBI agents working for the AT&T and its subsidiaries throughout the country.

Is there any purposeful connection there?

Mr. Adams. No. I think you will find in any major segment of industry that security officers. FBI agents, are employed in many industries as security officers. I think they have demonstrated over the years their qualifications. They do gravitate to good positions in private industry.

But there is no concerted effort to penetrate or to control or dominate or do enything of this sort on the part of FBI agents collectively or individually.

Mr. Murphy. Was it a practice of your department that when you are summoned before a congressional committee and queries are presented to you as to how many wiretaps are existing today in the United States, was it your practice to then, before the Director came down, to send out a notification, "Take the wiretaps off for a week or two so when I go to the committee I can testify that as of this day there are only 10 or only 4 domestic wiretaps existing"?

Mr. Adams. Absolutely not. I believe the information we furnished to this committee, and to the Senate Committee staff would clearly show by checking against appropriations

testimony, information of that type. There was no such 3 Mr. Hoover frankly imposed restraints on activity. 2 wiretarping in the FBI, considerable restraints on wiretapping. 3 In fact, some of the material we made available shows that he 13 was one of the loudest voices urging some type of authority  $E_{j}$ and approval in the Attorney General, not only of ours but other agencies. \*7

Mr. Murphy. All right. I only have five minutes. Did the FBI ever get information that the IRS was

conducting schools on wiretapping?

Mr. Adams. I don't recall whether we had any such specific information.

Mr. Murphy. We had a former U.S. Attorney General tell us that he acknowledged that the IRS was conducting informal schools on wiretap. They bought the equipment and the Director of the IRS came in and told the agents, "If you get caught, you are on your own but if you bring in good information, we will make a strong case out of it."

Are you possessed of that information?

Mr. Adams. No, sir. That would be IRS and not the FBI.

This was a former U.S. Attorney General Mr. Murphy. who was in charge of your department.

Mr. Adams. Any wiretaps requested today, security or under Title III of the Cmmibus Crime Control Act would require

23

22 23

Ğ

10

99

92

33

14

25

38

17

38

90

20

24

the approval of the Attorney General.

Mr. Murphy. It is interesting that you bring up that Act. There is a Title XII to that Act and this Administration and the last Administration have totally ignored Title XII to that Act. That title requires the Attorney General, the Director of the FBI, and all the agencies that we, the Congress, gave extraordinary powers to — entries into homes, special grand juries — they were to convene a special panel to see how these laws were working and if there were abuses. Since that law has been on the books, Title XII has never been acted on.

The Speaker of the House has appointed his designates, four Members of the House, to this Commission. The President of the Senate has appointed three Members of the Senate to that Commission. The last two Administrations have never commenced with that Commission.

Mr. Adams. The wiretapping commission?

Mr. Murphy. This is Title XII of the Omnibus Street Crime Act. It has nothing to do with the wiretapping commission. Title XII has never been implemented. I find that awful strange when Title XII required it.

That is what Chairman Emanuel Celler extracted from the police agencies of the Federal Government for passage of that bill. We gave you people extraordinary powers. Yet the Speaker of the House has appointed his Members and so has the

1 5

Ç

ęÇ.

President of the Senate and the President has never appointed public members or the chairman. They have come up and talked about it before the Appropriations Committee but that panel has never been implemented.

Mr. Adams. It is my understanding that the Commission which was instituted earlier this year was in furtherance of Title XII. I may be mistaken but it is representative of both Houses of Congress and does have Presidential appointees and we have been appearing before that Commission.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Treen.

Mr. Treen. Mr. Chairman, I ask to reserve my time.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Kasten.

Mr. Rasten. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wannall, how many years have you or the FBI been keeping the Socialist Workers Party under surveillance, for how many years?

Mr. Wannall. We have been investigating the Party, I would say, since 1940, since about 1940.

Mr. Kasten. Since 1945, how many violations of law have you in this surveillance discovered?

Mr. Wannall. The only ones of which I am familiar are the ones that have been addressed earlier today.

Mr. Kasten. If my understanding is correct, those were prior to 1945. In the last 30 years how many violations of law have you through this investigation discovered?

16

3

2

3

Λ

 $\mathbf{E}$ 

6

7

2

છ

10

6.3

13

84

IJ

18

20

99

21

\_22

23

24

Ý

Mr. Wannall. I can recall none at this time.

2

Mr. Kasten. For how many years have you kept the

3

Institute of Policy Studies under surveillance?

Å.

Mr. Wannall. We had an investigation on it which I think

was opened in 1968 and closed in early 1975.

Ø

Mr. Kasten. So for a total of 5-1/2 years, how many

7

violations of law were discovered by your agents during that

8

time?

9

Mr. Wannall. I have no knowledge of any such

10.

all violations.

97

Mr. Kasten. What about the cost of these kinds of

12

operations, 30 years with the Socialist Workers Party; 5-1/2

KS

years with the Institute for Policy Studies. We have the

14

material here of 5-1/2 years of studies for the Institute of

Policy Studies. How many agents were involved in this?

15

Mr. Wannall. I cannot give you an estimate of agents.

16

Mr. Kasten. Or informants?

function which we do perform.

87

18

Mr. Wannall. I would like to say to you that our

19

investigations in the internal security or domestic intelligence

20

area, as Mr. Adams indicated in his opening statement, are

28

not devoted entirely to the collection of evidence with regard

\_ 22

to possible violations of the law. There is an intelligence

23

Mr. Kasten. Through your 5-1/2 years of study and

surveillance of the Institute of Policy Studies, what

24

particular pieces of intelligence did you find that would be 1 valuable to our country? Mr. Wannall. I have some examples here. Would you 3 care for me to include those in the record? Eż. Mr. Kasten. Could you briefly summarize? 5 Mr. Wannall. Yes. I have been reminded that some of 6 the information we have here is of a classified nature and also there is litigation involving the FBI and the Institute of Policy Studies. €ş Mr. Kasten. Could you quickly just summarize it as to 90 the type of information that is there? If you would prefer 33 not to, that would be all right, too. 82 Mr. Wannall. I will be happy to summarize it, but I 33 88 Mr. Kasten. All right. 15

request that it be considered in executive session.

How many people were involved in the investigation or the surveillance of the Institute of Policy Studies over that 5-1/2 year period?

Mr. Wannall. Are you able to give any estimate on that? Mr. Shackelford. I would put it in the vicinity of two or three at the most.

Mr. Kasten. Two to three people? How many informers would be involved? In other words, in order to get all this information, it all came through two or three people?

Mr. Wannell. I will ask Mr. Schackelford if you don't

25

24

16

87

18

19

20

29

22

3

Ps.

Ş

G

7

8

9

10

99

72

13

14

95

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

mind, who had direct supervisory responsibilities on the case to attempt to give you an estimate on that.

Mr. Shackelford. I think you would have a situation where the case would be assigned to one agent along with a num'er of other case matters. At one time or another he may have another agent helping, another agent may contact a source of information he has. But I doubt that any one agent would devote his full time and attention to a particular case such as that.

Mr. Kasten. Our information shows that you have eight agents and that you have at least 52 informants. Is that simply incorrect?

Mr. Shackelford. I would say it would have to be. You may have had eight different agents at different times handling that case. I am speaking in terms of a continuing pattern of activity. You would not have had eight agents assigned to it.

Mr. Kasten. What about the 52 informants?

Mr. Shackelford. That does not sound proper. I don't think so.

Mr. Kasten. How much would an informant cost?

Mr. Shackelford. I would not have any way of answering any question like that.

Mr. Kasten. About \$100, \$500, about \$1,000?

Mr. Shackelford. I would not attempt to answer that

• 7 \$

> 23 . 20

question.

Mr. Kasten. What I am trying to determine is how much that 5-1/2 years cost the taxpayers. How much money that is that particular operation, the investigation of the Institute of Policy Studies, cost the United States taxpayer?

Mr. Shackelford. We don't have figures put together to answer a question like that. I could not answer that question accurately or even estimate it.

Mr. Hasten. \$5,000, \$10,000, hundreds of thousand of dollars?

Mr. Shackelford. I would not attempt to answer that question.

Mr. Kasten. Mr. Chairman, my time is up.

Chairman Pike. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Milford.

Mr. Milford. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Adams, it is time to bring some of the matters we are discussing into another perspective rather than looking at them in limbo. Civil rights have two different perspectives that should be considered. There have been numerous press and public adverse criticisms against the FBI and the Secret Service for their failure to locate and detain individuals who have recently allegedly threatened the life of the President of the United States.

Isn't it a fact, sir, that discovery of these individuals

3

2

1800

4 ö

6

4.3

8 Ø

10

35

33

73

83

15

83

37

28

10

20

23

. 22

23

24

Copeland follows Rudolph 11:05 11/18/75

1

Z

3

4

5

6

T

9

10

.11

12

13

14

15

. 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Adams: Well, what we are seeking is to obtain a proper balance, and it is a purpose, I think, that these hearings do provide, as well as the hearings in the Senate, that we do have to balance the interest of the country and try to satisfy the overall interests of the United States coupled with

the least intrusion possible into the rights of the individual.

It is true there are twenty thousand people a year murdered in the United States, and there are all sorts of brutal crimes of violence taking place, and it times we sometimes wonder who is the enemy. Are we establishing more restrictive safeguards against the law enforcement agencies to make sure that we don't repeat abuses which have taken place in the past, or are we giving equal concern to the rights of the individuals that are victims of the crime. Is the public afraid of us or the fact that they can't walk the streets at night; they can't enjoy the parks, engage in business without being victims of crime.

That is why guidelines which Congress will derive out of hearings such as this will give us a more clear shot at what our role is supposed to be in this area.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Hayes.....

Mr. Hayes. Mr. Milford would like me to yield a half a minute, and I will be glad to do it.

Mr. Milford. I wanted to finalize in this particular colloquy by stating that violations of civil rights is a relative matter so far as I am concerned. It would appear that

I A

ĵ,

O

this nation has a choice. We can violete a few civil rights to apprehend a few violators of our law or allow millions of our citizens' civil rights to be violated.

I feel this is a perspective that should be considered as we go through this.

Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Hayes. Mr. Adams, the development of confidential informants, I think, was one of the tasks you outlined to Mr. Milford.

Do you think that the FBI has a problem when among those developments that they have conjured, we find Jack Ruby and Sara Jane Moore? Do you think there might be something wrong with the development techniques in the FBI?

Mr. Adams. I don't think there is anything wrong with the development technique. It is such that we develop individuals, try to verify the information they furnish; we try to ensure their stability. We are dealing with human beings, and when you deal with human beings, they don't always go according to plan.

Mr. Hayes. From your experience and your carrying out of your particular responsibilities with the FBI, would you say that there is something that happens to the stability of the Rubys and the Moores in the course of being confidential informants? In other words, you have ensured their stability and something cracks them later on.

Mr. Pans. This happens. I would like to make a point that Mr. Ruby was not an informant of the FBI. We are hung up on an issue on that point, but he was contacted on nine occasions, which we did duly report to the Warren Commission, for the purpose of furnishing information, because we thought he would be in a position to furnish such, but all of the records show that on none of those occasions did he ever furnish any information.

So he was being contacted as a potential in that regard, but actually we were correct in saying he was not an actual informant.

But things do happen to informants that we try to guarantee, we try to ensure, and we constantly remind them not to engage in excesses, not to commit illegal acts.

Mr. Hayes. What happens that a Sara Jane Moore kind of gets away from all of that care and affection?

Mr. Adams. You are dealing with people and --

Mr. Hayes. Just ordinary folks?

Mr. Adams. Right; and in the criminal field the informant you develop are not recruited from the Sunday schools. They are recruited from individuals who have knowledge of criminal activity, and they do sometimes present personality problems. But over the years informants are the backbone of obtaining information today. Last year, over 5,000 fugitives, FBI fugitives, were apprehended, and as a result of informants.

. 4

Z

Ŷ

A. S

G

**\$**\$.

Another thousand of subjects were arrested in cases as a result of informants' information. Over \$86 million in contraband and stolen property was recovered through informants.

Information furnished the local police departments resulted in another six thousand fugitives or subjects being arrested.

They are valuable. They are essential.

Mr. Hayes. Mr. Adams, on page 11 of your testimony, the middle paragraph is a call to awareness to us, I assume, because the second sentence begins, "You should also be aware, however, there are others who have as their ultimate goal the overthrow of our political institutions and economic systems."

Then you go on to make a quote that some of these just don't like the use of some terrorist techniques at this point; they think they are counter-productive. But they haven't renounced anything.

Does that mean that the FBI will, through its policy formation and activities, continue to watch these people to see if they do sometime change their mind in the future about how they would like to bring about economic and political differences in this country?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir; we feel when an organization states maybe perhaps publicly, don't engage in violence, but yet the organization also states to its members and has as a program that we don't want to do anything that might be counterproductive, wait until the time is right to try to overthrow

Ç

S. . .

B

ē 3

the government, we feel that we have to monitor the activities of that organization to be on top of the situation when they do determine that because of, say, a hostile attack on the United States by the Soviet Union, or some other foreign country, that this group at that time will say, now is the time.

It wasn't productive to engage in an act to overthrow the government and storm the capital in 1975, but in 1977, if the time is right, we will act, and those are the groups that we find no way of ignoring and also discharging our responsibilities in connection with providing the necessary domestic intelligence to the President, the Attorney General, the Executive Branch, in order to make these decisions they are required to make.

Chairman Pike. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr., Chairman.

Mr. Adams, I am an ex-District Attorney, and I have probably experienced the same kind of frustrations you have in trying to deal with crimes that have been committed in the context of Supreme Court decisions that seem to law enforcers sometimes not to make a whole lot of sense. So I can sympathize and commiserate with you with the aspects of honest-to-God crime, so I will defend you from that point of view.

But when you start talking about the Lori Paton case, the Camden, New Jersey entrapment case, then I don't think that

you have any justification for that kind of activity.

And it seems to me that there may be an attitude on your part — and I would like to have you exament on this — particularly with respect to the Secialist Workers Party, that membership automatically means advocacy of revolution even though the individual might not advocace revolution.

In other words, you have gaid for thirty years you have followed these people. There has been no convictions in the last thirty years. Obviously, if they were advocating revolution and you were following them, you would have some convictions, but you continue to follow them because you think they are advocating it and that doesn't make any sense. Why do you stay after them if we don't have any convictions, any evidence that will result in conviction?

I can understand an investigation for a short period of time and then withdraw, but a thirty-year investigation, does that make sense to you?

Mr. Adams. Well, we have no evidence of a statutory violation of one of the crimes of medition, insurrection, rebellion.

We do have an intelligence function to perform if a group is saying and believing and practicing a belief that when the time is right, when we can combine our activity with other activities such as an attack on the United States --

Mr. Johnson. Are they advocating an overthrow of the government? If they are, it is a violation of the law and

NW 54980

De.

Ω

Ş

Z

Ą

H

B

subject to penalty.

Mr. Adams. Getting into questions of the Smith Act, advocacy of the overthrow of the government and the court decisions rendered interpreting it, the statute is still on the books. It is a valid statute, but the purpose and the interpretations of certain provisions do require far more than mere advocacy. They get into questions of imminency, and actual overt acts. Yet when people knowingly belong to an organization which says, when the time is right, we are going to strike, and they never deviate from this policy, and they work towards it, if Congress feels that we should not investigate that organization, out of these deliberations I am sure we will get a mandate that it is not necessary to follow this type of an organization.

But under the Presidential directives, and the interpretations of the Attorney General, we have the lawful authority to conduct these intelligence investigations, and this is what guidelines will result, I am sure, if we should not investigate people that say we are going to do something at a given time; when that time comes, we should wait until it happens. Even the Supreme Court has said you don't have to wait until —

Mr. Johnson. It seems to me you are searching after a straw man. Maybe you aren't.

How old was this little girl when she writes to the Socialist Workers Party for information?

Z 3 4

. 5

S

Ø

8

30

8.3.

12

73

143

15

16

27

18

20

Mr. Adams. I don't want to get into the lawsuit exactly, but basically what this boils down to is we had a mail cover on the Socialist Workers Party, a lawful mail cover provided for in the postal regulations.

In reviewing the outside of the envelope, the Post Office furnished us the name and address of this person writing -- we don't know whose writing -- to the Socialist Workers Party. An investigation was opened to determine. They checked, find out she is a school student; they close the case. No further investigation was conducted, but should we have stopped and never determined, well, is this a legitimate contact or a nonlegitimate contact -- no, it stopped right there.

Mr. Johnson. It stopped right where?.

Mr. Adams. At the point where it was determined that this was a high school student writing to the Socialist Workers Party. From that point on, it is evidently --

Mr. Johnson. It stopped right at that high-school level? Mr. Adams. Right; we did not continue an investigation of her to follow her activities, determine her beliefs and It was stopped right there. faiths.

On the entrapment situation -- ...

Mr. Johnson. I would like to know how long did that take and if the Chairman will indulge me, we can go on to the entrapment situation, since my time is up.

How long did that take to establish that with respect to

20

21

22

23

2/3

1 Miss Paton?

Mr. Adams. Perhaps we have the time limit here and would be glad to give it to you.

Mr. Johnson. Then, with the Chairman's permission, would you go on to the entrapment?

Chairman Pike. You may respond to the entrapment.

Mr. Adams. While he is looking, entrapment is a very difficult legal question, but from our standpoint and from the law, when an individual, as in this case, comes in and says he has been asked to participate in activities against the draft boards of an illegal nature — we didn't contact him; we didn't direct him. He came to us voluntarily.

Mr. Johnson. Have you seen his statements?

Mr. Adams. No. I haven't. I haven't been provided any statements.

Mr. Johnson. I suggest somebody be here this afternoon, because when that statement is made public, you may want to refute it.

Chairman Pike. All of the statements will be made available. I thought they had been made available, and you certainly should have them, Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams. There is going to be testimony scheduled on this at a later date involving our agent who actually handled the informant. I am not familiar with all the details, but in public session this will be fully explored, but in

2

-4

3

6

7

B

9

99

12

13

P

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

. 23

24

entrapment you are in a situation where if you don't induce someone to go out and commit an act he was not otherwise intend-2 ing to do, prepared to do, or willing to do legally, it is 3 not entrapment, and we have lost lawsuits before on informants, whether it did constitute entrapment, but I would like to get S on the record a statement that we don't use agent provocateurs, we don't tolerate inducing a person to commit a crime who would not otherwise do it, but if he is willing to do it, the law says we can provide him the opportunity. .... And we consult daily with United States Attorneys on this 10 because we feel it is a legal question and we want to abide by the law as much as we can. ...

Chairman Pike. Mr. Johnson's time has expired, but are you able to answer the other half of the question he asked earlier, about how long it took to determine this high-school student was not ---

Mr. Adams. We don't have it here, but we will be glad to make it available to the Committee ...

(The information is to be supplied.)...

20

13

7

4

ő

7

2.2

12

13

84

15

16

77

18

21

22

23

24

EE

Chairman Pike. Mr. Lehman.

Z.

Mr. Lehman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ĮQ,

. 22

In 1972, as Chairman of the Dade County School Board, I was included as part of a kind of leadership coalition to deal with and perhaps prevent any kind of violence that we had anticipated at the Republican Convention, especially on the beach that year, and in our conversations with the public safety people from the beach and from the County, we at that time were more concerned with provocateurs leading the violence and causing the violence than actually the people in the various organizations that many people thought would be the problems.

One of the indications was that some administrative people or something was going on that would do the kind of provocateur work that would turn public opinion strongly against anti-war groups, especially the group such as the Viet Nam Veterans Against the War. Actually, the Viet Nam Veterans seemed to be at that time on the beach one of the primary targets to focus anti-public opinion.

Not related to the beach, but I have heard from reliable sources that in the VVAW that in New Orleans most of the people in that chapter were people on the FBI payrolls.

Now the Florida chapter of the VVAN in Gainesville was certainly a major target, and this resulted in the well-known trial of the Gainesville Eight, and according to the

Z

Z,

Ę)

G

7

8

g

10

. 3 5

12

13

10

\$5

16

17

18

\$Ð

20

21

22

23

21

25

trial information, the chief government witness was an agent provocateur and apparently the jury found out that the provocateur was the source of most of the problems and not the Gainesville Eight, which resulted, of course, in finding them not guilty.

Now my problem is I have no guarral with informers, but I do have a problem with the possible use of provocateurs, which are certainly counter-productive, and I would like to ask two questions.

that you do not use them, but from the information I have
there has been use of provocateurs in different Federal agencies,
and I would like to know whether you have used them and whether
you are continuing to use them, and, if so, I would like something in this final report of this Committee that would condemn
the use of provocateurs and to make the necessary legislation
to prevent the further use of provocateurs.

My question to you is, did you use them, and do you use them?

Mr. Adams. No, sir; it has never been a policy of the FBI to use provocateurs. We do use informants. We don't use them today. I would have no objection to this Committee going strongly on record in that regard, because it coincides with our policy.

Mr. Lehman. Would the gentleman yield? What would you

call the chief government witness at the Gainesville trial? Would you call him an informer, or what?

Mr. Adams. I believe, and I am calling on this from recollection, but I believe the government's position in that was that he was not a provocateur, and I think it was a factual situation, and where you do get into these, that is what juries are for, but in our view we did not use him in an agent-provocateur relationship, to my knowledge.

Mr. Lehman. Thank you, Mr. Adams. I yield back the rest of my time.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Treen...

Mr. Treen. I would like to yield two minutes to Mr. Kasten and two minutes to the Chair and reserve one minute until after Mr. Field's questions.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Kasten....

Mr. Kasten. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to follow up on a question Mr. Johnson had. It seems that the testimony of Lori Paton indicates that in February of 1973 you originally began — and she is sitting right here in the room — and it wasn't until July that you, according to a letter we have from Judge Wallace La Prade, that you were still working on it, so it took you from February until July to say whether or not this person was a high-school student.

The letter reads: "After carefully reviewing the facts in this matter, I have concluded there was no proprietary -- .

Ī

2

3

i

S

6

8

. 10

S

**4 8** 

12 13

12

**F**5

16

17

58

19

20

21

22

23

28,

25

You may be assured Miss Paton is not the subject of investigation. You deny -- " et cetera " -- you were even involved with her."

What is the fact here? Does it take you from February until July to find out whether she is a student or not, and the you deny you even had a mail cover on her.

Mr. Adams. We did not have a mail cover on her, but on the Socialist Workers Party. Her name came to our attention through that. We did not investigate her in the sense of going out and conducting neighborhood inquiries and asking people what do you know about Miss Paton.

Mr. Kasten. How can it take you six months to find out whether this person was a high-school student in New Jersey?

Mr. Adams. I would have to look at the particular file, but I would also like to state we don't have one case per one agent and when a violation or question comes to our attention, a matter within our jurisdiction, that an agent starts out of the door handling that. Each agent in the FBI carries about thirty to thirty-five investigative matters at any one time, and they are handled in orders of priority.

So what the actual time limit was, I would have to refer to the file. I would be glad to make it available to the Committee subsequently, but we just don't have people waiting, and this is the only case you have, you go out and handle it.

Mr. Kasten. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ü

Ü

Ç

çç

Chairman Pike. Thank you. Mr. Treen, I appreciate your yielding a couple of minutes to me.

Mr. Adams, I want to get back to this report in which I have a particular interest, because it involves my own office. In this report Rom Johnson was asked to call Marcus Raskin and did so on 7/26/72. I didn't read all of it. I am going to read some more of it now. "Raskin was expected to return the call when he returned to IPS."

Now to me that sounds like telephone calls, but I don't know, and I do ask you to check exactly how that report got into this file. Now I read further: "Information copies of this report are being designated for Atlanta, Boston and San Francisco, inasmuch as those offices each have officet institutes in their territories and since this report underscores the IPS attack on the FRI."

Now, I am sort of interested when I become a part of a report alleging an attack by the IPS on the FBI.

I know what the FBI was doing to the IPS, but would you tell me what the nature was of the attack by the IPS in which I am somehow involved, on the FBI?

Mr. Adams. First, from the reading as you gave it to me, there doesn't appear to be any allegation that you were part of any attack on the FBI.

Chairman Pike. Well, what is the nature of the attack by the IPS on the FBI?

ý Mr. Adams. Could I consult with one of the gentlemen who Zi. may know? 3 . He is unable to be of assistance in that regard. I å. would have to check and see what that particular statement was 3 referring to.

Chairman Pike. I yield back Mr. Treen his remaining time.

Mr. Treen. I would like to reserve the last minute until after Mr. Field's questions. . . .

·Chairman Pike. Fine. Mr. Field?

Mr. Field. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wannall, I would like to ask you a few questions, and I would like to begin with some of the statements made in Mr. Adams' opening statement.

In the opening statement he refers to instructions issued by President Roosevelt in 1934. He refers to 1936 instructions concerning the activities of the Fascism and Communism, with a capital "C". He refers to a 1938 approval by President Roosevelt of a Hoover Plan. He refers to a Presidential directive dated in 1939. And he goes on in that tone.

In your view, have the subversive threats to the United States, and your authority for investigating them, changed since the wartime climate of the 1940's? Have they changed in the last quarter of a century?

25

6

7

8

ç

10.

3

12

13

14

15

16

37

18

19

20

21

22

23

Mr. Wannell. Yes, sir; in my view they have.

Mr. Field. Do you think that the FBI should have a political philosophy?

Mr. Wankall. I don't think the FBI does have a political philosophy.

Mr. Field. You don't have a political philosophy. So, in other words, your rationale for investigating the Socialist Workers Party would be based either upon some violation of law or upon some threat to the United States. Would that be correct?

Mr. Wannall. Or for the intelligence needs of the Executive; yes, sir.

Mr. Field. And the intelligence needs would be based upon a threat to the United States; is that not correct?

Mr. Wannall. A potential threat, I would say.

Mr. Field. A potential threat to the United States.

In thirty years you have never found a violation of any Federal law by the Socialist Workers whom you have surveilled extensively. Could you say the same about the Republican and Democratic Parties?

Mr. Wannall. May I, in answer to your question, quote from a special issue of the "International Socialist Review", dated November 7, 1975. This is a monthly magazine supplement to the "Militant", which is the official Socialist Workers Party newspaper, and this special issue is devoted to a single

document, a resolution approved by the 26th National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party, entitled "The Decline of American Capitalism; Prospects for a Socialist Revolution".

It includes the following statements of the Socialist

Workers Party policy: "The world crisis of capitalism does not
favor extensive and effective long-term capitalism reform in
the United States but development of the requisites for a
revolution."

That is at page 5, paragraph 1 --

Mr. Field. Mr. Wannall, are you aware revolution can take place in nonviolent ways? Are you aware that the Socialist Workers Party has never advocated a violent revolution and witnesses will testify to that this afternoon?

You were unresponsive to the quastion, which was, have you such a record with respect to the Republican and Democratic Parties?

Mr. Wannall. No, sir.

Mr. Field. Are you aware that the violations of law that you cited back in 1941 were declared unconstitutional, the portions of the Smith Act which you prosecuted Socialist Workers on, were declared unconstitutional subsequently?

Mr.-Wannall. There were portions of it in 1969 in the Ohio case which were declared to be unconstitutional.

Mr. Field. And the Supreme Court upheld that?
Mr. Wannall. That is correct.

:3

. 5

. 10

Mr. Field. Mr. Adams cited that as one of the bases on which we continue to surveil them, because even though there may not be any specific statute any more, there had been violations of the Smith Act. Is that correct?

Mr. Wannall. We raised that question with the Department of Justice and in November of 1974 within the past year, we were advised that the Smith Act or portions of it have been declared --

Mr. Field. Mr. Adams specifically said something to the effect whereas they had not taken any positive steps --

Mr. Wannall. Would you repeat your question, please?

Mr. Field. Mr. Adams said something to the effect whereas they had taken no overt acts to violently overthrow the government of the United States, that the advocacy of these which had been a basis of the Smith Act violations were the reason why you were continuing to surveil.

You are continuing to surveil on something that has now been declared unconstitutional. Is that correct?

Mr. Wannall. No, sir; it is not correct.

Mr. Field. Why are you continuing to surveil?

Mr. Wannall. The Smith Act, in all its parts, has not been declared unconstitutional.

Mr. Field. The part you refer to and the part that refers only to the nonactivity, advocacy of views, has been declared unconstitutional. Is that the basis on which you

23

24

surveil this party?

Mr. Wannall. No, sir.

Mr. Field. On what basis do you surveil it?

Mr. Wannall. On the basis of the activity in which it is engaged.

Mr. Field. Has it engaged in any violent activities or advocated violent activities, not the word revolution?

Mr. Wannall. Not violent ...

Mr. Field. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Treen. ...

Mr. Treen. I think I have just one minute.

Let me ask you this, sir: Do any of you have information that either the National Republican or National Democratic Parties have ever advocated the violent overthrow of the United States Government?

Mr. Wannall. No. sir.

Mr. Treen. What is the status of morale within the FBI today as compared to, let's say, five years ago and ten years ago?

Mr. Adams. I think morale in the FBI over the years has been fairly high. There have been highs and lows, of course, but based on my contact with FBI employees, I think we generally run a fairly high morale in the FBI.

Mr. Treen. Is that true today?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir.

25

17

18

10

20

21

22

23

. .

2

3

- 14

Ġ

ξ,

8.

 $\mathfrak{S}$ 

99

10

12

13

653

36

87

98

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Treen. Are you having any difficulties with recruitment of agents?

Mr. Adams. Absolutely not. Only in certain areas. Overall, we have more applicants than we can possibly consider.

Mr. Treen. What areas are you having difficulty in?

Mr. Adams. We still have difficulty recruiting in the minorities, Blacks, Spanish-speaking, and women. Those are the only categories we encounter difficulty in recruiting.

Mr. Treen. Thank you. That is all.

Chairman Pike. Thank you, gentlemen. I realize that some of the questioning today was sort of adversary in nature, but I can only say that we tend to be adversary in nature with people whom we agree with as well as with people whom we disagree with sometimes, and I do reiterate my request that someone be available, and I would particularly request, I think, Mr. Wannall to be available for rebuttal later on or for additional questions later on, because we are now going to some other witnesses, and I thank you very much for your testimony.

Our next witness will be a former FBI agent, Mr. Arthur Murtagh, and, Mr. Murtagh, when the present witnesses have vacated the table, I would appreciate it if you would go up and take the table.

Just for the benefit of the members of the Committee, after Mr. Murtagh, our next witness will be Mr. Hardy, a former FBI informant.

here today.

3

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR MURTAGH, RETIRED FBI SPECIAL AGENT

Mr. Murtagh. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Go ahead, Mr. Murtagh, and we thank you for your presence

5

I welcome this opportunity to testify before you as a retired

6

special agent of the FBI who loyally served the Bureau for

7

twenty years and who was assigned to the FBI's Internal

Ę

Security Intelligence Squad in Atlanta for ten years, from 1960

9

approximately until 1971. I would hope I could give this

10

Committee insight into the Eureau's intelligence practices not

97

from the theoretical viewpoint of a policy-maker but from the

12

13

14

practical viewpoint of a field agent ....

The thrust of my comments will be to attempt to have you see that it is possible for the structure of an organization such as the Bureau to be responsible for much wrongdoing

#5 16

without any measurable culpability on the part of individuals

17

working in the lower levels of the organization. For example,

I was at one time asked to obtain through my informants

33

. .

13

20

21

22

\_\_\_

23

24

25

body, the Honorable Andrew Young of Atlanta. I was also asked to obtain handwriting samples of several of his associates in

handwriting samples of a gentleman who is now a member of your

Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership

Conference. I was an agent with a lot of experience at the

time this request came to me from my superior. I was aware

that the manner in which the request was made was such that

the information was to be used for one of the illegal purposes of the Bureau.

The request was made after regular working hours orally to me in private. I turned to my supervisor who was known among the agents as "Colonel Klink" and told him that I flatly refused to comply with his request and that he could tell his counterpart at the Bureau who had called him on the watchline seeking the information that I knew damn well it was going to be used in an unrecorded counterintelligence operation to destroy Mr. Young's chances of getting elected to the House of Representatives. The request came only a few days after Mr. Young had announced that he was seeking a seat in the House

My supervisor's reaction was, "Now don't get excited,
Art, we will make some other arrangement." And I responded,
"I suppose you will." And I told him that if his counterpart
at the Bureau wanted to force the issue, we would do it in
the open with lots of publicity. That was the last I heard of
that request from my supervisor, and I noticed later that
Mr. Young made it to your august body so I must assume that
my supervisor had no other source at that time that could get
the information for him. You, of course, will find no record
of the above incident in the Bureau files.

I am cognizant of your mandate to investigate the intelligence operations of the Bureau and of the great mass of information that has already been uncovered regarding these

Æ,

Ø

1

3

Ą

5 6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

operations. I believe, however, that a clear, precise picture of the Bureau's intelligence practices can only be seen by analyzing the Administrative structure, the entrenched biases and the pervasive indoctrinated FBI mentality that command and control their intelligence practices.

In the incident involving Representative Andrew Young, if the same request had been made to most agents who had reached the level in the Bureau that I was at that time, and with most of the agents I came in contact with during the period that the Young incident took place, for that matter, they would have routinely complied with their supervisor's request, simply because they would have gone through a process which would have eliminated all those who saw anything wrong with the type of activity contemplated by their supervisor. The oft-times expressed feelings of all of the personnel working in conjunction with me on the intelligence squad in Atlanta during the period that the Young incident took place accounts for the fact that the information requested would have been routinely obtained. The feeling was that the racial movements in which Mr. Young was engaged, although not illegal per se, was inimicable to the value standards that the squad members subscribed to. If it took a little illegal activity to compromise the movement, then so be it. Past experience had made it clear to all agents that Mr. Hoover had no sympathy with any racial movement.

You may justly inquire at this juncture how I happened to survive in the Bureau if these selection processes weeded those in opposition out. The answer was and is that I was both stubborn and smart enough to keep my record good and clear and those around me knew it. As an attorney and someone who believed in the rule of law, I wouldn't conform if it required me to be dishonest or to violate the law, and I knew I can sorrowfully say that my views were not shared the law. by my neers universally in the Bureau. At this point, I would like to interject a note that is not in the written section here and say that great numbers of the agents that I worked with were of the highest calibre, fine gentlemen that I have great respect for, and it is not with any pleasure that I come here to relate to you circumstances that I think should be corrected. It is with a . seated embarrassment that I have to say that I was a member of this organization for as many years as I was and was unable to come to you during that period.

And back to the transcript, I joined the FBI as an agent in 1951 and retired in 1971.

By 1957, the weaknesses in the structure of the Bureau had become all too obvious to me. In 1960, as a result of administrative action taken against me by Mr. Hoover, on account of an alleged problem of overweight, I found myself in a YMCA room in Macon, Georgia, away from my family for a period of about five months. During that time, I did a great deal of

2

3

Ä,

ij

6

7

8

B

7 Z

32

73

86

15

16

17

88

13

20

23

22

23

24

soul-searching and reading in an effort to make a decision as
to whether I should leave the Bureau and attempt to expose the
weaknesses in structure, and I underscore structure at every
point, because it is the structure that is wrong with the
Bureau and not the agent-personnel, whether I should expose
the weakness in the structure or stay in the Bureau and wait
for a more opportune time when the probability of success in
correcting these weaknesses would be greater. I decided to
remain and observe, but I resolved that I would under no circum
stances participate in any of the unethical or illegal activities that were by then so prevalent in the Bureau.

I was able to observe from my vantage point in the FBI that the Bureau was on a collision course of collapse which would result in Congressional investigation, and I said so openly among agent associates from 1960 onward until the time I left the Bureau in 1971. I counseled with many, yes, practically all, of the agent-personnel with whom I came in contact at this time and for the remaining eleven years that I spent in the Bureau, and found that they were vaguely aware in 1960 of the process of which I speak, and they were acutely aware of it in 1971.

The inherent administrative processes within the Bureau which I have alluded to before, which adversely affect the Bureau's intelligence functions can be summarized as follows:

Number one is secrecy. Mr. Hoover threw a veil of secrecy

· F

over the Bureau at its very inception, though the great mass of information handled by the Bureau could be placed on bill-boards in the middle of Times Square and the public interest would not block the sidewalks, but secrecy served many useful purposes to the Bureau. It made it impossible for the public or Congress to know anything about what was going on internally. It gave the Bureau operation an aura of mystery and created a type of fear and respect for the Bureau which I personally feel is unhealthy in a lociety that strives to be both democratic and open.

Number two: Complete unfettered control of the process of selecting personnel. Gentlemen, I submit this is the most important thing that I will say to you today, complete and unfettered control of the process of selecting personnel.

This is an area to which your Committee should direct its greatest efforts, for it was through a selection process exempt from Civil Service under the sole control of the Director that Mr. Hoover was able over a period of nearly fifty years to bring in thousands of carefully selected agent-personnel who were politically disposed to the right as he was and then through a personnel system, which offered no possibility at all for an agent to question Hoover's ethics or methods, to force thousands of those selected to leave the Bureau in utter disgust simply because they had no avenue through which they could air grievances involving unethical or illegal conduct. For example,

· ...

ş

2

3

Ŀ,

. 📆

6

Ţ.

8

10

3%

32

33

84.

15

97

ig

20

21

22

23

24

and I have many, but I will give you one, a young agent whom I know was sent to Albany, Georgia for his first office. His wife was a sociologist. She was offered a position in the Head Start Project in Albany, Georgia that was under the direction of a Black attorney named King. I think his initials were A. B., but I know his last name was King. The agent reported this information to his superior in Albany. He was immediately summoned to Atlanta by the Agent in Charge and told that his wife could not take the job because they did not want FBI personnel or their wives associated with Blacks who were active in the civil rights movements. This agent subsequently resigned in disgust.

The third area I want you to take note of is manipulation and control of the press.

The examples of this subject are legion. The one that I am most familiar with was the concerted effort to get what was always referred to in the Bureau as "our friends in the media" to publish personal and very private information taken from the wiretap which itself was of questionable legal validity on Dr. Martin Luther King. Of course, the day-to-day manipulation was accomplished by leaking choice items to our "friends".

It was not at all uncommon to learn of some politically damaging information about some leading figure in politics as having been developed by the Bureau and then always at a time when it would be most damaging to the individual, the information

. 5

şg

would some way show up in the Chicago Tribune or some other friend of the Bureau. If the information was more valuable for purposes of political blackmail by holding it, than by giving it to the press, it was withheld. The leaked information always seemed to involve persons of liberal persuasion. From my years in the Bureau, I can only assume that the Bureau had deduced that persons of liberal persuasion are somehow more apt to sleep with somebody else's wife, drink too much liquor, or be sexually perverted than are solid conservatives.

The fourth point is absolute authority at the top and blind loyalty at the bottom aided by the selection process.

This question of loyalty is interesting since, of course, we all like our friends to be loyal to us and we respect it as a quality in man. The Watergate hearings were particularly informative on this point, as you all recall. Each of the witnesses who were implicated in wrong-doing in Watergate opened their statements with a bit on loyalty and went on to tell eventually how in the name of loyalty they had violated the law. The Bureau has its parallel in this concept of blind loyalty.

I might interject here I think I saw some of it a few minutes ago. Personnel have been willing to forego their own integrity to allow improper, unethical, or illegal activity by the Bureau to go on unchallenged rather than injure the Bureau by a public attack which many regard as disloyal to the

£

Bureau.

Number five is the harsh disciplinary measures, and I understand these may have been changed somewhat under Mr. Kelley. The harsh disciplinary measures which were the hall-mark of Mr. Hoover's personnel policy are too extensive to go into at length here. They sometimes resulted in humorous situations but very often in very tragic situations.

As an illustration of that, I might say when coming down here from northern New York, my wife became terribly distraught and she turned to me and said, "Do you think they will take your pension away from you?". And I assured her, "No, honey, they won't."

By the mid-1960's these harsh disciplinary measures had so eroded confidence in Hoover among the agent-personnel that the policy of "tell the man nothing" had reached a point where information could actually get into the hands of Bureau supervisors, and it still would not get to Hoover because the harshness of the disciplinary action made the integrity of all agents very pliable.

In a democracy, domination of a powerful organization such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation by any segment of the political spectrum threatens the very existence of democracy.

The process results in the organization being used to aid the political and philosophical friends or causes of the leader

Bur

. P. S. S.

ç

2

Š

3

6

7

8

9

20

13

8%

13

34.

£B

16

17

88

**19** 

20

21

22

23

24

and to neutralize any opposition.

ă

Ø

ξã

Mr. Hoover's vendetta against Dr. Martin Luther King illustrates this process in a graphic manner.

I submit that the FBI now constitutes a degenerate dictatorship in which the structure still remains but from which public support is rapidly being withdrawn. I further submit that such a dictatorship is incompatible with the Constitutional concepts upon which this nation was founded. I feel that this can be historically paralleled with the ascension of other dictatorships throughout the world.

I make the following recommendations.

I recommend that any reform which you consider deal directly with each of the points I mentioned in the establishment of the process, but I urge you to give particularly careful attention to the process of agent selection.

In order to insure against re-establishment of uncontrollable power within the Bureau I would suggest the following:

Seek the removal of all entrenched personnel, including the

Director, as quickly as is practical, not in a vindictive way,

but for the good of the service. These gentlemen have been

trapped into the system; they have been unculturalized; and

they can't act differently than they act, but they are a

serious threat to the freedom and security of the United

States under our Constitution.

The second thing: Establish a system by which line-level

personnel can report unethical or illegal activity within the Bureau to an outside control agency. Incidentally, I was very happy to hear Mr. Adams say this morning that the Bureau would be willing to submit to an outside control agency. It is only a sad thing they didn't do it twenty years ago and we wouldn't be here today.

Although there are some Constitutional questions involved, I would recommend that the control agency be under the judiciary, thus extending the concept of checks and balances, and that the time necessary for setting up hearings and resolving difficulties be extremely short, maybe as little as seven days so that corruptive processes could not get started.

Number three: That all personnel working within the agency be required to attend instructional classes given by various educational institutions throughout the country in which the rights and duties of Bureau employees would be thoroughly taught so that we would not have people like Jim McCord in the Watergate situation telling the Senate or the House in years to come that he thought that what was obviously illegal could be made legal by the flick of a pen by the Attorney General or the Director. This concept was very prevalent in the Bureau when I was there. If Mr. Hoover ever said something, no one ever questioned whether he was right or wrong, legal or ethical, illegal or otherwise. There was never anything taught in the

Ŷ

Ì

A

21.

erger Ania

Ş

2

T.

4 5

ô

7

B

10

ę ę

12

13

15

16

íÝ

88

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bureau schools to equip agents to make decisions they made in this area.

Number four: Legislate the process of agent selection in such a way that future personnel would represent the full spectrum of American society instead of only a narrow segment as it now does. Either reduce the pay of agent personnel or establish educational requirements for admission that would justify the current high-pay standards. I would prefer that the standards be made higher and leave the pay where it is.

Number five: Legislate controls regarding the release of information from the Bureau which will prevent the Bureau from using the wealth of information it collects at government expense as a means of press manipulation. If Quinn Martin Productions can examine Bureau records and produce a television play, as they did in the Philadelphia-Mississippi case, and, incidentally, I worked on that case at great length and I know the circumstances, and they produced this two-hour movie which was on NBC last spring, and the picture of what actually happened down there, from my viewpoint, was very badly distorted. The movie was made in such a way as to protect the Bureau image and protect the Bureau's relationship with the Mississippi State Police.

And it had many things in there that I would not have put in, and I think anyone of a moderate liberal persuasion would not have put in.

So the legislation should provide if anybody can look at the Bureau records and write a book, if any special person can, anybody can. If we are going to have a free press, let's have it free all the way, in other words, and I think this restraint the Bureau has used in making the records available to writers and to the press is a sort of reverse or inverse abridgment of the First Amendment of those who weren't able to get to these records.

I think, gentlemen, that if those recommendations, or some like it, are put into effect, that the Bureau can be reestablished as an organization in the Unstice Department which is a service body for the United States Government, which belongs to the people, and the Bureau can be brought back into perspective and do an excellent job, and it has a big job to do.

Thank you very much.

Chairman Pike. Thank you very much, Mr. Murtagh. Obviously, you feel very strongly on this subject, and it took a certain amount of courage on your part to be here.

Rather than attempt to question at this time, we do have one other statement by a former semetime employee of the FBI, Mr. Robert Hardy. It is a very short statement, and I think perhaps we can get that in before we break for lunch.

If Mr. Hardy would take the table. Bring the microphone close to you and go right shead.

24 25

2

Ź

4

ij

G

7

Ö

Ø

10

33

12

13

98

13

16

17

18

Ŷ

20

21

22

jh 1

Ŷ

ē,

Ęį

\$7

## STATEMENT OF ROBERT HARDY FORMER FBI INFORMANT

Mr. Hacdy. Mr. Chairman and committee members, my name is Robert Hardy. I am 37 years old and I live in Camden, New Jersey. I am married and the father of four children. I support myself and my family as a general contractor. I have served my country in the U.S. Marine Corps and on June 25, 1971 I became an FBI informer.

I am not proud that I was an FBI informer. I am not proud of what happened as a result of my being an informer.

I only hope and pray that by coming here today I can right some of the wrong that was committed. Perhaps we all can learn a lesson from what has happened in my case so that it can never happen again.

On June 24, 1971, a long-time friend of mine was having dinner at my house. He was upset. He had been active in the anti-war movement in our area. He related to me that a plan to enter the Camden draft board had been discovered by the FBI and had fallen through. I told him that such a plan was senseless and I discouraged him from considering any such action. I was concerned, however, that a group of people, some of whom I had known for years and considered good, law-abiding Americans, would consider such action in order to protest the war.

The following day I went to the FBI office in Camden and asked them for advice. I told them that I did not want my

. . . .

Z

ŗ;

G

E S

នេ

friends to go to jail. They told me, at that time, just to keep them posted on developments. I then went to the group of people I have just mentioned and in a short time they had taken me into their confidence as a member and fellow sympathizer.

At first the FBI instructed me not to present any new thoughts or ideas to the group. However, after a while they encouraged me to suggest to the group the exact illegal activity about which I had originally come to them. They told me that all they wanted was enough evidence of a conspiracy to raid the draft board. They told me that this would be a lot better than if some of my friends were charged with the actual crime itself. I was greatly confused at this time, but I trusted the FBI and eventually I carried out their wishes.

By mid-July I had gained a strong leadership position within the group. I told the FBI, with whom I was in daily contact at this time, that this was not quite right. I was no longer a mere informer, but was how a promoter or provocateur. They told me to continue.

If I may interject in the statement here, the word informer and provocateur was not in my vocabulary at the time. These were words that were put on me by the press and by the FBI after the actual crime had taken place, or the break-in.

In the course of the next month, upon the instructions

of my FBI agents, my leadership role increased to the point that it became absurd. I was not only encouraging the group to raid the Camden draft board; I was initiating all the plans to do so. The way I did this was very simple. I provided them with constant moral encouragement. I provided them with the tools they needed — ladders, ropes, drills, bits, hammers and so forth. I provided them with food to sustain them during the course of the preparation. All this was paid by the FBI. They paid me also, on a regular basis, for my services.

As a man who had been in the general contracting business most of my adult life I provided invaluable technical assistance to the group. Mr. Chairman, you would not believe what an inept band of bungling burglars these people were. There were about 30 persons in the group. It was a loose-knit anti-war group composed of college professors, clergy, students, and concerned citizens. They were dreamers, who talked a lot but did nothing.

On instructions I once tried to give them guns, but they refused.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman? Chairman Pike. Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson. May I interrupt at this point, because the gentleman says "on instructions" and I believe that in view of the testimony that came from Mr. Adams that that should be

3

2

3

...

3 - 4

:

(j

7

8

Ø

10

2 2

13

9.8

\$13

**16** 

?7

13

30

20

21

22

23

24

4 . 9

A,

F

B

more clearly elucidated.

On instructions from whom?

Mr. Hardy. At the time we were having ricts in the City of Camden and the FBI was concerned for the safety of their agents, myself and the people involved in what became known as the Camden 28. They asked me to check to see if they had weapons or a tendency for violence and I offered one of their members a gun which I did not have and would not have provided to them. It was to check out whether they were —

Mr. Johnson. You didn't make this clear. You said "on instructions, I once tried to give them guns."

Mr. Hardy. Yes, my agent that I had been in contact with asked me or suggested that I ask them if there would be any guns for self protection since there was a rioting condition in the City of Camden.

Chairman Pike. Go ahead.

Mr. Hardy. They were the most non-violent, wellintentioned people I ever met in my life. But most of them
couldn't even tie a knot properly. I am not proud to say that,
with respect to breaking into the draft board, I taught them
everything they knew.

Again breaking from the statement, every draft board that had been broken into within the United States had been broken into from the inside. This was the first draft board that was to be broken into from the outside. They had no

experience in this area.

Ä,

. 5

()

Ð

\$7

I taught them how to cut glass and open windows without making any noise. I taught them how to open file cabinets without a key. I rented trucks for them. I obtained a floor plan of the draft board building for them. I taught them how to climb ladders easily and walk on the edge of a roof without falling. My neighbors began to wonder why I had this crowd of people climbing up the side of my house and parading along the edge of my roof everyday. I began to feel like the Pied Piper.

I had convinced the group to break into the draft board on either August 21st or August 22nd. A week before the appointed time I went to the FBI numerous times and told them that my job had been accomplished. The conspiracy had taken place and I wanted to be stopped. It was not stopped. I was told there were 100 FBI agents in the area for the occasion. I protested vigorously that I had been double-crossed. The FBI apologized to me and told me that the new orders had come directly from the little White House in California.

Members of the committee, the rest is history. In the early hours of August 22nd a group of people were caught and arrested for breaking into the Camden draft board. Viclence and lawless conduct by the radical left had been averted. The FBI, again, had gotten its man. The country could now see positive proof that the Administration was correct in warning

2/

2

3

4

. 5

6

ĩ

8

H

10

38

## AFTERNOON SESSION

2:00 p.m.

Chairman Pike. The committee will come to order.

Our procedure, because of the time constraints we have, is going to be just to go through the prepared statements of all of the witnesses whom we have remaining, and we have five of them, after which we will go into questions.

I understand that some of the witnesses do have to leave. We will understand if they really have to get out of here.

Our first witness will be Ms. Lori Paton, who I understand is not a member of the Socialist Workers Party. Please proceed with your statement.

12

13

14

:53

16

\$7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the country about the threat from the left.

I will never forget the role I played in this abuse of American justice. I am sure such things have happened before. but I am here to try and prevent them from happening again.

Chairman Pike. Thank you very much.

The committee will stand in recess until 2:00 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2:00 the same day.)

\$)

STATEMENT OF LOW PATON, STUDENT, UNIVERSI

OF VIRGINIA

Ms. Paton.

My name is Lori Paton. I am now a sophomore at the University of Virginia. I am here today to talk with you about something that happened to me when I was a student at West Morris Mendham High School in Mendham, New Jersey.

In February of 1973, I was one of about 25 students enrolled in a social studies course called "Left to Right." title suggests, this course involved the study of the spectrum of the contemporary American political scene. For a class assignment, I wrote a letter to what I thought to be the Socialist Labor Party, requesting information about its programs and policies. However, I had inadvertently addressed the letter to the Socialist Worker's Party. At that time, as I later learned, the FBI was conducting surveillance of all mail addressed to the Socialist Workers' Party. Thus, unknown to me, the FBI acquired my name from the letter I sent and began a criminal investigation to determine if I was engaged in "subversive activities." (I have submitted Exhibit A, the FBI memorandum directing that investigation.) The FBI contacted the Morris County Credit Bureau and the Police Chief of Chester, New Jersey and made inquiries about my family and me. The FBI next appeared at my high school and told the principal that I was under investigation because of contact with the Socialist Workers' Party. After the agent left, my parents and I were notified by a school official of the investigation. That was when I first became aware that my letter had been intercepted and that I was the subject of an FBI

investigation. My first reaction was anger because I had been investigated without my knowledge and I felt that at least I should have been contacted by the agent. Shortly after that, our high school newspaper learned of the FBI's investigation and wrote an article about it. This public exposure that I was the subject of an FBI investigation caused me a great deal of embarrassment among my fellow students and townspeople. I was subjected to remarks by other students and I felt I was an object of ridicule. I was no longer known for myself but instead I became known as a person who was investigated by the FBI. I later became notorious among townspeople, many of whom felt that I should not rock the boat by making an issue of this incident.

When I became aware of the investigation, I was concerned about its possible effects on my career plans. I was approaching my senior year in high school and was looking forward to college. My plans were to major in Chinese and to find employment in government service. I knew that the fact that I had been investigated by the FBI might adversely affect my career plans, particularly if I wanted to work for the government. I found this possibility very distressing.

Because of the above concerns, my teacher in the "Left to Right" course, Mr. Gabrielson, suggested that we ask the ACLU for advice. My parents said that they would support me in anything I did, so Mr. Gabrielson contacted the ACLU. At that time, I wanted to find out what was in my file and

whether it could have an effect on my later life. My lawyer, Professor Frank Askin of Rutgers Law School, who is with me today, sent a letter to the FBI asking why they had investigated me and if there were any FBI files concerning me. I was shocked when FBI Director La Prade wrote back denying that I had been the subject of an investigation. (I attach as Exhibit B Director La Prade's reply letter.) I realized that the FBI's denial was false because I obviously had been investigated. At this point I was very upset over the conduct of the FBI. I was initially surprised to find that I had been the subject of an FBI investigation but I found it even more incredible that a representative of my government would lie to me in this way. The possibility that I had an FBI file and my disillusionment with the government's conduct led me to bring a lawsuit seeking expungement of my file and damages for the violation of my constitutional rights. That suit is still pending. United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit ruled recently that I was entitled to sue the FBI agents involved for damages and injunctive relief.

Chairman Pike. Thank you very much, Lori.

The next witness will be Mr. Peter Camejo, who, as

I understand it, is a member of the Socialist Workers Party.

I would like to make it very clear at this point that nobody

on this committee has, nor do they intend, to ask any questions
that sound like "Are you now or have you ever been a member

of --".

Please proceed.

\*

Ç.

¥4

**\$**5

Ĭ

2

45

/i

No.

6

8

20

22

12

13

14

35

16

87.

73

39

20

29

22

23

24

25

STATE OF PETER CAMEJO, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

Mr. Camejo. I ma now and I have been.

My name is Peter Camejo. As the Presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers Party, I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify. I realize that you disagree with many of my views. Until today, the investigations of FBI and CIA activities have not given those of us who have been the victims of those agencies an opportunity to be heard. Of course, there are many other victims of these FBI and CIA activities in addition to the SWP.

Because the FBI spends so much time and money trying to disrupt the SWP, I think it's important that I emplain briefly exactly who we are and what we stand for.

We believe that this society needs to be recognized on the basis of production for human needs, not for private profit. We think that a political party based on the working class is needed. That is why we are offering candidates in the 1976 elections.

Both by vote and the number of states for which we have gained ballot status in recent years, we are the fourth largest political party in the United States -- after the Democratic, Republican and American Independent Parties. In 1974 our vote rose to 440,000 in just ten states. In 1976 we hope to be on the ballot in 30 to 40 states.

On many issues our views are shared by many, if not most, Americans. These are issues such as the right of every worker to a job, the right of Blacks to attend desegregated schools, the importance of organizing massive support for the Equal Rights Amendment for women, and opposition to sending American soldiers to prop reactionary governments around the world.

On the question of establishing socialism, however, we are in a minority. Our goal is to win a majority to our point of view.

We run in elections to explain our ideas and win support for our program. In addition, our members participate in organization demonstrations, such as the large peaceful antiwar marches that helped force an end to the Vietnam war. Many of our members are active in the labor movement and the struggle to desegregate the schools. We hold public meetings and distribute leaflets, books and newspapers.

These are all activities protected by the Bill of Rights.

The Socialist Workers Party doesn't advocate or engage in violent or illegal activity. The FBI has never produced any evidence to the contrary. But, in spite of thet, they admit that they began wiretapping us in 1945. They've burglarized us, "investigated" us, bugged our offices, "covered" our mail, visited our members, gotten them fired from jobs, harassed our election campaigns and generally made efforts to prevent

. 15

us from getting a hearing for our views.

But since the exposure of the illegal and unconstitutional FBI COINTELPRO tactics, the FBI has been trying to fool the public with a claim that it stopped disrupting political activities back in April 1971. But we know that's not the case. I'm turning over to the committee a list of some 225 incidents of FBI harassment that have taken place since April 1971. These include FBI visits to landlords, employers, and parents of members and supporters of my party and visits to members and supporters themselves.

Two of the witnesses with me, Kathy Sledge and Lori Paton will describe two incidents from that list of 225.

In the FBI's view, the SWP continues to be a legitimate target for disruption. They have been attempting it for decades and they are continuing it right now.

In their public explanations, sometimes they say this is because we are terrorists, or because we are "subversives," or because we advocate violence. I would like to respond to these charges.

First, the FSI itself has provided us with proof that their charges are false. Let's look at the record. The FBI admits it began wiretapping our party in 1945. Since then the FBI has not brought a single indictment against a single member of the SWP. Not one indictment against a single member in thirty years of the tightest imaginable surveillance.

21.

B

As was pointed out earlier today, the Democratic and Republican parties, on the other hand, cannot point to such a record.

Secondly. I call your attention to the 1961 FBI memorandum that launched the "SWP Disruption Program." Here they give the FBI's real reason for this war of disruption. This document, which was never intended for public view, stands in sharp contrast to their public charges of viclent and illegal acts.

I was astonished this morning that the FBI fulled to make a single reference to the COINTELPRO Program in their statements.

The memo said: "The SWP has . . . been openly espousing its line . . . through running candidates for public office and strongly directing and/or supporting such causes as Castro's Cuba and integration problems arising in the South."

They don't charge us with violence, not assassinations, not kidnapping. Our crimes, to the FBI, were running candidates, supporting the fight against segregation, and opposing this government's criminal attempts to overthrow the Castro regime.

What about the public charges that the FBI makes? Is
the SWP terrorist? Absolutely not. We believe, as Marxists
have always believed, that the philosophy and methods of
terrorism are damaging to the workers' movement. We believe
that society can only be changed through the efforts of millions,
through broad social forces representing the overwhelming
majority, not through acts of terror.

ğ

Advocacy of terrorism is incompatible with membership in the SWP. And, I repeat, no evidence has ever been produced by the government that the SWP advocates or engages in terrorism or other illegal acts of violence.

To take up another charge: Is the SWP run by a foreign power or organization? No. We are internationalists. We work for the release of political prisoners in Chile, in Spain, in the Soviet Union and in China. We are opposed to totalitarianis everywhere in the world, whether in the USSR or in Spain. We meet with socialists from other countries to exchange ideas and to discuss major world political developments. But these are not illegal acts.

We maintain a relationship of fraternal solidarity with the Fourth International. Does this violate the Voorhis Act? No. We decide on our own policies and principles through our own conventions and elected bodies. And although we strongly disagree with the Voorhis Act, since it was passed in 1940 we have not been affiliated to the Fourth International. No government agency has ever produced any evidence to the contrary.

In a recent editorial condemning the continuing FBI harassment of the Socialist Workers Party, the New York Times pointed out that "the SWP is a legal American political organization."

The FBI has no evidence to dispute that. What they are

ć.

. 53.

ŝ

trying to do is to effectively outlaw our ideas. In their defense against our suit, in place of evidence of illegal SWP activity they are reduced to quoting from books written by Marx and Lenin.

The notion that some ideas are "subversive" is dangerous for everyone who may disagree with an administration in power. If it can be applied to our ideas today, it will be applied to others tomorrow.

Of course, it is already clear that many dissenting groups other than SWP have been the targets of FBI harassment and attempted disruption, especially Black individuals and organizations. To help force an end to all political spying, the Socialist Workers Party plans to continue with its landmark suit against the FBI, CIA and similar agencies.

In our opinion, only a tiny corner has been lifted on the shroud of secrecy behind which the FBI, CIA and other secret police agencies operate. Ending this secrecy would be a big step in the direction of bringing their crimes to a halt.

The American people need and deserve all the facts about the past and present secret-police operations carried out behind their backs. I hope this committee will help bring the full truth to light and take steps to bring about the full disclosure of the secret files on the FBI and CIA crimes.

Only such steps can give the American people the facts necessary

9

:5

to decide the important issues posed by the actions of the FEI and CIA.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like, with the permission of Chairman Pike, to respond extremely briefly to the one contention made by the FBI against us today. That was they admitted and conceded, and I think it is extremely important, that we have not engaged in any illegal activity. They have admitted that we are not engaging in any illegal activity or advocating violence. Instead they presented the "ripe" theory. That is that although we do not do so now, at some later date when things are ripe -- you might call it the notten-ripe theory -we will turn rotten and then engage in illegal acts and The FBI knows what our position is probably better than anvone else in this room because they are present in our organization. They have sent informers and agent-provocateurs for decades. They know very well that our goal is to try to win the majority of the American people to establish some basic change. That is what the Declaration of Independence says we have a right to do.

The American people have the right to alter the government, the economy or anything else they want to do. It is up to them to do that. We don't believe any such social change can come about unless we win the majority. After we win the majority, we do not intend to use violence or carry out illegal

Sin

\$

2

3

10

Ĺ

 $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda}$ 

30

83

12

8.24

27

4:43

16

97

38

99

20

25.

22

23

2

Sec.

3

લ

5

6

7

8

10

33

12

13

14

¥3

16

97

83

19

20

21

. 22

23

20

25

to carry out their activities and should a small group interfere? That is what we mean by revolution, the right of the American people to make basic change, as we did in 1776 and as we did in 1861.

activities. All we state is that the majority have a right

Then we had a majority in this country during the anti-war movement, did we win a majority? Did the SWP engage in illegal activities? On the contrary, the FBI knows we continue to advocate only legal and peaceful means to get the policies of the United States altered.

Now, I do believe that this "ripe" theory, however, does apply to the FBI. When they found it ripe, they did engage in illegal activities and when they see the moment is ripe, they are willing to carry out illegal acts, including That has been the case also for other agencies. violence. I wonder when I listen to them here. They say they must continue to have informants in our party. Are they waiting for the moment when it will be ripe, when the majority of the American people turn to our position and they will turn to violence? We will certainly not. Our position is well established in over 30 years in action before you and by endless evidence and by their own admission. What more can be asked than that we be treated like any other party and that the Watergating of my campaign and other activities be ended and the full treatment of the FBI and CIA be brought to light:

Thank you.

Chairman Pike. The House is currently undertaking a vote. The committee will stand in recess until 20 minutes before 3:00, at which time we will resume.

(Brief recess.)

.: .35\*

Mr. Stanton (presiding). The Select Committee on Intelligence is now reconvered.

We will continue the testimony.

At this time we would like to hear from Kathy Sledge-Lovgren who is a member of the Socialist Workers Party and who has been the subject of an investigation.

24

STATEMENT OF KATHY SLEDGE-LOVGREN, MEMBER OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

Ms. Sledge-Lovgren. My name is Kathy Sledge-Lovgren.

I was born in Spokane, and after attending high school there,
graduated from the University of Washington in 1973 with a
degree in zoology. I am employed by the Veterans Administration
Hospital in Cardiological Research as a surgical technician.

I first became acquainted with, and later joined, the Young Socialist Alliance while at the University of Washington, because I, like many other Americans at the time, was very much against the war in Vietnam. I felt the YSA was an organization I could agree with. Other organizations were involved in civil disobedience and acts of violence, like "trashing," a term meaning throwing rocks and breaking windows, et cetera, which I did not then and do not now agree with. Neither, incidentally, does the SWP.

Also, the YSA and SWP were organizations respected for their unyielding demand to keep anti-war demonstrations peaceful and legal. Accordingly, they were able to organize large demonstrations which were both effective and law abiding.

In 1974 a number of things happened to me as a result of an intense FBI investigation of me, allegedly for a job clearance. First, I received a detailed letter from the Civil Service Commission asked me to answer questions about my political views and associations, about my marital

7 2

्**ञ** ः

. 5

6

7

Ø

. 10

37

. 32

F

929

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2

Ŷ

1355

4

3

ij

7

\$ Ø

Ð

33

84

15

16

97

18

30

20

28

22

33

24

23

status, and whether or not I was still married to one person while living with another.

I was shocked, and upset, over the extent to which the FBI had gone to find out if I was suitable to perform dog My job was to assist doctors in medical research by doing the surgical preparations on animals -- not a job warranting security precautions.

My supervisors were concerned because, to their knowledge, no similar FBI investigation had ever been undertaken regarding an employee of the research staff.

Second, the FBI came to my work unit, called in my fellow workers (one at a time), and asked questions about my loyalty to hte government, whether I advocated the violent overthrow of the government, if I was a Communist, and whether or not I had tried to sell or hand out subversive literature. MY co-workers were upset that they had been brought into the matter at all.

My boss, Dr. Tremann, was outraged and disgusted with the FBI for this disruption. Not only had they caused me a lot of worry and fear for my job, but they also managed to anger my chief supervisor, because they had ordered individuals in my work unit to come up and answer questions without first informing the Director of the hospital.

Third, the FBI questioned all of the tenants in the apartment complex I was managing at the time, asking them if I had had meetings there, or if they had noticed people coming and going, and what my political views were. They also questioned tenants about who I was living with.

My best personal woman friend was called down to an FBI office to answer questions. So, too, was my former boss, who was then living in Chicago. Both were angered by the intrusion.

Worst of all, the FBI embarrassed my family in Spokane.

My father is a well respected and conservative doctor.

They came to his office and quertioned him about my political ideas and associations. He bacame greatly worried about the effect on his practice and reputation.

They questioned my mother at home, extensively. As a result, she almost had a nervous breakdown. Both my parents begged me to quit the organization. They feared that I would lose my job.

Until then, my family and I had maxaged to avoid talking about my politics, and maintain a close-knit relationship, including my uncle (a Circuit Court Judge of the Fifth District. We did so, that is, until the FBI caused a breech, which only now is beginning to heal.

Sometime after I answered the questions in the Civil
Service Commission letter, I found out that my case had been
dropped, at least for the time being. Since then, as I have
continued to work at the Veterans Hospital, I have received
two promotions. I believe I am considered to be an excellent

. 5

ĩ G

I employee by the management.

1800

ņ

2

3

53

Ĉ

Ø

30

100

32

73

17

3.55

16

17

18

10

23

23

22.

23

24

25

I have no police record. I have never committed a crime or any act of violence. I keep my political ideas to myself when with my fellow emploises, who have recently honored me by electing me to be their shop steward for the American Federation of Government Employees.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much for allowing me to come here and hearing what I have to say.

Chairman Pike. Thank you, Kathy.

We deeply appreciate your testimony.

The next witness will be Robert Silverman, a former employer of Social Workers Party member who was investigated by the FBI.

## STALMENT OF ROBERT GEORGE SILVERMAN BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.

November 18,1975

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Robert George Silverman, President of Peer Enterprises

Ltd. This is my best recollection of a visit to my offices

at Peer Enterprises Ltd. during the fall of 1972 by two

men who identified themselves as agents of the FBI.

I was called in our sixth floor production office on that day, and told the two agents were present and wished to inquire about an employee. After they produced FBI identification for my father and me, they inquired about Bruce Bloy—and I believe one other employee. I wanted to know the purpose of their inquiry; their response was vague. They asked what kind of employee Bruce was, and, after I again asked what the investigation was all about, indicated that Bruce—and this other employee—were members of a political party the FBI was interested in.

My father at this point wanted to know if this meant that his employees were members of the Communist Party, that they were "reds." One of the agents responded by saying he couldn't go into that. My father reacted by expressing his desire to fire both of these people.

By now the exchange between my father and one of the FBI agents had become heated. I interrupted, said that I thought my father was not thinking clearly, that there would be no firings that day, and that I deeply resented the impression that the agents were creating about Bloy and our other employee by refusing to answer our questions while at the same time indicating by inference that the investigation had to do with their political affiliations. Clearly, any reasonable person would conclude that there must be something unacceptable, undesirable, or illegal about my employees conduct.

I told the FDI agents that these employees were desirable ones from my standpoint, that they had never given me cause to believe otherwise, and that until such time as they did. Bruce and the other person could remain with my company.

I said further that as an employer, I had no interest in the political beliefs of my employees, and felt that the FBI had no right to raise such things at an individual's place of employ.

However regrettable my father's response to these FBI questions, it is exactly the sort of response that can be expected from employers approached in this manner by FBI Agents—and I told the agents as much.

I would characterize the approach of the agents as presumptive, mysterious, and in this instance aggressive. What was most distressing to me, was the presumption on the agents' part that we would necessarily share their point of view.

I would like to be specific with respect to

Bruce Bloy and the other employee (who remains nameless
out of respect for her privacy). May I state emphatically
that I viewed them both as desirable employees with good
work habits, and I would be pleased to re-employ them at
any time. It is in my view something more than
regrettable that these two people should be subjected to
such embarrassment, for what third parties suspect they
might do, rather than what they have actually done.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stanton. Thank you, Mr. Silverman.
The next witness we will have testimony f

The next witness we will have testimony from is Marcus

Raskin, Co-Director of the Institute for Policy Studies, which
has been the subject of a five and a half year FBI investigation.

STATEMENT OF MARCUS G. RASKIN, CO-DIRECTOR, OF THE INSTITUTE

FOR POLICY STUDIES

Mr. Raskin.

Mr. Raskin.

4223

I count it as a distinct privilege to appear before today and to answer any questions which will help you in your difficult and important task.

My name is Marcus G. Raskin. I am Co-Director of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. I am a graduate of the University of Chicago and its law School. I have served in the United States government for five years as an advisor to a group of Congressmen and then as a member of the Special Staff of the National Security Council under President Kennedy. I also served as a member of the Presidential Panel on Educational Research and Development and an education advisor in the Bureau of the Budget. I have written half a dozen books in the area of foreign and national security policy, political philosophy and politics, as well as numerous articles which have appeared in scholarly journals, newspapers and magazines.

Since 1963 I have served as the Co-Director of the Institute for Policy Studies with Richard J. Barnet, a leading scholar in foreign and economic affairs. In 1963 the Institute for Policy Studies was established as an independent center of research and education in public policy. Its mandate was to pursue inquiry and truth about those matters which were central to a free and democratic society. The Institute grew out of a belief that the great universities were too closely identified with ongoing policies of the federal government in the area of public policy. We believed that it was necessary to develop an institution which would be financially independent of the government. Consequently, the Institute does not accept government contracts and grants. We also believe that the major questions of our time are moral and political ones. Those of us who were in the government found that the fundamental questions about policies were rirtually never asked. Thus, moral questions, or even questions about consequences. were almost never addressed. The emphasis was on "getting it done" without much concern with what the "it" was. I might add that this unwillingness in government, difficult in all cases, to ask fundamental moral and political questions. culminated in the Nixon period of government, although as you are

Testimony before House Inteligence Committee

aware, the seeds of the Nixon era have been present in American government for many years.

Since 1963, fellows of the Inst. ute have published books, studies, reports and articles on a wide variety of issues and questions. These studies include analysis of the university system, the media, health care, the defense system, military budget, education, multinational corporations, political theory, problems of economics, bureaucratic-aecountability, problems of religion the neighborhood, as well as worker dissatisfaction and participation in the decisions of the work place. Books by Institute fellows are used in many universities. As you might have guessed from the subject matter considered, Institute fellows have been various disciplines. They have received their degrees in law, trained in economics, physics, psychology, sociology, history and political science. We have also been fortunate in developing a PhD program in conjunction with the Union Graduate School. Seminars and task force discussions are held at the Institute. Membership in such study groups usually includes members from the government, the Congress, educators from universities, people from the different citizen's movements which developed over the last decade, and fellows of the Institute. These sessions are open and informal, indeed too informal, as recent revelations suggest. In this regard, Institute fellows see themselves as as practicing public scholarship. They are "scholars of the people", available to any and all for discussion. They are not on contract to any group or corporation. In this basic sense they are independent of party. From time to time, following the principles of the best social science, the Institute has undertaken certain social inventions and projects. For example, we have begun and studied such social inventions as mini-schools, new towns for people leaving agricultural life as tenant farmers, neighborhood science laboratories and community technology labs. We have helped communities begin neighborhood governments. Recently we have initiated a clearing house of policy

alternatives for people interested in local and state governments.

During this last thirteen year period where so many values have been questioned, and where authority has been seen to be unwise and insensitive, people have reacted through the development of movements which they hoped would make real the ideals of American civilization. Movements concerning civil rights, worker participation, ecology, anti-war, consumerism, and women's liberation shaped and reflected a new consciousness on American life. These impulses set the tersm of what equality, freedom and democracy should be.

We at the Institute attempted to relate our intellectual studies to this new consciousness. One reason was that people at the Institute believe that there was a congruence of the high ideals of these movements to those qualities necessary to make this society a decent and humane one. This point of view was not shared by the various police and intelligence agencies of the government who feared public scholarship and the kind of scholarship which gave information to anyone who cared to listen or read. For our troubles we have found ourselves harrassed, bugged, tailed, broken-into, eavesdropped, wiretapped and burgled. We know the following, but I am sure that now you know much more.

Every agency which has responded to FOIA requests: the FBI, the CIA, the Office of Naval Intelligence, Army Intelligence - have indicated that they have files on IPS and its fellows.

Reliable testimony indicated that:

1) The "special services" squad of IRS, the Service's political "hit" squad, collected information on IPS in a special room of the IRS. The IPS tax status underwent special audit for about six years. A spurious challenge to this status was finally made; it was overruled upon appeal within the IRS in 1974, as the Watergate scandal began to unravel the Nixon Administration's plans to quash domestic discussion.

- 2) The FBT targeted informers to infiltrate and report upon IPS meetings and seminars. Informers also attempted to gain memployment at IPS, but without success. The Bureau also rifled IPS garbage, reviewing papers involved, reconstructing typewriter tapes which were thrown out, and presumably dispensing with the coffee grounds, tissue papers, paper towels, and other garbage generally thrown out each day. The Bureau files on the Institute and its fellows run to several feet of papers already, and only the barest minimum have been revealed.
- 3) IPS fellows were targets of the Boston grand jury investigation of the Pentagon Papers, an investigation which never resulted in indictments. Several had suppens issued against them, but these were dropped rather than reveal tapes of conversions which had been overheard on warantless wiretpas.
- 4) It is clear that IPS fellows have had their conversations intercepted by many warrartless wiretaps, although it is not yet known on whom the taps were placed. It is clear that the IPS files were created by each of the federal agencies: the CTA, the FBI, the Office of Naval Intelligence, military intelligence agencies in general. It is not known if IPS or its fellows were targets of the special "watch lists" which were distributed to various intelligence agencies, including NSA, the FBI, CIA, IRS, and military intelligence, but it would be surprising if it were not. The Institute, Richard Barnet and I were on President Nixon's Enemies list. And various IPS trustees were given special auditing treatment.
- 5) As if federal attention were not sufficient, IPS came to the attention of the DC Police and their political intelligence unit. The DC police employed the same informer used by the FBI against IPS, and perhaps several others. Several mysterious break-ins took place at IPS over a course of two years.

The powerful and the state are never very comfortable with open scholarship and with the willingness to pursue questions whose answers may not serve the status

the scholar for the people. Ideas are indeed frightening things. They cannot be seen, but they can be felt, they represent the accumulated wisdom of people, and yet they seem ivory towered and remote; they challenge the status quo and undermine the powerful, but they can be tested and evaluated publicly and honestly. This can be done through debate, not through wiretapping or burglary. It can be done not through imprisonment, indictment, impugning the patriotism or honesty of another person, but by stating directly one's interests, arguments and purposes. The value of this hearing is that it will encourage the police agencies to think again about who they are and what they serve. It might even encourage them to come to discussions of the Institute not as spies, sneaks and informers, but as participants who are open to having their dearest assumptions challenged.

Copeland follows Rudolph 3:00 p.m. 11/18/75

. 3

Mr. Stanton. Thank you, Mr. Raskin. I am delighted to have your testimony, and my colleague, Congressman Dellums, is delighted to welcome you as a co-member of the President's Enemy List, on which he is happy to join you. We would like at this time for Mr. Murtagh and Mr. Hardy to pull chairs up to the table.

We will begin the questioning of members of the panel.

Any member who wants to question any particular person who has testified can do it now.

Mr. McClory. I don't want to get the answer right now, but the last witness, Mr. Raskin, I guess, you mentioned wiretaps in a very general way and unlawful acts and things like that.

We are investigating the FBI today, and I would like you to, at an appropriate time, delineate the precise time and place when unlawful wiretaps were placed on you and any members of your organization, or any other illegal acts were performed by them which we could investigate with them.

Mr. Stanton. Fine; Mr. Raskin; do you want to respond?

Mr. Raskin. Mr. Congressman, may I submit the file to you

Mr. McClory. Yes, that is what I want you to do.

Mr. Raskin. I don't have it with me, but I will submit it.

(The information is to be supplied.)

	Mr. McClory. I want to ask Mr. Murtagh, you mentioned
S. S	
2	unlawful wiretaps and especially a wiretap on Martin Luther
Ś	King. As a matter of fact, that was a wiretap which was placed
A service	on Martin Luther King by direct authority of the Attorney
. 5	General Robert Kennedy, was it not?
6	Mr. Murtagh. As I understand it I guess you have been
7	through this before, and I said, "of questionable legality",
	and I am not concerned
9	Mr. McClory. Just answer the question.
30	Mr. Stanton. Do you know who placed the wiretap or
62	authorized it?
23	Mr. Murtagh. No, I don't know who authorized it.
13	Mr. Stanton. That answers the question.
4.4 ·	Mr. Murtagh. May I make a correction in my original
15	statement, Mr. Chairman?
16	Mr. Stanton. We would be happy to have any corrections.
17	Mr. Murtagh. This is just a short correction and will
18	only take a minute. I said that I had known thousands of
<b>89</b>	agents who had resigned in disgust, and I guess that would be
20	incorrect; I probably have known hundreds who did.
21	Mr. McClory. Would you give us the names of five or ten
22	you can think of?
23	Mr. Murtagh. No, sir, I couldn't give you the names of
24	five or ten agents. I don't recall names that rapidly. I
צ	ł in kina in the management of the contract of

25

think I could .--

Mr. McClory. Do you know the names of ten?

Mr. Murtagh. Yes; I could go back and review them. If the Bureau would want to give me a list of the agents that went through the offices I was in, I could pick out many.

Mr. McClory. Get ten for me. I would like to have the names.

Every former FBI agent I met until you came along was very proud of his service, of the FBI, and felt a sense of loyalty right up until today and didn't feel any need to bring such loyalty as you have today.

Mr. Murtagh. You and I are talking to different agents.

Mr. Stanton. Mr. McClory, I don't think you ought to characterize the witness' testimony.

Please continue.

Mr. McClory. I want to ask Mr. Camejo, from 1938, I think it was, until 1940 the Socialist Workers Party did, and originally did advocate the overthrow of the government by force of violence, did it not?

Mr. Camejo. No, it did not.

Mr. McClory. It never did? .

Mr. Camejo. Never did.

Mr. McClory. Are you talking about never since you became affiliated with it or never in its history?

Mr. Camejo. Never in its history.

Mr. McClory. Now, when you talk about that, you want to

23

32

23

20

 $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{C}}}}}$ 

assert rights such as those that were exercised in 1776 and 1861, those were violent revolutions, were they not?

Wir. Camejo. The American people chose in 1776 that they wanted no taxation without representation; they wanted a republic; they wanted a democracy; and there was a tyranny that would not allow them to have that.

I don't know if you are acquainted with this type of history, but there was a revolution at that time which most Americans supported. The entire nation is celebrating it next year. You might have heard of that.

Mr. McClory. Was it a violent revolution?

Mr. Camejo. Yes, it was guite violent.

Mr. McClory. Is that the kind you advocate now?

Mr. Camejo. I support the revolution of 1776.

Mr. McClory. Is that the kind you advocate now?

Mr. Camejo. No; I think we don't need to repeat that revolution. We are independent from England now, so it is unnecessary to try that one again. It would be rather foolish.

Mr. McClory. Mr. Murtagh, in addition to the wiretap that you say was illegal, will you give me the --

Mr. Murtagh. Congressman, I did not say the wiretap was illegal.

Mr. McClory. You used the expression illegal activity throughout your testimony. I want to know what they were.

Mr. Murtagh. The illegal activity consisted of a series

20

1

of things --

2

Mr. McClory. I want you to delineate them,

. 3

answer them.

. 5

6

7

8

9

30

13

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

22

23

24

25

Mr. Murtagh. If you will give me an opportunity, I will

Mr. McClory. We won't have time today, because I am sure there are too many you want to delinease. I want you to furnish the Committee with a complete list of all the illegal activity you were called on to perform when you were in the FBI.

My time is up. That is why I am asking you to submit it. So if you will do that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Murtagh. All right, Mr. McClory, let me tell you I will not bother to submit it for this reason: I have been through this thing. My wife has been suffering --

Mr. McClory. I just want --

Mr. Murtagh. Can I make my statement or not?

Mr. McClory. You are not responding to my question any more than Mr. Camejo responded. I want answers to questions. don't want speeches and performances here. This isn't a spectacle. It is an investigation, and you are refusing to respond to my question when you refuse to turn over in delineated form the illegal activities which you referred to in a general way in your statement.

I think we will give you one moment to Mr. Stanton. explain, Mr. Murtagh, if you would like to explain why you are not going to submit the testimony.

Mr. Murtagh. I am not going to continue any longer in this business. If the Committee hasn't by this time collected enough information to see the need for reform of the FBI, then I think that the cause is lost and the country is lost if we can't do it with what we have now.

Mr. Stanton. Thank you. The Chair would like to ask
Mr. Raskin if there has ever been a time when the Institute
for Policy Studies has ever advocated change by violent means.

Mr. Raskin. No, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Has the IPS ever engaged in training sessions or strategy sessions for individuals, who advocated violence to achieve their goal?

Mr. Raskin. No, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Have they ever provided refuge for fugitives from justice?

Mr. Raskin. No, sir.

Mr. Stanton. Thank you. .....

The Chair will yield to Mr. Dellums.

Mr. Dellums. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Murtagh, unfortunately I was not able to be here this morning, and I would like to take the opportunity to ask you a few questions, perhaps in a different tone and certainly in a different nature than the distinguished ranking minority member.

Î

2

ु

Ą

.

6

g.

9

30

12

13

91%

15

16

17

18

£9

20

Has the FBI tended to screen out certain racial groups and religious groups?

Mr. Murtagh. I am sorry; I didn't hear the question.

Mr. Dellums. Has the FBI tended, over the years, to screen out certain racial groups and religious groups?

Mr. Amrtagh. Racial and religious groups. I don't understand what you mean by screen out. In hiring?

Mr. Dellums. Tes.

Fig. Murtagh. There is no guestion about it, that the selection process has been designed in such a way that a person could not be hired in an agent capacity unless he could get by an interview with a person who was already in the position of, say, an SAC and the screening has been done along the lines of if you look the part, if you are the type of person that I am, then we will take you, and if you are not, we won't.

I have personal experience in a situation where an Air Force captain was coming into the Bureau — I mean was asking for employment and the assistant in charge in Atlanta called me in. I had been assisting in screening some of these people. He asked me to go out and take a look at this fellow, and I went out and looked at him, and I went back in and he said, "Do you see anything wrong with him?" I said, "No, I can't see anything wrong."

He said, "Didn't you notice that he has eyes like Robert

Ĉ,

Ø

Mitchum? His eyelids fall down over his eyes." I said, "Yes, I noticed that." He said, "Well, I would be afraid to recommend him." He said, "I got transferred one time for recommending somebody that had some on their face."

I give that as an illustration of the sort of qualifications that they looked into.

Mr. Dellums. Thank you, Mr. Murtagh.

My next question, has this policy of exclusion had consequences or affected the results or policies of the PBI?

Mr. Murtagh. I think it is the whole problem because the direction and the attitudes that control the thinking in the FBI are the attitudes of those that are hired.

Now, Mr. Adams here this morning was mentioning that they were having trouble recruiting minority agents. I happened to know of a situation where I recruited minority people in Atlanta for clerical positions at the request of the SAC, several hundred of them over a period of four years, and I recruited them very vigorously.

My job was merely to get them, approve them for investigation, and them other agents conducted the investigations.

We got to the point where we had a hundred or more finished investigations at the Bureau.

The boss at that 'time was Joe Fonder, the boss in Atlanta. He came to the Bureau for his yearly conference and came back to me, came up to my desk, sat down and said, "Art,

17

32

90

20

23

22

23

. 24

25

ċ.

3

I was at the Eureau last week, and I went around the horn and talked to all the supervisors until I got to Adams, and Adams spoke to me and he said, "One way or another, you have got to stop Murtagh's movement" — meaning Murtagh's Blacks — "coming up to the Eureau to work." And he says, "If you don't stop it, you are going to get those miggers back down south to work in your office."

Mr. Dellums. Thank you, Mr. Murtagh. My next question is, does the FBI have a political philosophy, and, if so, does the agency's political views affect its investigation of Blacks, browns, reds, yellows, Socialist Workers Party, anti-war movement and other so-called dissident groups?

Mr. Murtagh. The emphasis on all the intelligence investigation is to hit the left hard and to ignore the right until they do enough damage as they did in the sixties in the Klan situation, to do enough damage so that the Bureau is forced into investigating by the press.

I went into Birmingham in the Birmingham bombing situation and the trouble in Birmingham with a group of agents in the early sixties and the Bureau at that time — the Brown decision came down in 1954 and by 1962 they had nothing on the Klan in Alabama other than a list of first names and that sort of thing, no penetration whatsoever, and if you contrast that with the intensive investigations that they made of the Black units — and I did them myself, so I know what I am talking

ç

- 4

ä

2.5

\$6

about — the Black units in the Atlanta area during the sixties when certain Blacks became militant, there is no comparison whatscever of the effort put in, the agent time, the amount of agents assigned to the job, the thoroughness with which the investigations were worked in connection with Black militants as opposed to the Klu Klux Klan.

The only time they investigated the Klan was when there was actual murder and the press forced them into it.

Mr. Dellums. Thank you very much for that illuminating testimony, Mr. Murtagh.

Mr. Stanton. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Murtagh, this morning you said with respect to the call that you had from a Colonel Klink about the Andrew Young election, that you thought that the information, his hand-writing sample, I believe it was, was going to be used in an unrecorded counterintelligence operation to destroy Mr. Young's chances of being elected.

Was that anything that you knew about, or is that a speculation on your part?

Do you know of any kind of counterintelligence operation against Mr. Young or any other candidate for Congress?

Mr. Murtagh. That I know of personally, myself?
Mr. Johnson. Yes, sir; that you know of.

?

 $\epsilon$ 

**£**9

Mr. Muxtagh. No. I know of another situation involving information that was used in that manner or at least Arthur DeLoach told us it was, in which they picked up some information on a midwestern -- I wouldn't mention his name, but a midwestern Senator who was in a hit-and-run accident situation.

He told us this in a class with fifty agents present here in Washington on the week that Kennedy was killed. >

Mr. Johnson. Was that used by the FBI in operation against somebody's election?

Mr. Murtagh. Here is what Delkach said. Somebody asked him, "What do we use all this memorandum stuff we put in about things we see, what do you do with it?" DeLozch said, "You fellows have been in the Bureau for more than ten years, so I guess I can talk to you off the record." He said, "The other night we picked up a situation where this Senator was seen drunk, in a hit-and-run accident, and some goodlooking broad was with him." He said, "We got the information, reported it in memorandum", and DeLoach -- and this is an exact quote -he said, "By noon the next day the good Senator was aware that we had the information and we never have had any trouble with him on appropriations since."

Mr. Johnson. Anything else, any other operations that you might know about?

Mr. Murtagh. I am only one agent.

Mr. Johnson. I understand that. I am just asking you if

2

14

. 5

6

7

8

9

10

5.5

33.

24

15

18

17

18

10

20

28

22

23

24

we are going to find out about this, we have to know what our witnesses can tell us. I would like to know what you thought might be the kind of counterintelligence operation that could be used to destroy Mr. Young's chances by getting a handwriting sample?

Mr. Murtagh. Well, I didn't put it all in the statement. The supervisor in that case said something to the effect that they wanted it to disrupt the relationship between Andrew Young and his co-workers in the SCLC unit by a counter-intelligence operation which I knew to mean writing letters and seeing that they got into SCLC indicating that Hosea Williams was saying something about Young or something of that nature and having them surreptitiously delivered to the individuals causing internal difficulty.

Mr. Johnson. Those the Committee know who Colonel Klink is and who called him with this idea and on whose orders that was initiated?

Mr. Murtagh. His name is Charles Harding. He is retired from the Bureau now.

Mr. Johnson. He is the one you identified as Colonel Klink?

Mr.-Murtagh. The last I heard, he was working as a fundraiser for SCLC.

Mr. Johnson. Do we know who initiated that contact with Colonel Klink?

ş

:3

5;

Ø

ş

· 35.

Mr. Murtagh. Who initiated it?

2

Mr. Johnson. Yes; you said he received a call. You

3

don't know whose orders this allegedly originated with: is

Æ,

SCLS?"

that correct?

5 8

hours, and he said, "Art, the Bureau called. Can your boy

7

get" -- apologies for the reference to boy, but -- "can your

Mr. Murtagh. All I know is Klink called me in after

ß

boy" -- meaning my Negro informant -- "can your boy get hand-

writing samples and letterhead material and envelopes from

20

11

12

13

14

85

16

27

18

19

20

51.

22

23

24

23

I responded, "Yes, he can, but he won't, and I know what you want them for." I said, "You and your crowd are going to run a counterintelligence operation and you can tell that guy at the Bureau I won't do it."

Mr. Johnson. Did Colonel Klink confirm what --

Mr. Stanton. Your time is up.

Mr. Johnson. I am sorry. . .

Mr. Stanton. Thank-you.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Lehman.

Mr. Lehman. Just a couple of brief questions on provocateurs and the information I received was that there were no provocateurs used previously to now or in the present time acting as provocateurs.

This is contradictory to some information that I had

received, and I just wonder, I have no quarrel with informers, 9 but how do you keep informers from becoming provocateurs, and did you have knowledge of any provocateurs when you were in Э the FBI? Mr. Murtagh. I spoke to Mr. Hardy this morning when the . 5 question of provocateurs came up and said it is my judgment  $\mathfrak{S}$ that the situation that he told you about is probably a rarity 7

I think that it was probably the actions of in the Bureau. ξŝ an individual agent. 

The Bureau, to my knowledge, never indicated they wanted you to develop a provocateur, but, of course, it is also my feeling that this unbalanced political membership of agents, that is, the fact that they are all rightwingers rather than having a liberal here and there, this creates an atmosphere in which provocateurs develop. . . .

If you were in the Bureau and you were a racist, you waxe a strong supporter of the Viet Nam War; you hated all the minority groups; you could be very popular, because most of the agents felt that way.

Mr. Lehman. That was a little different -- I was trying to find out if you had any information as to --

Mr.-Murtagh. No; frankly, I think the Bureau did not want the agents to develop provocateurs.

Mr. Lehman. I am just trying to find out the facts; that

24

10

53

32

23

84

25

15

17

B

19

20

21

22

23

7

is all. Thank you.

2

3

Ą

. 5

G

7

3:50

9

10

3 3

12

13

14

\$55

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Stanton. I would like to thank the witnesses for coming. We are going to adjourn the Salect Committee until twenty to four, at which time we will have questions for the early-morning witnesses from the FBI.

Thank you very much for coming. We appreciate it.

(The Committee stands recessed until twenty to four.)

Mr. Dellums (presiding). The Committee will come to order. May we have the FBI witnesses return to the table, please?

May I ask the gentlemen who are witnesses if you have opening statements? If you don't, we will proceed to the questioning.

Mr. Wannall. Mr. Chairman, we appeared earlier today and there was an opening statement. I would appreciate just a couple of minutes to make a few remarks, if I may.

Mr. Dellums. You may proceed.

further testimony of W. Raymond Wannall, of FbI

Mr. Wannall. Chairman Pike asked that I remain this after noon and listen to the testimony which has been given by the witnesses who appeared.

prior to our arrival here this morning, we had not received the statements which were utilized by those witnesses in making their presentations. We are not in a position to discuss in detail the various allegations which have been made. We

certainly are in a position to talk about our policies and procedures, and from the allegations which I have heard today, I can assure you that they do not represent the policy of the FBI at this time, and, to my knowledge, not at any time in the past.

There were some questions which Congressman Dellums posed regarding our policy with respect to employment of minority groups. I had the opportunity during the recess, from which we have just returned, to have a call placed to our office, and I do have figures with respect to employment of minorities as of October 31, 1975.

May I say before I put these figures on the record, Mr. Adams addressed himself this morning to the efforts which are being made to build up our complement among the minority groups.

As of October 31, we had among our special agent complement 103 agents who are Blacks, 113 with Spanish-American surnames, fourteen of American-Indian background, twenty-one of Oriental background.

We do have on our rolls to date 37 female agents, and a very great need for additional ones among the female agents and among the others which I have delineated.

Chairman Pike. To put those figures in perspective, can you tell us out of how many agents?

Mr. Wannall. Our total agent complement is in the

\$

8

neighborhood of 8,384.

j.,

3

4

Ĝ

. 8

9

10

3.5

12

33

14

15

16

17

18

ß

20

21

22

24

23

25

Among our clerical complement we have 1,863 Blacks, 263 with Spanish-American surnames, thirteen American Indians, and 96 Orientals. Very many of these are Semales. I have not tried to delineate between the males and females of our clerical complement.

It is the charter of this Committee to check into our operations, and I hope that that also, Chairman Pike, will be put into perspective. We have been discussing only the domestic intelligence operations of the FBI. May I give you an idea of what percentage of our overall operations that represents?

The FBI does have investigative responsibility under some 2.30 to 17.4

135 statutes. The agent complement of the 8,384 agents we have, there are less than ten percent who are engaged in our domestic intelligence operations. The most up-to-date figure I have at my fingertips was as the result of a survey made in April last year, and the precise number was 788, and that number has been reduced since that time.

Some three years ago, that number was over 1,200. The trend has been downward, as a result of our requirements to place on higher priority work additional manpower.

There have been statements made or questions asked, perhaps I should say, with regard to the FBI utilization of agent provocateurs. When we speak of agent provocateurs, I am sure we are speaking about activities which would amount to entrapment.

about a third of a century, there has been in our manual a very specific prohibition against any agent engaging in entrapment. Any agent who was found to have engaged in that would be subject to severe disciplinary action.

With regard to the utilization of informants: At the present time in our domestic intelligence area, we are investigating a certain number of organizations, each of which has numerous chapters, districts, clubs. If you put all of those together, including the segments of the organizations as well as the principal organizations, we would come up with a figure of over 1,100 organizations or subdivisions of organizations that to some extent would receive investigative attention.

Our total number of informants in our demestic intelligence area is less than that number, less than 1,100. The extent of our use of informants might be best represented — and I might explain here that I am talking about informants not only in our domestic intelligence area, I am talking about those we use in our foreign counterintelligence operations. I am also talking about those individuals whom we have under inquiry for the purpose of determining whether or not they may be utilized as informants.

The total amount of money paid for all of these things in

. 5

£ 2

\$43

5 27

1974 was one-half of one percent of the FBI's budget. In no year in the last twenty has it exceeded 1.2 percent of the budget. And that figure was attained at a time when our activities were particularly concentrated in our foreign counterintelligence areas.

The witnesses who have appeared this afternoon are connected with organizations — not all of them, the majority —
organizations which are currently involved in litigation involving also the FBI as well as other agencies and officials of
our government. The Socialist Workers Party presently has a
suit pending for some \$27 million against numerous officials
and agencies of the government.

I offer to you, Mr. Chairman, that in connection with that suit we have, of course, been required to file pleadings papers indicating the basis for investigation, and if the Committee would be interested in having a copy of that particular paper, we would be very happy to submit it for the Committee records.

Chairman Pike. I don't have any idea how voluminous these documents are, but without objection, they will be made part of the Committee records.

Mr. Wannall. I spoke particularly of the documents showing the basis for our investigation, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pike. Can you tell me roughly the size of that document, that is all I am asking.

\* 10

	Mr. Wannall. I am told it is about five pages.
23	Chairman Pike. That is fine. Without objection, it will
3	be made part of the record
4	(The information is to be supplied.)
153	
6	
7	
8	·
9	
۲0°	
دراسمسورییوه و بها م <sup>ا</sup> دنه	·
72	
13	
34	
15	
16	
33	
18	
19	
20	
Si	
22	
23	
2A	
25	

E

Mr. Wannall. There was one statement made by Miss Lori
Paton this afternoon that I would like to comment upon.
There is litigation involving Miss Paton at the present time,
also, so I do not want to go extensive y into it, but she did
make a statement that when she wrote to the Director of the
FBI to inquire as to whether there was an FBI investigation of
her, she received a reply in the negative, and I am sure that
is the case.

She has explained there were three contacts which were made, and I think this morning it was pointed out that it took us six months really to get around to doing this, but three contacts that were made and established that she was a high-school student and in connection with a civics class, I think it was, had prepared and sent a letter.

When that information was developed, it was considered by our field office as completely insignificant, not of sufficient significance to send to headquarters, so when Miss Paton wrote to headquarters and made this inquiry, we had absolutely no record in the files of our headquarters division with respect to Miss Paton, and that was the basis for her having received the reply which she did.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to make these few remarks, and if I am able to reply to matters of a policy or procedure nature, I would certainly be most happy to attempt to.

Chairman Pike. I am interested in your last comment that
there was no record at headquarters involving this Paton case.

Are you saying there was no record at all at headquarters
involving this Paton case?

Mr. Wannall. At our headquarters here in Washington.

Chairman Pike. Now, are you saying that this mail cover surveillance under which Miss Paton's name got picked up was not operated out of Washington but was operated on a regional basis?

Mr. Wannall. No, sir.

Chairman Pike. How did the regional office get Miss Paton's name?

Mr. Wannall. Through the mail cover concerning —
Chairman Pike. So there was some record in Washington of
Miss Paton's investigation, at least that her name had been
sent from Washington to the regional office; is that not
correct?

Mr. Wannall. No, sir. The mail cover in order to be established — and I think it ran for a period of some 120 days — had to be approved at headquarters. It could not have been put on without headquarters approval. In fact, it could not have been put on without the approval of the chief postal inspector of the Post Office Department.

The mail cover then was operated in a regional office covering the Socialist Workers Party.

愆

9 4

Chairman Pike. You mean that once the headquarters says go ahead and run a mail cover, they no longer get any records as to the result of the mail cover?

Mr. Wannall. We get complete records of significant information.

Chairman Pike. Well, here is a situation in which a kid in a high school class wrote to a political party and, as a result, got investigated by the FBI. That is really what it boils dom to.

Then when she found she was being investigated by the FBI, she wrote to the FBI and asked them whether she was being investigated by the FBI and they said no.

Now, I don't really think that you can avoid responsibility for this sort of misinformation by the bland statement that "We didn't have any records about her in Washington."

Do you mean the FBI every time that anybody asks them whether they are being investigated doesn't bother to check in the region?

Rudolph follows

3:59 p.m.

22

. .

-2

B

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

73

12

13

84

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

28

r dolph

. 2

3

4

រី ៤

r)

Ç)

23 30

12

£3

88

16

17

.10 81

20

21

22

23 24

25

Mr. Wannall. No, sir. What I am trying to convey to you is that our manual, which provides the guidelines for investigation in this area, a copy of which has been sent to you --

Chairman Pike. Well, the letter which was sent to Mr. Frank Askin on July 6, 1973, was from the Newark, New Jersey, office and was signed by J. Wallace La rade, Special Agent in Charge, and flatly denied that there was any investigation by the Bureau. That didn't come from Washington; that came from the Regional Office and from the man who purported or alleged that he was in charge of the investigation.

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter, but

Mr. Wannall. I am not familiar with the letter with the l

I assumed from that she had written to Headquarters.

Chairman Pike. I don't know whether she said the Director had lied to her. She said the FBI had lied to her.

Mr. Wannall. Then I took my notes down incorrectly, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pike. It is possible that you are right.

But the man in charge, J. Wallace LaPrade, is a real name,
he was the one in charge of this and here is the language
of the letter: "After carefully reviewing the facts in this
matter, I have concluded them was no impropriety on the part
of investigative personnel of this bureau and that the FBI

has no knowledge of any letter Ms. Paton may have sent to the Socialist Labor Party. You may be sure that Ms. Paton is not the subject of an investigation by this Bureau and that the FBI does not maintain a general policy of surveillance of correspondence of political groups such as the Socialist Labor Party."

We are now talking about the Socialist Labor Party as opposed to the Socialist Workers Party. But other than that, it seems to me a rather straightforward mis-assertion of the facts as they actually were.

Mr. Wannall. Mr. Chairman, I will be very happy to pursue this, get the facts and submit them to you. I was endeavoring to address myself to the policies and procedures that we have.

Chairman Pike. Mr. McClory.

Mr. McClory. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to the employment of FBI agents, Mr. Murtagh stated that there were thousands who have been forced to leave the FBI service in utter disgust. Now you state that you have 8300 agents. How many were asked to resign last year or how many resigned voluntarily last year?

Mr. Stanton. Would the gentleman yield for a second?

He amended his statement.

Mr. McClory. I know, but I am just asking how many.

I am not asking whether he made a direct statement or not.

2

2

A S

3

G

7

8

9

3 7

# 650

13

14

15

10

17

78

19

20

21

22

23

28

Mr. Stanton. You would not want to misrepresent what he said.

Mr. McClory. That is his written statement. All I want to know is how many wanted to resign or how many requested to resign. Would you furnish us with that information for the last two or three years so we will know how many are resigning in disgust or what?

Mr. Wannall. Mr. McClory, the best way I can answer that is to tell you that the turnover rate among agents, if you exclude those who retire, is less than 3 percent.

Mr. McClory. With respect to informants, that is a legitimate and very vital way of securing information and intelligence, isn't it?

Mr. Wannall: Yes, sir.

Mr. McClory. You are not going to discontinue that because we have some intelligence excesses or failures or abuses. I hope.

Now also, Mr. Murtagh, of course, came to work for you in 1951. That was before the Civil Rights Act of '64 and before the Voting Rights Act of '65.

We have had a change, have we not, during these later years with respect to rights of minorities, especially the rights of blacks to vote and unemployment and things like that and they have been reflected in the FBI as well as in all segments of our society, I trust. Is that right?

2

3

23

6

7

8

30

ŞĒ

22

13

10

913

96

Mr. Wannall I think that is a correct statement, sir.

Mr. McClory. Mr. Murtagh also testified about the wiretap of Martin Luther Ring, Jr., but he didn't seem to know whether it was authorized or unauthorized, actually.

Actually, that was authorized by a former Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, was it not?

Mr. Wannall. It was authorized, jes, sir.

Mr. McClory. Now, with respect to state wiretaps, you don't have anything to do with that, whether they are authorized or anauthorized, do you?

Mr. Wunnall. No.

Mr. McClory. Have you had any kind of wiretaps on this organization which is the IPS Institute of Policy Studies, do you know?

Mr. Wannall. Mr. McClory, that case is in litigation and we would be very glad to answer that in executive session.

Mr. McClory. With respect to the Socialist Workers

Party, did they at one time, according to your information,

advocate the overthrow of the government by force and

violence?

Mr. Wannall. Yes, sir.

Mr. McClory. When was that?

Mr. Wannall. It is my recollection that Leon Trotsky established the Fourth International in 1938 and the Party

25

24

19

20

23

22

333. Z 3 ٤. ij 6 સુ 10 .72 13 15 ŶĜ 87 ïS 19

here in the United States was established at the same time.

Mr. McClory. Do you regard them as a revolutionary party now that is advocating overthrow of the U. S. Government by force and violence?

Mr. Wannall. I would have to say I regard them as a party that follows the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism as interpreced by Leon Trotsky.

Mr. McClory. How about the Institute of Policy Studies, do they advocate any violent overthrow of the Government?

Mr. Wannall. I have no knowledge to that effect.

Mr. McClory. We have quite a large file here. This is the FBI file on the IPS. Why do we keep such a large file on that?

Mr. Wannall. As was pointed out this morning, we had investigation, I think it was for about five and a half years.

Mr. McClory. Do they pose some threat to the United States Government?

Mr. Wannall. I think our investigation principally was based on the individuals who were involved in the organization as opposed to the organization itself.

Mr. McClory. Do the individuals who belong to the organization belong to some other organizations that advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence?

Mr. Wannall. I think the principal basis for our opening

CB

23

20

21

22

active investigation was the association or connections, at least, with an organization which was known as the Students for a Democratic Society which ultimately evolved into two or three organizations, one of which is the Weatherman underground today.

Mr. McClory. My time is up.

Chairman Pike. It is my understanding, Mr. Hayes, that because of the bells, you got counted out of your questioning period. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. Hayes. The feeling that I get is that somehow I am plunged back into a very murky ideological swampland.

I didn't really realize that anybody was still tramping around discussing at the kind of level that has been discussed today and in the testimony particularly, the ideological posturings of groups in America. I think it is really quite strange and to me quite disturbing. I want to simply comment on some views that were placed in the record by Mr. McClory, particularly, some views. I think probably ought to be taken into account considering the testimony we have had here this morning and considering some of the explanations that you have given.

The question of how long we should stay with an investigation of someone is answered, I think, basically by the FBI and the other witnesses representing the FBI as being interminably until such a time as they might renounce

.3

G

2/

the use of force or the use of terrorism or any device in carrying out what their end result might be, what they desire. That might be a change in the economic or political structure of this country. But as I understand it, this particular group here today is just simply saying that there is going to be a revolution, economic or political, and there is nothing they can do to either start it or stop it, and not much we can do to start it or stop it, but it is simply something that is going to happen.

The renunciation of something really is not in our laws. I do not know of anyplace we have a requirement, in the Smith Act, which has been cited ad infinitum today, or any other act. So we do not require the renunciation of any course of action. If somebody is silent, they stay silent. If you pursue these people because of their regard for Trotsky-have you heard of Max Eastman, because if you haven't heard of him, he was drowned reading the Reader's Digest. But he did happen to be Trotsky's secretary at one time. I think it is an expensive chore that you are getting the Government into if you are suggesting to policy makers that we pursue these investigations to some degree.

This is where I think Mr. McClory is mistaken when he lauds loyalty and this fastening down and makes all kinds of inquiries about what you found out about what somebody believes. You said you do not investigate organizations, but

.

IG

rather individuals in organizations. That is rather a sophistical way of looking at it. I don't believe it washes out and I don't know of any legislative charge that would allow you to do that. I think quite properly we should not be heaping too much blame on the FBI because it does rest with the Attorney Generals and ultimately with the Presidents and with the Congress to a great degree.

We have allowed monuments to be built to the FBI in the form of the office building you are now working at and we allow even some kind of admiration to grow up by saying we know most of the agents are really loyal to the organization.

I don't hear of anybody talking about loyalty to the Fairfax County Police Department. It seems to me this is an instance where our ministerial officers, whether they are police officers or whatever, really have one job to do, and that is carry out with reasonableness the laws of this country.

Mr. McClory is also interested in the use of informants and how swell they are, and I think they probably are, in the case of solving the enormous amount of Dyer Act cases in the United States. But I think most of us who have hung around in the courts system for any amount of time know what type of informants we are talking about. We are talking about the people you ask, "Did you see a yellow Plymouth convertible in your neighborhood and if they did, you have to pick it up.

That is how we use informants. You are not cracking any

E

·ç

9 2

9.13

big cases using them. So I think it is important that
we begin in some manner or other to qualify the kind of
testimony that we have here from Mr. Adams at page 11, which
I covered this morning, about how or where we ought to be
and that there are those who have as an ultimate goal the
overthrow of this country. That is a broad misstatement
and a misunderstanding of the ideological philosophy of those
groups which is a particular misunderstanding of your group being
intelligence officers of this country.

Chairman Pike. The gentleman's time has expired.

If you would like to comment at all you are welcome to.

Mr. Wannall. I would only say that we do, of course, provide all our material to the Department for review.

I think you are aware that the Attorney General is addressing himself to the matters Congressman Hayes brought up in the preparation of a series of guidelines at the present time. Chairman Pike. Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Stanton. Mr. Wannall, you have had an opportunity, in your position with the FBI, to examine in 1975 and 1974 what I would call the Socialist Workers Party modern structure.

Do you consider any of the modern structure of the Socialist Workers Party a threat to this country?

Mr. Wannall. Congressman, I think we are trying to resolve in this forum a matter which is before the courts at the present time.

Â

ď

I would be reluctant to try to give you a reply to that.

I think the Courts themselves are going to make the decision in connection with the current litigation.

Mr. Stanton. You rely, apparently, upon your investigation of the Socialist Workers Party on the predication that Mr. Trotsky was the founder of this organization.

You stated or inferred that Mr. Trotsky advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Do you believe that statement?

Mr. Wannall. I don't know that I inferred that he specifically advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States. To my knowledge he was never here. But I have offered, and certainly will follow through on the offer, to provide to the committee a five-page document which shows the basis for the investigation.

Mr. Stanton. A five-page document? I will be happy to look at that.

Can you justify now, after the fact, in your own mind, illegal entries by the FBI as a practice, historically?

Do you think it is justified that the Government should ever authorize, whether it is illegal or not, an agency of the Government that has a police jurisdiction to be involved in violation of the law?

Mr. Wannall. Congressman Stanton, that matter is under review by the Attorney General. I think the reason it is

under review. I heard someone cite an example, if a law enforcement agency knew that a group had an atomic bomb in the basement of the building and had an opportunity to prevent its going off, should the agency go in or not? There are ramifications to this.

Mr. Stanton. That would not be a violation of the law.

Mr. Wannall. Well, take scmething, then, that is not

fissionable material, which does not specifically rest

Mr. Stanton. If you are an FBI agent and you have knowledge of somebody who has nuclear material and if you had knowledge that they might use that nuclear material in a way that might damage the rights of other people or damage them physically, then you have a duty. Would you?

Mr. Wannall. I'm sure this is the rationalization which is being followed by the Department in connection with the consideration of the problem.

Mr. Stanton. There is a provision under the law which allows for search and seizure by governmental agencies.

Warrant for search and seizure is authorized under the law.

But I think as a matter of philosophy and policy that is important. You have a high position in the FBI. You have a high responsibility to ensure that from this day forward there is not a violation of the law in terms of the conduct of the United States Government. I think it is important to get from

6

O

343

22

12

13

13

313

TE

17

38

. 8 Ca

20

27

23

3.

in the Atomic Energy Act.

<u>~</u>

you some ideas as to whether you would justify in your own mind an illegal act such as must have been justified at some point in time by Mr. Hoover as head of the FBI.

Can you see any chance where you would act at some point the way Mr. Hoover acted?

Mr. Wannall. I cannot see any circumstances where I would either authorise or engage in an illegal act.

Mr. Stanton. I think that is important. You are going to affect the decisions of the Bureau and affect the carters of young men who will be coming in the Bureau in the future. I think your attitude in how you thrust these questions in terms of the disciplines within the Bureau itself are important for the future of the Bureau. There are many of us here who abhor the fact that you get involved in what we consider frivolous investigations at times or illegal investigations. We want to correct those abuses but at the same time we want a bureau which represents the best part of the American people and the American public.

Mr. Wannall. I am sure our Director does, too, and I can assure you I do, Mr. Stanton.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Wannall, did you have a chance to hear or see the testimony presented by Mr. Hardy with respect to the Camden operation?

Mr. Wannall. I was not here during his testimony this

morning.

Mr. Johnson. Have you seen that?

Mr. Wannall. I glanced over it at lunch time.

Mr. Johnson. Is there anything you would care to say in reply to that?

Mr. Wannall. No. sir.

I cannot comment on it. The case in fact was not even handled in the Division of which I am the Assistant Director. It was in another division. I have no first hand knowledge which would lend any information to the deliberations of this committee.

Mr. Johnson. Well, I think that in the event that anybody at the Bureau chooses to, the committee would be pleased to hear any reply which you might care to offer.

I would ask the Chairman, without objection, that that opportunity may be made available.

Chairman Pike. Certainly.

Mr. Johnson. If they choose to. There may be. At this point the statement stands unrebutted. We are offering you this opportunity.

Mr. Wannall. I can certainly say what I read in that statement does not represent the policy of the FBI.

Mr. Johnson. I understand it is not the policy. It might be an aberration. That is what we are trying to find out. Aberrations can happen. We would like to have verification

.

47

6

13

135

2

3

Ð

8

£()

12

13

2.4

15

36

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Rd

or your statement that it is or is not the truth, if you care to make it.

Chairman Pike. If the gentleman will yield for just a moment, I would simply say that that request which you made with regard to Mr. Hardy's statement, would hold forth to any of the statements which you would like to comment on, any statement made during the course of the day.

Mr. Wannall. Thank you.

Mr. Johnson. I would like to pursue in the brief time I have memaining your response to Mr. McClory's question about whether or not the Socialist Party poses a threat through violence to this country. Your answer was evasive. I understand you don't make policy, necessarily. But your answer was evasive, based on the fact of adherence to the Fourth International but in essence according to the testimony as I heard it, and as I say, I am an old District Attorney and I am prosecution-minded, you have been surveilling people for 30 years on the basis that they might commit a crime sometime in the future. I would like to know at whose direction this process was started, how often it was reviewed, if it was reviewed? Is it something that just got started and goes on forever without anybody considering whether it should be stopped or whether it was re-evaluated. We do not have any testimony justiffing this kind of conduct.

I also know you said that wasn't your policy, yet

4

6

3

. 63

6

7

8

g

30

8 8.

83

15

16

17

82.

19

20

21

22

23

it has gone on. 1

Mr. Wannall. I am not able to tell you who started it. It started before I did in the Bureau. But we do have the regular practice and procedure of sending our reports to a section at the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice with the understanding that if there is objection to our continuing with an investigation, it will be called to our attention.

Mr. Johnson. If anybody objects?

Mr. Wannall. If a decision is made that we should discontinue, we would be notified, may I put it in that sense?

Mr. Johnson. And that would be made by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Wannall. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. By the Attorney General?

Mr. Wannall. By a section in the Criminal Division which of course is under the Attorney General.

Mr. Johnson. I suppose there is an Assistant Attorney General involved?

Mr. Wannall. There is an Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division.

Mr. Johnson. Is that an appointed office? Is that one of those offices where you have people that are serving for a while and then they go out and another is appointed

•

...

12

70

83

94

15

k ser

16

17 18

19

Œ.

21

22

23

24

2

3

A E

6

3

G

10

18

13

84

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and he goes out? It looks to me this is probably what happened, that they started the investigation 30 years ago and nobody ever challenged it or stopped it.

Mr. Wannall. It is an appointed office, but I'm sure the reports are not personally reviewed by him. They are probably reviewed by someone under him, who would certainly have some degree of continuity in his position.

Mr. Johnson. What kind of oversight in the Congress do we have to check these things?

Mr. Wannall. Oversight by Congress?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, has anybody in the Congress ever said "Why are you doing this and why have you continued for 30 years when you have not found there is any danger?"

Mr. Wannall. I don't know whether it would be termed oversight as such, but I think during the entire period of time the Director of the FBI testified in connection with the appropriations of the FBI.

Mr. Johnson. We have had testimony about what that kind of testimony involved. If that is what it was, it is understandable as to how it went on so long.

Chairman Pike. Mr. Dellums.

Mr. Dellums. Before going into questions, I would like to say I appreciate your going into statistics with respect to minorities employed by the FBI. But in appropriate terms your employment of blacks is 1.2 percent and in a nation where 51.2 percent of the population is women, you have .4 percent women agents.

Now with respect to your statement about the Fourth
International, as I understand it, the Socialist Workers
Party was affiliated with the Fourth International back in the
late '30s which was not illegal. As a result of the passage
of the Voorhis Act the Socialist Workers Party discontinued
any affiliation from that day to the Fourth International
which in my opinion flies in the face of your justification
for 30 years of intimidation, burglarizing, warrantless wiretape
and other programs you have used to justify under the absurd
nomenclature of counter-intelligence program. With respect
to the Socialist Workers Party specifically, as I understand
this morning you testified that the FBI has not engaged in
surreptitious entry or burglary since 1965.

In the fall of 1971 the Office of the Michigan Socialist
Party was burglarized and file materials were taken. In
April, 1973, the Civil Service Commission confronted a former
SWP member with a copy of a letter of resignation from SWP.
The letter had been in the burglarized file.

My questions are twofold. Has the FBI burglarized SWP offices and specifically have you burglarized Michigan offices of the SWP?

Mr. Wannall. Congressman Dellums, this morning the date I mentioned was 1958 as opposed to 1965. I have no knowledge that the FBI has burglarized the Socialist Workers Party

94

3

čį.

5

ij

Ç

AKB.

32

13

325

353

96

33

150

:20

21

22

in that or other instances you are talking about since then.

Mr. Dellums. You say you have no knowledge. Let me put it this way: I would like to suggest that you check the files and if there is any material leading to any facts that you burglarized the SWP or the Michigan Office, would you supply that in writing to this committee?

Mr. Wannall. The files have been checked, and I assure you there is nothing in the files to indicate that in 1971 the Michigan office was burglarized.

Mr. Dellums. Thank you.

FBI Manual Section 122, entitled "Extremist Matters and Civil Unrest" says in part: "In addition to the three principal statutes outlined above the following statute would pertain to investigations of Klan and other white hate groups.

(4) Civil Rights Act of 1968 (T18, USC, (241)

In summary, this statute makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, opposes, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Additionally, it prohibits two or more persons going in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any rights secured by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

Doesn't this in fact describe the major part of the FBI's

2

3

4

ä

ý

G

S

. ??}

79

12

18

15

96

T

18

40

20

Si

22

23

24

25

intelligence activities against so-called dissent groups in this country?

Mr. Wannall. The entire matter relating to the so-called COINTELPRO has been reviewed and is under consideration in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

We took our entire file on the COINTELPRO and made it available to the Assistant Attorney General and two of his deputies to review the matter. While it was not possible for him to look at every serial, he did look at all serials and in fact Mr.

Ryan, who is at the table with me, tried to direct his attention to specific items that might be troublesome.

Following the review, he said based on his review there was no indication of a violation of the statute. He did say that if any information is called to his attention in the future, he certainly would consider it.

Mr. Dellums. You indicated in testimony this morning that you no longer have a security index file. You have an ADEX file, does the FBI still maintain at some location cards which have names of 13,000 persons who were on this security index?

My point is: Yousny you don't have it, but don't you in fact still have those names and you can call them forward at any time?

Mr. Wannall. We have cards on 13,000. I will accept that figure. I think it is probably in that neighborhood.

When the security index was discontinued by legislation of this Congress in September of 1971, we had a program regularly of destroying cards. They were maintained for a certain 3 period of time and then destroyed. However, Senator Mansfield 1 issued instructions in January of this year that no 5 records should be destroyed pending the outcome of the investigations by the Senate Committee. We have made no destruction of any records since that time. Chairman Pike. The time of the gentleman has expired. 9 Mr. Milford. 10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Milford. 39

First, I would like to clear up for the record the colloquy you had with the Chairman concerning this Lori Paton statement. According to the written statement the appropriate words of the statement were: "I was shocked when FBI Director LaPrade wrote back denying I had been the súbject of investigation." Now the record is clear on it.

Mr. Wannall. Thank you. I picked up FBI Director.

I did not pick up LaPrade. In that instance, I have read
the letter signed by Mr. LaPrade. He was not the Director.

He was Special Agent in Charge of our Newark Office.

n(C

22

72

13

18

\$5

18

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Copeland 7 rls. Rudolph 4:30 p.m. 2

Mr. Milford. Mr. Wannall, on the surface it would seem that several witnesses have appeared before this committee and have given some very disturbing testimony against the FBI. Some of these accusations and allegations are very serious.

Under our system of justice whether in our courts or before our juries or even in Congressional investigations there exists the right of rebuttal by the accused or maligned. Without a doubt the FBI has been accused of some serious aberraulors and violations of our laws. There are actually two hearings going on here today.

One is the official hearing being conducted by this committee on behalf of the House of Representatives. The other is a public hearing that in effect is a form of trial by television and notoriety by newspapers.

With little doubt tonight's television and tomorrow's newspapers will detail the sensational statements made by the witnesses that appeared before this committee today.

Unlike our legal system of justice the press is not required to plod through painstaking investigations to assure that all legitimate facts are known and presented to the jury or to the public.

of information as long as someone will simply say it, particularly if it conveniently fits a one-minute TV blurb or

; {

. 3

185.5

8

6

Ţ.

\$

11

12

8.8

47

19

ic

2.7

18

ro

20

20

23

23

3

4

5

6

\*\*

8

 $\mathcal{G}$ 

three-hundred word newspaper item, and particularly if the quotes are sensational, controversial or sgandalous.

While the FBI is probably going to flunk out as a TV star in tonight's news or as a celebrity in tomorrow's newspaper, I think it is extremely important for this committee's record to have the complete and detailed information concerning the allegations and accusations that have been made by witnesses before us today.

You have rebutted portions of that testimony. Mr. Wannall, I realize that you may not be able to fully comment on each and every allegation that has been made today. The time remaining for this committee to finish its investigation will probably not allow us to call you or other FBI officials back before the committee in formal hearings.

Therefore, I will ask you, as an official of the FBI to take the statements of reach and every witness that have appeared here today in each case where the FBI has been charged with the commission of an illegal act or allegations of improper actions have been made, and I would ask you to supply for the committee's record the following information:

- All evidentiary information contained in FBI files that will either substantiate or rebut each allegation.
- Written and sworn statements, if any, from other individuals who can give testimony to the fact that either rebulf or substantiate each allegation that has been made by the above

28

22

23

list of witnesses.

3. Any other documents or evidence that will tend to rebut or substantiate each allegation that has been made by the above-listed witnesss.

Will you supply that information for the committee record, sir?

Mr. Wannall. We will do our best to reply to your requests.

Mr. Milford. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wannall's reply and all documentary inclusion attached to his reply be made part of the committee record when received.

Chairman Pike. I frankly thought we had already covered that. Without objection it is so ordered.

(The above-referred to information follows:)

er:

3

. 🚉

Ű

έŝ

g

70

44

92

33

魏

26

17

72

19

20

23

22

23

24

Mr. Milford. Thank you, sir. I yield back my time. Mr. Dellums. Would the gantlewan yield to me? 2 Mr. Milford. Yes. ્રે Mr. Dellums. I would like to ask this question: 23 your records wasn't the real reason for the IPS investigation . B their relationship with Ramparts Magazine and your perception 6, of Ramparts Magazine? 370 Mr. Wamnall. Of the IPS? 8 Mr. Dellums. Yes. 9 Mr. Wannall. Not to my knowledge. 10 Mr. Dellums. What was the justification? \$ 3 Mr. Wannall. I think I previously stated that the act ¥.2 ef investigation, to the best of my recollection, was opened 13 in 1968 based upon contacts with an organization which was 14 then known as Students for Democratic Society. 15 Mr. Dellums. Do you have documentation that indicates ß that your records will show that there were contacts with the 37 You mentioned that very specifically. 18 Mr. Wannall. We have information that there were, as I 19 20 Mr. Dellums. 21 please? -22 Mr. Wannall. Yes, sir. 23

recall, contacts with at least two Weathermen; yes, sir.

Mr. Dellums. Would you supply that to this committee,

please? 
Mr. Wannall. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dellums. Thank you.

(The above-referred to information follows:)

24

25

• • • •

- 14

17

G

7

9

10

11

5:3

13

2.2

15

. . . .

Mr. Field?

Chairman Pike.

through people's trush in order to collect intelligence, socalled trash covers?

Mr. Wannall. I think there have been isolated incidents where that has been done. The policy of the FBI since the middle of 1966 has been not to conduct so-called trash covers.

Mr. Field. Mr. Wannall, do agents of the FBI rummage .

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Field. Since 1966 that has been their policy and did you testify under oath before our committee that since then to your knowledge that has not been done?

Mr. Wannall. I did so testify. I have since learned of one occasion where trash which was discarded by an organization was in fact recovered by an agent. It was not done with prior knowledge of FBI headquarters.

Mr. Field. Mr. Wannall, is it a policy of the FBI to report on somebody's secret life if it has no relevance to the investigation?

Mr. Wannall. No, sir.

Mr. Field. In other words, they would not report on it?
Mr. Wannall. No, sir.

Mr. Field. Mr. Wannall, are you aware of the memo of August 29, 1972 -- and I will read from it since it is not classified -- saying, "On August 23rd last, Special Agent Robert Feuer observed the private trash truck picking up trash

.

16

ij

83

19

20

21

22

23

24

25.

from the Institute of Policy Studies. The truck proceeded to a burning dump where the trash was abandoned. Special Agent Feuer obtained the IPS trash and information obtained from this source is being a signed symbol number WF 4868-S."

Is that the incident you are referring to?

Mr. Wannall. That is the incident I am referring to concerning which I have become acquainted since my deposition on the fifth day of this month.

Chairman Pike. Would the gentleman yield?

You did get some information about some trash recovered from the House Select Committee on Intelligence, too, didn't you?

If the gentleman doesn't know the answer --

Mr.McClory. If the gentleman will yield, I think what happened is that someone in the building reported that to the FBI and --

Mr. Ryan. The superintendent and apartment building furnished certain classified documents to the FBI that were found in the trash of that apartment.

Chairman Pike. Weren't the so-called classified documents the envelopes in which classified documents had once been contained?

Mr. Ryan. They were primarily envelopes. I understand, and I was not personally involved with this, that there was one document which had communications, intelligence coded

words on it which was classified top secret. I could be wrong in that.

Chairman Pike. There was one document which was classified confidential. And I did have --

Mr. McClory. If the gentleman will yield.

Chairman Pike. Certainly, it is Mr. Field's time we are arguing over, Mr. McCloxy.

Mr. McClory. That was reported to the FBI by someone or you got information about that? You are not carrying on an investigation of all of the trash of all of the staff and members of the committee, are you?

Mr. Ryan. No, sir, as I understand this was reported to the FBI by the superintendent of an apartment building where a staff member of this committee resided.

Mr. Milford. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Field's full time be restored to him.

Chairman Pike. Without objection.

Mr. Field. Thank you very much, Mr. Milford and Mr. Chairman.

This trash cover, was it referred to in later documents -and again I quote from a non-classified document: "On August
23, 1972, WF 4868-S -- "which we now know is plain IPS trash -"who has furnished reliable information in the past, gave the
following information and/or material to Special Agent Robert
W. Feuer:"

20

2.3

57

23

Ė

4 5

6

7

9

S S

12

3.3

14

15

.16

17

18

19

20

24

22

23

24

25

Are you aware of that kind of document and why would trash be referred to as a person who has furnished reliable information in the past?

Mr. Wannall. Does it say a person?

Mr. Field. It says who. Who usually refers to people.

Mr. Wannall. I think it is a matter of the way the agent sets it up in the report.

Mr. Field. Are you aware in the course of rummaging through the trash your special agent came across a typewriter ribbon which the FBI reconstituted and it contained a letter exclusively involving the sex life of some employees of the Institute of Policy Studies?

Are you aware of that letter and was that letter kept in your files and if so where?

Mr. Wannall. I am not aware of the letter. I knew as a result of a reconstruction of a typewritter ribbon some document was produced. I have not seen the document. I was not aware of the contents of it.

Mr. Field. Perhaps the staff could provide you a copy of that letter and you could perhaps explain why a letter like that, which is almost totally sexual gossip would be in the FBI files on the Institute of Policy Studies.

Mr. Wannall. Mr. Field, I have previously indicated I was in a position to try to address myself to policies and procedures and my knowledge with regard to specifics, if any,

5.5 Feb.

· 🔆 .

of these cases would be very vague. I don't usually get down to the --

Q.

3

E.

6

7

Š

9

73

1.2

23

14

ÌĠ

**?**7

18

19

20

21

22

æ

24

25

Mr. Field. Mr. Wannall, you testified under oath last week that the policy of the FBI was not to report on somebody's sex life if it had no relevance to the case. Did this person's sex activities have any relation to this case?

Mr. Wannall. What is this document, Mr. Field? I don't have the first page.

Mr. Field. I believe that is all that was provided to the committee when we received the documents from the FBI.

Mr. Wannall. This is not in the form of a document prepared for dissemination. In fact it is a mamorandum from the agent to his supervisor in the Washington field office setting forth the results of the se-called trash cover in this instance.

At least that is what it appears to me to be.

Mr. Field. That is correct. In other words, it is not raw intelligence. This is now a finished product, often referred to as an analyzed product.

Why would this information make it through the analysis procedure if it was the policy of the FBI to screen out information about people's sex lives if they had no relevance to the investigation?

Mr. Wannall. I think, Mr. Field, if you will check my deposition you will establish that I indicated that information

of this type could well be recorded in our files but certainly not reported in a disseminative document.

Mr. Field. I took that to mean it obviously could be collected in raw form but it would not be reported further unless it had some relevance to the investigation.

We now see a memo in which some agent has analyzed this information, has included excerpts from it and every single excerpt pertains only to sexual information.

Is that a correct analysis of that memo?

Mr. Wannall. I have not read it. Do you want me to take a reading of it?

Chairman Pike. I think my answer would be no. You have never seen this memo before?

Mr. Wannall. No. sir.

Chairman Pike. I think what Mr. Field is trying to put forth is that it certainly doesn't seem to comply with what you have stated your policy to be and I think that rather than ask you to read it at this time and analyze it, we will drop that.

Mr. Field. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no further questions.

Chairman Pike. I want to thank you, Mr. Wannall, and I do recognize the fact that when we deal in the policies of an organization we frequently find that we get surprised by some of the specifics that come up.

20

21

22

23

24

ê ÷ 3 Д 3 6 tar L E, 3 Û Ş 12 13 14 15 15 77 18 30

I appreciate the fact that you did return this afternoon and that you did comment on some of these issues on rather short notice.

Mr. Dellums?

Mr. Dellums. Mr. Chairman, my very last question that I asked of the gentleman with respect to IPS, and "Ramparts Magazine," the staff has given me different information.

Can I just ask one question before we adjourn?

Chairman Pike. You may ask one quastion before we adjourn Mr. Dellums. Thank you.

In response to my question, wasn't the real reason for the IPS investigation their relationship with "Ramparts Magazine" your response was no, it was primarily concerned with SDS.

Now the staff has provided me with information that says that the initial memorandum which is dated November 1968 from your office dealing with IPS, was exclusively devoted to "Ramparts Magazine" and that it wasn't until a memorandum written in March of 1969 that there was my reference to SDS and that there is in fact no evidence of SDS contacts with this organization.

Now that contradicts your testimony before we leave and I wanted to give you an opportunity to address that.

Mr. Wannall. Congressman Dellums, I gave you the best information I could based on my having seen material. It seems

82

20

29

22

23

to me that there was a meeting in Chicago sometime before we opened the investigation on that and during the course of briefing sessions which I have had over the last three or four days, including Saturday and Sunday, my recollection was that the principal interest that we had in the IPS at the time the case was opened, at least, was contact with the SDS.

I did not try to mislead you or give you false information.

I was trying my best to call up the facts as I recalled them

from the briefing sessions.

Chairman Pike. Before I adjourn, I want to announce one thing. At the time of our next meeting which will be on Thursday, we will have ready the report which it is necessary for us to provide to the Floor of the House to accompany our action on certain subpoenas. That report will be available for the members to approve at our next meeting which will be at 10:00 o'clock Thursday morning.

Mr. McClory. And the opportunity for presenting additional or Minority views will expire when?

Chairman Pike. It will expire one week from Friday because our committee rules appear to be in some conflict with the House rules and I am giving the broadest possible interpretation which is the committee rules which give five days after the approval of the report. That is actually six days, but Thanksgiving comes in there and that is a holiday so a week from Friday will be the last day for Minority,

Ť

§ §

8.8

. 20

additional, concurring or whatever you want to call them, ş views. The Committee stands in recess until 10:00 o'clock Thursday morning. Ą (Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m. the Committee adjourned.) ő 2 £