

F.O.I.A.

JULIUS ROSENBERG ET AL.

FILE DESCRIPTION

HQ

FILE

SUBJECT MORTON SDBELL

FILE NO. 101-2483

VOLUME NO. 38

SERIALS

1420-1459

NOTICE

THE BEST COPIES OBTAINABLE ARE INCLUDED IN THE REPRODUCTION OF THE FILE. PAGES INCLUDED THAT ARE BLURRED, LIGHT OR OTHERWISE DIFFICULT TO READ ARE THE RESULT OF THE CONDITION AND OR COLOR OF THE ORIGINALS PROVIDED. THESE ARE THE BEST COPIES AVAILABLE.

File No: 101-2483
Net 38

Re: Lochell

Date: _____
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
1420	2/17/58	Ny rept HQ and incl.	3/2	3/2	b2, b7c
1421	2/17/58	Ny lit HQ	3	3	
NR	2/21/58	Lee memo to Branigan	1	1	
NR	3/5/58	Ny a/t HQ	2	2	b2, b7D
1422	2/26/58	Ny lit HQ	2/15	2/15	b7D
1422	3/6/58	HQ lit NY	1	1	b7D
1423	4/3/58	Ny lit HQ	6	6	
1424	4/16/58	Branigan memo to Belmont	2	2	b7D
1425	4/17/58	3rd party lit HQ and incl.	1/4	1/4	
1425	4/23/58	Branigan memo to Belmont	1	1	
1425	5/2/58	HQ lit LA	1	1	
NR	5/7/58	Ny lit HQ	1	1	

45 45
Rev Rel Deny Ref Prepro Presume
FBI/DOJ

File No: 101-2483
12-1-38

Re: Sobell

Date: _____
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
NR	5/9/58	Branigan memo to Belmont	1	1	
NR	5/12/58	HQ let DOJ	1	1	
1426	6/18/58	NY rept HQ	9	9	
1427	6/18/58	NY let HQ	3	3	b2, b7D
1428	7/2/58	HQ let DOJ	2	2	b2, b7D
1429	7/12/58	CIA TT HQ	-	-	Disposition handled by CIA in '75 (2)
1430	8/4/58	AT let HQ	1	1	
1431	8/6/58	HQ let NY	1	0	Refer to CIA
NR	9/25/58	Lee memo to Branigan	1	1	
1432	1/12/59	Nease memo to Tolson ^{and send.}	1/17	1/17	
1433	1/14/59	Branigan memo to Belmont	3	3	
1434	1/19/59	Nease memo to Tolson	1	1	

41 Rev 40 Rel Deny Ref Presume ²Preserve
FBI/DOJ

File No: 101-2483
act 38

Re: Lobell

Date: _____
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
1435	1/27/59	HQ Cable London	1	1	b7D
1436	1/28/59	HQ let CIA	2	2	b1, b7D
1437	1/30/59	London let HQ w/enc	1/1	1/1	b1
1437	2/27/59	HQ let London	1	1	
1438	2/26/59	Brannigan memo to Belmont	1	1	b1, b7D
1439	3/18/59	London Cable HQ	1	1	b1
1439	3/16/59	HQ Cable London	1	1	
1440	3/17/59	London let HQ and incl.	1/2	1/2	b1
1440	3/27/59	HQ let CIA	2	2	b1
1441	3/26/59	Brannigan memo to Belmont ^{and incl.}	2/1	2/1	
1442	4/1/59	London Cable HQ	1	1	b1
1443	4/7/59	AT let HQ	8	8	

27
Rev

26
Rel

1
Deny

0
Ref

0
Preserve

0
Preserve

File No: 101-2483
let SS

Re: Wells

Date: _____
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
1444	4/15/59	BA let HQ	1	1	
1445	4/14/59	AT let HQ	13	13	
1446	4/17/59	AT let HQ	17	17	
1447	5/7/59	London let HQ and end.	1/1	1/1	b1
1447	5/18/59	HQ let CIA	2	2	b1
1448	5/15/59	AT let HQ	18	18	b7D
1449	5/15/59	Barrigan memo to Belmont	1	1	b1, b7D
1450	5/26/59	London let HQ and end.	1/2	1/1	b1
1451	6/10/59	AT let HQ	8	8	
1452	7/27/59	London Cable HQ	1	1	b1
1453	7/28/59	HQ let CIA	1	1	b1
NR	7/21/59	Baumgardner memo to Belmont	3	3	

70
Rev

69
Rel

1
Hing

0
Ref

0
Prepro

0
Presum

FBI/DOJ

File No: 101-2483
sect 38

Re: LoSelle

Date: _____
(month/year)

Serial	Date	Description (Type of communication, to, from)	No. of Pages		Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)
			Actual	Released	
NR	8/13/59	HQ let London	1	1	b1
1454	8/21/59	London let HQ and encl.	1/3	1/3	b1
1454	8/31/59	HQ let London	2	2	b1
1455	9/11/59	Bonn let HQ and encl.	1/3	0	4 pg refer Army
NR	11/19/59	HQ let London	1	1	b1
NR	10/14/59	Lee memo to Branigan	1	1	
1456	11/4/59	NY rept HQ	17	13	b1, b2, b7D
1456	11/19/59	HQ let NY	1	1	b1
NR	12/4/59	NY let HQ	1	1	
1457	12/4/59	Branigan memo to Belmont	1	1	
NR	12/4/59	HQ let Dept	1	1	
1458	12/30/59	incoming let	1	0	b1

35 Rev 36 Rel 45 Ref 4 Repro 0 Pres

File No:

sect 38

Re:

Jobell

Date:

(month/year)

Rev *Rel* *Deny* *Ref* *Preserve* *Presume*
FBI/DOJ

~~SECRET~~

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Reporting Office NEW YORK	Office of Origin NEW YORK	Date 2/17/58	Investigative Period 1/13,17;2/5/58
TITLE OF CASE MORTON SOBELL, was.		Report made by WILLIAM D. DONOHUE	Typed By pcs
		CHARACTER OF CASE ESPIONAGE - R	

Synopsis:

Business Certificates at New York County Clerk's Office, New York, New York disclosed ownership of Carmelita Beauty Parlor, Majestic Beauty Parlor, Tete's Beauty Parlor and Gilbert's Beauty Shop. No Business Certificates located for Herman's Beauty Shop or Helene Sobel Beauty Parlor.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED

- P* -

HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 4/30/77 BY 3042 Jmt-PK

DETAILS:

REINO HAYHANEN, a defected illegal Soviet intelligence agent related to T-1, another government agency which conducts intelligence investigations, on May 6, 1957, among other things that HELEN SOBELL resided at 306 West 137th Street or 138th Street, New York, New York, and that she had a beauty shop located between 139th Street and 142nd Street on Broadway, New York, New York.

Approved <i>Egg/23</i>	Special Agent in Charge	Do not write in spaces below	
Copies made: ① Bureau (101-2845) (RM) 3- New York (100-37158)		101-2483-1420	REC-99
COPIES DESTROYED R 2 1 MAR 10 1961		FEB 21 1958	

AGENCY *RAB*
REC'D
DATE FORW. *2-27-58*
HOW FORW. *by R/C*
BY *gpd/mt*~~SECRET~~~~SECRET~~

FEB 28 1958

Property of FBI - This report is loaned to you by the FBI, and neither it nor its contents are to be distributed outside the agency to which loaned.

NY 100-87138

On January 13 and January 17, 1958, SA WILLIAM D. BONOHE examined the following Business Certificates at the New York County Clerk's Office, Supreme Court Building, Foley Square, New York:

1. "Business Certificate for Partners" number 004112 in the name of Carmelita's Beauty Parlor, 3436 Broadway, New York, New York, which reflects that the beauty parlor is a partnership of EDUARDO STASZESKI of 315 East 5th Street, New York, New York and BRUNHILDA WERS, 606 West 137th Street, New York, New York. The certificate which was executed May 1, 1957, and filed with the County Clerk on May 2, 1957, describes the partnership as successors in interest to HERMINIA BERMUDEZ.

The files of the New York Office contain no information identifiable with HERMINIA BERMUDEZ.

2. "Certificate of Partners" number 002121 for the Majestic Beauty Parlor, 3423 Broadway, New York, New York, disclosed that the partners are JOSE E. RAMOS, 126 West 80th Street, New York, New York, and ANGELICA BERDECIA, 3413 Broadway, New York, New York. This certificate was executed and filed on February 24, 1956.

3. Certificate number 002548 of MARIA TERESA BETANCOURT, 640 Riverside Drive, New York, New York, doing business as Tete's Beauty Parlor, 3466 Broadway, New York, New York. This certificate which was executed on March 13, 1957, and filed with the County Clerk on March 14, 1957, indicates that there is no predecessor in interest to this business.

4. Certificate number 0496 of CESARDO NUNEZ, 601 West 136th Street, doing business as the Gilbert's Beauty Shoppe, 3420 Broadway, New York, New York. This certificate, which was executed May 21, 1952, and filed with the County Clerk on May 21, 1952, discloses that NUNEZ is successor in interest to GILBERT A. JIBAJA.

Files of the New York Office contain no identifiable information concerning GILBERT A. JIBAJA.

~~SECRET~~

NY 100-37158

Requisition forms placed with the New York County Clerk by SA DONOHUE for certificates in the name of the Helene Sobel Beauty Parlor and Herman's Beauty Parlor were returned to SA DONOHUE marked no record.

SECRET³ -
SECRET

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Records Branch

3/3, 1958

<input type="checkbox"/>	Name Check Unit - Room 6523
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service Unit - Room 6524
<input type="checkbox"/>	Forward to File Review
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attention _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Return to <u>J. P. Lee</u> <u>1784</u>
	Supervisor Room Ext.

Type of References Requested:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular Request (Analytical Search)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All References (Subversive & Nonsubversive)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Subversive References Only
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nonsubversive References Only
<input type="checkbox"/>	Main _____ References Only

Type of Search Requested:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted to Locality of _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exact Name Only (On the Nose)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buildup <input type="checkbox"/> Variations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Check for Alphabetical Loyalty Form

Subject Giles Playfair

Birthdate & Place _____

Address _____

Localities _____

 R# _____ Date 3/4 Searcher Initials JAP
 FILE NUMBER SERIAL

	<u>65-56402-1074</u>
N1	<u>62-64178-3741702</u>
N1	<u>one</u>
N1	<u>101-4053-1415-p17</u>
N1	<u>23</u>
N1	<u>112-268-551X8</u>
	<u>new</u>
	<u>rh</u>
	<u>4/29/87 3042 fwt-B1c</u>

3/3, 1958

<input type="checkbox"/>	Name Check Unit - Room 6523
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service Unit - Room 6524
<input type="checkbox"/>	Forward to File Review
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attention _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Return to <u>J. P. Lee</u> <u>1734</u>

Supervisor Room Ext.

Type of References Requested:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regular Request (Analytical Search)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All References (Subversive & Nonsubversive)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Subversive References Only
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nonsubversive References Only
<input type="checkbox"/>	Main _____ References Only

Type of Search Requested:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted to Locality of _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exact Name Only (On the Nose)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Buildup <input type="checkbox"/> Variations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Check for Alphabetical Loyalty Form

Subject Derrick Sington

Birthdate & Place _____

Address _____

Localities _____

R# _____ Date 3/4 Searcher Initials JLP

FILE NUMBER SERIAL

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

4/28/87

3042

JLP

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (~~101-28437~~) *425 al* DATE: 2/17/58

FROM : SAC, NEW YORK (100-37158)

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL, was.
ESPIONAGE - REnclosed herewith are 7 copies of the report of SA
WILLIAM D. DONOHUE dated and captioned as above.REFERENCEReport of SA WILLIAM D. DONOHUE at New York dated
October 31, 1957. *ser 1412*INFORMANTS

Identity of Source	Date of Activity and/or Description of Information	Date Received	Agent to Whom Furnished	File Number Where Located
--------------------	--	---------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

T-1- CIA Washington, D. C.				100-37158- 1834
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--------------------

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE *4/30/82* BY *3042 fwt*

EX - 116

101-2483-1421
FEB 21 1958

ESP. SEC.

2-Bureau (~~101-28437~~) (RM) (Encl. 7)
3-New York (100-37158)WDD:pcs
(5)

76 FEB 28 1958

ENCLOSURE
79

EX - 116

1. ☒ Subject's name is included in the Security Index.
2. ☒ The data appearing on the Security Index card are current.
3. ☐ Changes on the Security Index card are necessary and Form FD-122 has been submitted to the Bureau.
4. ☐ A suitable photograph ☐ is ☐ is not available.
5. ☒ Careful consideration has been given to each source concealed and T symbols were utilized only in those instances where the identities of the sources must be concealed.
6. ☐ Subject is employed in a key facility and is charged with security responsibility. Interested agencies are _____
7. ☒ This report is classified secret because (state reason) _____

Information furnished by CIA was so classified.

8. ☐ Subject was not reinterviewed because (state reason) _____

9. ☐ This case no longer meets the Security Index criteria and a letter has been directed to the Bureau recommending cancellation of the Security Index card.
10. ☒ This case has been re-evaluated in the light of the Security Index criteria and it continues to fall within such criteria because (state reason) _____

MORTON SOBELL is still incarcerated and his wife and the committees to secure justice for MORTON SOBELL are actively engaged in efforts to have him released.

NY 100-37158

ADMINISTRATIVE

As the Bureau is aware in the Pincase, REINO HAYHANEN may be available for interview in the near future.

When he becomes available for interview in the Pincase he will be questioned concerning information he furnished about the alleged beauty parlor with which HELEN SOBELL was reportedly associated.

Since no other logical investigation appears warranted at this time, the case on MORTON SOBELL will be placed in a pending inactive status at New York until the results of the reinterview with HAYHANEN becomes available in the Pincase.

2.21.58

TO: W. A. Branigan, *BP*
FROM: J. P. Lee *JP*

Re: *O* MORTON SOBELL

Captioned case has been reviewed and careful consideration given to the advisability of any reinterviews, interviews or other action which may now appear warranted. In the event such now appears desirable, necessary action is being initiated.

Bureau file: 101-2483

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 *put-DTC*

101-2483-
NOT RECORDED
3 FEB 25 1958

5-ENG

1210
62 FEB 25 1958

FBI

Date: 3/5/58

Transmit the following in PLAIN TEXT
(Type in plain text or code)

Via AIRTEL

(Priority or Method of Mailing)

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (100-387835) ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
FROM : SAC, NEW YORK (100-107111) HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT: COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE FOR MORTON SOBELL DATE 4-30-87 BY 3042 put-etc
IS - C

On 3/4/58, [REDACTED], who has furnished reliable information in the past, advised SA WILLIAM G. LINEHAN that at a meeting of the NYC Sobell Committee, on 2/28/58, it was announced that MORTON SOBELL was transferred to the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia, from Alcatraz. [REDACTED] also furnished a mimeographed copy of a news release dated March 4th, announcing SOBELL's transfer and a mimeographed copy of a letter dated 2/23/58, from MORTON SOBELL to his wife, which states in part that it is to be his last night on Alcatraz prior to his transfer to Atlanta. Photostats of the news release and letter are attached for the Bureau and interested offices. b2, b7D

- ③ - Bureau (100-387835) (4 Attachments) (RM)
(1 - 101-2483) (MORTON SOBELL)
2 - Atlanta (100-) (Committee To Secure Justice for MORTON SOBELL) (4 Attachments) (RM)
1 - Boston (100-) (Committee To Secure Justice for MORTON SOBELL) (RM)
1 - San Francisco (100-35117) (Committee To Secure Justice For MORTON SOBELL) (2 Attachments) (RM)
1 - New York [REDACTED] (CIFU) (19-2) b2, b7D
1 - New York (100-37158) (MORTON SOBELL) (2 Attachments) (7-2)
1 - New York (100-122650) (TED JACOBS) (12-15)
1 - New York (100-134210) (SYLVIA MENKIND) (7-6)
1 - New York (100-18469) (AARON KATZ) (12-10)
1 - New York (100-109849) (HELEN SOBELL) (12-14)
1 - New York (100-107111) (2 Attachments) (7-2)

WGL:fer

(15)
57 MAR 17 1958 F259

ENCLOSURE 5 FILED WITH ORIGINAL 101-2483

NOT RECORDED
158 MAR 10 1958
INITIALS ON ORIGINAL

100-387835-1841
ORIGINAL FILED IN

FBI

Date: 3/5/58

Transmit the following in _____

Via _____

NY 100-107111

[REDACTED] also advised that the Sobell Committee has contracted for a dinner party at the NYC owned Tavern On The Green on 4/21/58. The contract calls for a minimum of 400 persons, with a maximum of 700. Tickets will sell at \$10 each. Of this amount, \$4.50 is for the meal, \$2.50 for expenses, and the balance for contribution to the Sobell Committee. Two committees, Petition and Ticket, headed by AARON KATZ and SYLVIA MALKIN or MENKIND (PH), respectively, were formed to push and publicize the party. In addition, SYLVIA MALKIN has arranged 7 unadvertised private parties to be held in March. Plans are also being made for an East Side Sobell Committee Party on 4/5/58. [REDACTED] also advised that AARON KATZ was appointed as part-time organizer in the NY area and would be available at the Sobell Office daily from 2 to 10 p.m. b2 b7D

[REDACTED] further advised that TED JACOBS and HELEN SOBELL had received a good reception on their recent trip to Boston as a result of SYLVIA MALKIN's efforts there several weeks ago. b2 b7D

For information.

POWERS

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (101-2483)

DATE: FEB 26 1958

FROM : SAC, NEW YORK (100-37158)

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL
ESPIONAGE - R
(OO: NEW YORK)ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3842 Pmt-D/K

Enclosed are Photostats of the following:

1. Letter from WILFRED DENNO, Warden, Sing Sing Prison, Ossining, New York, dated 12/13/57 to Simon and Schuster, Publishers, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.
2. Letter from GILES PLAYFAIR, Williamstown, Massachusetts, dated 1/7/58 to Warden WILFRED DENNO.
3. Letter from Mrs. MORTON SOBELL to Warden WILFRED DENNO dated 2/7/58, with enclosures.
4. Letter from Warden DENNO to Mrs. MORTON SOBELL dated 2/14/58.

On 2/14/58, Warden WILFRED DENNO made the above material available to SA WILLIAM A. FLYNN, Jr., with the comment that he thought it might be of interest to the Bureau as the book in question "The Offenders" deals with the ROSENBERG case.

He advised that he was furnishing it for information purposes only as he was contemplating taking civil action against the publishers and the authors for the unauthorized use of his name.

DENNO advised that the authors of this book, GILES PLAYFAIR and DERRICK SINGTON, never consulted him despite the fact that they mention HIS NAME on the "Acknowledgement

the files of the NYO contain no information identifiable with DERRICK SINGTON.

- 2- Bureau (101-2483) (Encl. 4) (RM)
 1- New York (100-37158)
 1- 100-109849 (HELEN SOBELL) (#6)
 1- 65-15348 (JULIUS ROSENBERG) (#6)
 1- 100-107111 (NCSJMS) (#7-2)

WDD:pcs
(6)let to ny
3-6-58
JPL:zll

FEB 27 1958

ESP/SEC

NY 100-37158

New York letter to Bureau of 11/4/44 entitled *b7D*



One Photostat copy of the material is retained in exhibit section of the New York file on MORTON SOBELL.

December 13, 1957

Simon and Schuster
Publishers
Rockefeller Plaza
630 Fifth Avenue
New York 20, New York

Gentlemen:

I wish to acknowledge receipt of the book which you sent with your compliments entitled "The Offenders".

I have just finished reading the article pertaining to the Rosenbergs, which I was naturally interested in due to the fact that they were confined at this institution for a considerable length of time.

I wish to call your attention to an inaccurate statement on page 227 of the book which states, "Tiers of seats were erected in the execution chamber at Sing Sing Prison to accommodate an invited audience of record size. (The Warden of the prison was responsible for "inviting" the witnesses. He could presumably have been instructed or advised to limit the number to the minimum required by law.)" For your information, or whoever may have been responsible for writing this, I wish to advise that either the ones responsible were grossly misinformed or they are just plain liars. As a matter of fact, I wish to inform you that no seats were erected in the execution chamber to accommodate a large audience "of record size" as stated. As a matter of fact, there was no audience as such with the exception of one news representative from each one of the news services, a total of three, representing the United Press, Associated Press and International News Service. Furthermore, the warden of the prison was not responsible for inviting the witnesses as the records will plainly show, but the witnesses comprising the three newspaper representatives mentioned above were invited by the U. S. Government as represented by the U. S. Marshall, who, in effect, was the one responsible for carrying out the execution on behalf of the government of the United States with the facilities of this institution being used for the carrying out of sentence. The other persons present at the execution were the U. S. Marshall, one of his assistants, and personnel of the Department of Correction necessary for the proper carrying out of sentence. None of the persons invited were the guests of the warden as such.

All of the above information I believe was printed in the press at the time sentence was carried out or was easily available, and it would appear to me that if the writers of this material could not verify such simple facts I am wondering how accurate the rest of the material written is.

(continued)

①

Simon and Schuster

December 13, 1957

In order to set the records straight, I might state for your information that there were less persons present at the executions of the Rosenbergs than there are present at an execution conducted for the State of New York, which specifies that twelve witnesses be invited. In the case of the Rosenbergs only three witnesses representing the news services were invited and which is in accordance with the regulations of the Federal Government that press be represented.

I felt that this should be called to your attention as the publishers.

Very truly yours,

W A R D E N

LD:cm

1



Handwritten text:
1. 1958-1959
2. 1959-1960
3. 1960-1961
4. 1961-1962
5. 1962-1963
6. 1963-1964
7. 1964-1965
8. 1965-1966
9. 1966-1967
10. 1967-1968
11. 1968-1969
12. 1969-1970
13. 1970-1971
14. 1971-1972
15. 1972-1973
16. 1973-1974
17. 1974-1975
18. 1975-1976
19. 1976-1977
20. 1977-1978
21. 1978-1979
22. 1979-1980
23. 1980-1981
24. 1981-1982
25. 1982-1983
26. 1983-1984
27. 1984-1985
28. 1985-1986
29. 1986-1987
30. 1987-1988
31. 1988-1989
32. 1989-1990
33. 1990-1991
34. 1991-1992
35. 1992-1993
36. 1993-1994
37. 1994-1995
38. 1995-1996
39. 1996-1997
40. 1997-1998
41. 1998-1999
42. 1999-2000
43. 2000-2001
44. 2001-2002
45. 2002-2003
46. 2003-2004
47. 2004-2005
48. 2005-2006
49. 2006-2007
50. 2007-2008
51. 2008-2009
52. 2009-2010
53. 2010-2011
54. 2011-2012
55. 2012-2013
56. 2013-2014
57. 2014-2015
58. 2015-2016
59. 2016-2017
60. 2017-2018
61. 2018-2019
62. 2019-2020
63. 2020-2021
64. 2021-2022
65. 2022-2023
66. 2023-2024
67. 2024-2025
68. 2025-2026
69. 2026-2027
70. 2027-2028
71. 2028-2029
72. 2029-2030
73. 2030-2031
74. 2031-2032
75. 2032-2033
76. 2033-2034
77. 2034-2035
78. 2035-2036
79. 2036-2037
80. 2037-2038
81. 2038-2039
82. 2039-2040
83. 2040-2041
84. 2041-2042
85. 2042-2043
86. 2043-2044
87. 2044-2045
88. 2045-2046
89. 2046-2047
90. 2047-2048
91. 2048-2049
92. 2049-2050
93. 2050-2051
94. 2051-2052
95. 2052-2053
96. 2053-2054
97. 2054-2055
98. 2055-2056
99. 2056-2057
100. 2057-2058
101. 2058-2059
102. 2059-2060
103. 2060-2061
104. 2061-2062
105. 2062-2063
106. 2063-2064
107. 2064-2065
108. 2065-2066
109. 2066-2067
110. 2067-2068
111. 2068-2069
112. 2069-2070
113. 2070-2071
114. 2071-2072
115. 2072-2073
116. 2073-2074
117. 2074-2075
118. 2075-2076
119. 2076-2077
120. 2077-2078
121. 2078-2079
122. 2079-2080
123. 2080-2081
124. 2081-2082
125. 2082-2083
126. 2083-2084
127. 2084-2085
128. 2085-2086
129. 2086-2087
130. 2087-2088
131. 2088-2089
132. 2089-2090
133. 2090-2091
134. 2091-2092
135. 2092-2093
136. 2093-2094
137. 2094-2095
138. 2095-2096
139. 2096-2097
140. 2097-2098
141. 2098-2099
142. 2099-2100
143. 2100-2101
144. 2101-2102
145. 2102-2103
146. 2103-2104
147. 2104-2105
148. 2105-2106
149. 2106-2107
150. 2107-2108
151. 2108-2109
152. 2109-2110
153. 2110-2111
154. 2111-2112
155. 2112-2113
156. 2113-2114
157. 2114-2115
158. 2115-2116
159. 2116-2117
160. 2117-2118
161. 2118-2119
162. 2119-2120
163. 2120-2121
164. 2121-2122
165. 2122-2123
166. 2123-2124
167. 2124-2125
168. 2125-2126
169. 2126-2127
170. 2127-2128
171. 2128-2129
172. 2129-2130
173. 2130-2131
174. 2131-2132
175. 2132-2133
176. 2133-2134
177. 2134-2135
178. 2135-2136
179. 2136-2137
180. 2137-2138
181. 2138-2139
182. 2139-2140
183. 2140-2141
184. 2141-2142
185. 2142-2143
186. 2143-2144
187. 2144-2145
188. 2145-2146
189. 2146-2147
190. 2147-2148
191. 2148-2149
192. 2149-2150
193. 2150-2151
194. 2151-2152
195. 2152-2153
196. 2153-2154
197. 2154-2155
198. 2155-2156
199. 2156-2157
200. 2157-2158
201. 2158-2159
202. 2159-2160
203. 2160-2161
204. 2161-2162
205. 2162-2163
206. 2163-2164
207. 2164-2165
208. 2165-2166
209. 2166-2167
210. 2167-2168
211. 2168-2169
212. 2169-2170
213. 2170-2171
214. 2171-2172
215. 2172-2173
216. 2173-2174
217. 2174-2175
218. 2175-2176
219. 2176-2177
220. 2177-2178
221. 2178-2179
222. 2179-2180
223. 2180-2181
224. 2181-2182
225. 2182-2183
226. 2183-2184
227. 2184-2185
228. 2185-2186
229. 2186-2187
230. 2187-2188
231. 2188-2189
232. 2189-2190
233. 2190-2191
234. 2191-2192
235. 2192-2193
236. 2193-2194
237. 2194-2195
238. 2195-2196
239. 2196-2197
240. 2197-2198
241. 2198-2199
242. 2199-2200
243. 2200-2201
244. 2201-2202
245. 2202-2203
246. 2203-2204
247. 2204-2205
248. 2205-2206
249. 2206-2207
250. 2207-2208
251. 2208-2209
252. 2209-2210
253. 2210-2211
254. 2211-2212
255. 2212-2213
256. 2213-2214
257. 2214-2215
258. 2215-2216
259. 2216-2217
260. 2217-2218
261. 2218-2219
262. 2219-2220
263. 2220-2221
264. 2221-2222
265. 2222-2223
266. 2223-2224
267. 2224-2225
268. 2225-2226
269. 2226-2227
270. 2227-2228
271. 2228-2229
272. 2229-2230
273. 2230-2231
274. 2231-2232
275. 2232-2233
276. 2233-2234
277. 2234-2235
278. 2235-2236
279. 2236-2237
280. 2237-2238
281. 2238-2239
282. 2239-2240
283. 2240-2241
284. 2241-2242
285. 2242-2243
286. 2243-2244
287. 2244-2245
288. 2245-2246
289. 2246-2247
290. 2247-2248
291. 2248-2249
292. 2249-2250
293. 2250-2251
294. 2251-2252
295. 2252-2253
296. 2253-2254
297. 2254-2255
298. 2255-2256
299. 2256-2257
300. 2257-2258
301. 2258-2259
302. 2259-2260
303. 2260-2261
304. 2261-2262
305. 2262-2263
306. 2263-2264
307. 2264-2265
308. 2265-2266
309. 2266-2267
310. 2267-2268
311. 2268-2269
312. 2269-2270
313. 2270-2271
314. 2271-2272
315. 2272-2273
316. 2273-2274
317. 2274-2275
318. 2275-2276
319. 2276-2277
320. 2277-2278
321. 2278-2279
322. 2279-2280
323. 2280-2281
324. 2281-2282
325. 2282-2283
326. 2283-2284
327. 2284-2285
328. 2285-2286
329. 2286-2287
330. 2287-2288
331. 2288-2289
332. 2289-2290
333. 2290-2291
334. 2291-2292
335. 2292-2293
336. 2293-2294
337. 2294-2295
338. 2295-2296
339. 2296-2297
340. 2297-2298
341. 2298-2299
342. 2299-2300
343. 2300-2301
344. 2301-2302
345. 2302-2303
346. 2303-2304
347. 2304-2305
348. 2305-2306
349. 2306-2307
350. 2307-2308
351. 2308-2309
352. 2309-2310
353. 2310-2311
354. 2311-2312
355. 2312-2313
356. 2313-2314
357. 2314-2315
358. 2315-2316
359. 2316-2317
360. 2317-2318
361. 2318-2319
362. 2319-2320
363. 2320-2321
364. 2321-2322
365. 2322-2323
366. 2323-2324
367. 2324-2325
368. 2325-2326
369. 2326-2327
370. 2327-2328
371. 2328-2329
372. 2329-2330
373. 2330-2331
374. 2331-2332
375. 2332-2333
376. 2333-2334
377. 2334-2335
378. 2335-2336
379. 2336-2337
380. 2337-2338
381. 2338-2339
382. 2339-2340
383. 2340-2341
384. 2341-2342
385. 2342-2343
386. 2343-2344
387. 2344-2345
388. 2345-2346
389. 2346-2347
390. 2347-2348
391. 2348-2349
392. 2349-2350
393. 2350-2351
394. 2351-2352
395. 2352-2353
396. 2353-2354
397. 2354-2355
398. 2355-2356
399. 2356-2357
400. 2357-2358
401. 2358-2359
402. 2359-2360
403. 2360-2361
404. 2361-2362
405. 2362-2363
406. 2363-2364
407. 2364-2365
408. 2365-2366
409. 2366-2367
410. 2367-2368
411. 2368-2369
412. 2369-2370
413. 2370-2371
414. 2371-2372
415. 2372-2373
416. 2373-2374
417. 2374-2375
418. 2375-2376
419. 2376-2377
420. 2377-2378
421. 2378-2379
422. 2379-2380
423. 2380-2381
424. 2381-2382
425. 2382-2383
426. 2383-2384
427. 2384-2385
428. 2385-2386
429. 2386-2387
430. 2387-2388
431. 2388-2389
432. 2389-2390
433. 2390-2391
434. 2391-2392
435. 2392-2393
436. 2393-2394
437. 2394-2395
438. 2395-2396
439. 2396-2397
440. 2397-2398
441. 2398-2399
442. 2399-2400
443. 2400-2401
444. 2401-2402
445. 2402-2403
446. 2403-2404
447. 2404-2405
448. 2405-2406
449. 2406-2407
450. 2407-2408
451. 2408-2409
452. 2409-2410
453. 2410-2411
454. 2411-2412
455. 2412-2413
456. 2413-2414
457. 2414-2415
458. 2415-2416
459. 2416-2417
460. 2417-2418
461. 2418-2419
462. 2419-2420
463. 2420-2421
464. 2421-2422
465. 2422-2423
466. 2423-2424
467. 2424-2425
468. 2425-2426
469. 2426-2427
470. 2427-2428
471. 2428-2429
472. 2429-2430
473. 2430-2431
474. 2431-2432
475. 2432-2433
476. 2433-2434
477. 2434-2435
478. 2435-2436
479. 2436-2437
480. 2437-2438
481. 2438-2439
482. 2439-2440
483. 2440-2441
484. 2441-2442
485. 2442-2443
486. 2443-2444
487. 2444-2445
488. 2445-2446
489. 2446-2447
490. 2447-2448
491. 2448-2449
492. 2449-2450
493. 2450-2451
494. 2451-2452
495. 2452-2453
496. 2453-2454
497. 2454-2455
498. 2455-2456
499. 2456-2457
500. 2457-2458
501. 2458-2459
502. 2459-2460
503. 2460-2461
504. 2461-2462
505. 2462-2463
506. 2463-2464
507. 2464-2465
508. 2465-2466
509. 2466-2467
510. 2467-2468
511. 2468-2469
512. 2469-2470
513. 2470-2471
514. 2471-2472
515. 2472-2473
516. 2473-2474
517. 2474-2475
518. 2475-2476
519. 2476-2477
520. 2477-2478
521. 2478-2479
522. 2479-2480
523. 2480-2481
524. 2481-2482
525. 2482-2483
526. 2483-2484
527. 2484-2485
528. 2485-2486
529. 2486-2487
530. 2487-2488
531. 2488-2489
532. 2489-2490
533. 2490-2491
534. 2491-2492
535. 2492-2493
536. 2493-2494
537. 2494-2495
538. 2495-2496
539. 2496-2497
540. 2497-2498
541. 2498-2499
542. 2499-2500
543. 2500-2501
544. 2501-2502
545. 2502-2503
546. 2503-2504
547. 2504-2505
548. 2505-2506
549. 2506-2507
550. 2507-2508
551. 2508-2509
552. 2509-2510
553. 2510-2511
554. 2511-2512
555. 2512-2513
556. 2513-2514
557. 2514-2515
558. 2515-2516
559. 2516-2517
560. 2517-2518
561. 2518-2519
562. 2519-2520
563. 2520-2521
564. 2521-2522
565. 2522-2523
566. 2523-2524
567. 2524-2525
568. 2525-2526
569. 2526-2527
570. 2527-2528
571. 2528-2529
572. 2529-2530
573. 2530-2531
574. 2531-2532
575. 2532-2533
576. 2533-2534
577. 2534-2535
578. 2535-2536
579. 2536-2537
580. 2537-2538
581. 2538-2539
582. 2539-2540
583. 2540-2541
584. 2541-2542
585. 2542-2543
586. 2543-2544
587. 2544-2545
588. 2545-2546
589. 2546-2547
590. 2547-2548
591. 2548-2549
592. 2549-2550
593. 2550-2551
594. 2551-2552
595. 2552-2553
596. 2553-2554
597. 2554-2555
598. 2555-2556
599. 2556-2557
600. 2557-2558
601. 2558-2559
602. 2559-2560
603. 2560-2561
604. 2561-2562
605. 2562-2563
606. 2563-2564
607. 2564-2565
608. 2565-2566
609. 2566-2567
610. 2567-2568
611. 2568-2569
612. 2569-2570
613. 2570-2571
614. 2571-2572
615. 2572-2573
616. 2573-2574
617. 2574-2575
618. 2575-2576
619. 2576-2577
620. 2577-2578
621. 2578-2579
622. 2579-2580
623. 2580-2581
624. 2581-2582
625. 2582-2583
626. 2583-2584
627. 2584-2585
628. 2585-2586
629. 2586-2587
630. 2587-2588
631. 2588-2589
632. 2589-2590
633. 2590-2591
634. 2591-2592
635. 2592-2593
636. 2593-2594
637. 2594-2595
638. 2595-2596
639. 2596-2597
640. 2597-2598
641. 2598-2599
642. 2599-2600
643. 2600-2601
644. 2601-2602
645. 2602-2603
646. 2603-2604
647. 2604-2605
648. 2605-2606
649. 2606-2607
650. 2607-2608
651. 2608-2609
652. 2609-2610
653. 2610-2611
654. 2611-2612
655. 2612-2613
656. 2613-2614
657. 2614-2615
658. 2615-2616
659. 2616-2617
660. 2617-2618
661. 2618-2619
662. 2619-2620
663. 2620-2621
664. 2621-2622
665. 2622-2623
666. 2623-2624
667. 2624-2625
668. 2625-2626
669. 2626-2627
670. 2627-2628
671. 2628-2629
672. 2629-2630
673. 2630-2631
674. 2631-2632
675. 2632-2633
676. 2633-2634
677. 2634-2635
678. 2635-2636
679. 2636-2637
680. 2637-2638
681. 2638-2639
682. 2639-2640
683. 2640-2641
684. 2641-2642
685. 2642-2643
686. 2643-2644
687. 2644-2645
688. 2645-2646
689. 2646-2647
690. 2647-2648
691. 2648-2649
692. 2649-2650
693. 2650-2651
694. 2651-2652
695. 2652-2653
696. 2653-2654
697. 2654-2655
698. 2655-2656
699. 2656-2657
700. 2657-2658
701. 2658-2659
702. 2659-2660
703. 2660-2661
704. 2661-2662
705. 2662-2663
706. 2663-2664
707. 2664-2665
708. 2665-2666
709. 2666-2667
710. 2667-2668
711. 2668-2669
712. 2669-2670
713. 2670-2671
714. 2671-2672
715. 2672-2673
716. 2673-2674
717. 2674-2675
718. 2675-2676
719. 2676-2677
720. 2677-2678
721. 2678-2679
722. 2679-2680
723. 2680-2681
724. 2681-2682
725. 2682-2683
726. 2683-2684
727. 2684-2685
728. 2685-2686
729. 2686-2687
730. 2687-2688
731. 2688-2689
732. 2689-2690
733. 2690-2691
734. 2691-2692
735. 2692-2693
736. 2693-2694
737. 2694-2695
738. 2695-2696
739. 2696-2697
740. 2697-2698
741. 2698-2699
742. 2699-2700
743. 2700-2701
744. 2701-2702
745. 2702-2703
746. 2703-2704
747. 2704-2705
748. 2705-2706
749. 2706-2707
750. 2707-2708
751. 2708-2709
752. 2709-2710
753. 2710-2711
754. 2711-2712
755. 2712-2713
756. 2713-2714
757. 2714-2715
758. 2715-2716
759. 2716-2717
760. 2717-2718
761. 2718-2719
762. 2719-2720
763. 2720-2721
764. 2721-2722
765. 2722-2723
766. 2723-2724
767. 2724-2725
768. 2725-2726
769. 2726-2727
770. 2727-2728
771. 2728-2

"Bennie Creek Farm"

Williamstown, Mass. Tel. Williamstown 550

January 7th, 1958

Dear Mr. Denno:

I have just received from Simon & Schuster your letter to them of December 13th, 1957, regarding THE OFFENDERS, of which I am co-author.

It is quite clear from what you say that we are to blame for a seriously inaccurate statement, and I think that you are fully justified in calling the attention of the publishers to it. I shall make sure that it is eliminated from any future editions of the book, and I must apologise unreservedly for any irritation or embarrassment it may have caused you personally.

I can only ask you to believe that the statement was made by us in good faith, and was not invented with a view to supporting our line of argument. I hope and I believe, too, that the rest of the book, however much its views may be disagreed with, is factually accurate, although I am bound to confess that the doubts you express on this score are perfectly understandable under the circumstances.

I should just like to add that I have written this letter entirely ~~of my~~ of my own volition, and not at the prompting of Simon & Schuster who sent me on your letter without comment.

Yours very truly,
Philip Mayhew

2

MRS. MORTON SOBELL

RECEIVED
30 Charlton Street
SING SING PRISON

New York 14, N. Y.

February 7, 1958

Mr. Wilfred Denno
Warden of Sing Sing Prison
Ossining, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Denno:

I have just finished reading the book by Giles Playfair and Derrick Sington entitled, "The Offenders". I find your name listed among those to whom the authors acknowledge their indebtedness for help in the preparation of a very important and timely book. Since I have a particular sensitivity to the problems discussed in the book, I take the liberty of writing to you.

I am the wife of Morton Sobell who was convicted in 1950 on a charge of conspiracy to commit espionage. You undoubtedly remember his name as a defendant together with the Rosenbergs, a case discussed in "The Offenders". Despite my husband's innocence he has already spent 8 years in prison, 5 of them in Alcatraz.

I hope you will take the time to read the Reduction of Sentence Motion which I have enclosed. This motion was submitted in January 1953. The facts and the pleas made at that time are as true today as they were then. Now however, our family has added five more years of suffering, and unless we can enlist the attention and help of those, like you, who are aware of the problem, we see no end of our sorrow.

There are many who have asked for a new trial or freedom for my husband. Perhaps you will add your name to the enclosed letter, or perhaps you will advise me what you feel can be done. My husband is an innocent man he doesn't belong in any prison, much less the "maximum security, minimum privilege" prison of Alcatraz which violates every principle of human dignity. Please help me to free him.

Very sincerely yours,

Morton L. Sobell

(Mrs. Morton Sobell)

Rev. C. Earl Page, First Congregational Church, Spencer, Iowa
 Rev. J. Kenneth Pfohl, Winston-Salem, N.C.
 Rev. Dreyden L. Phelps, Fellowship Church, Berkeley, Cal.
 Dr. Irving E. Putnam, Methodist Church, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Rev. Daniel Lyman Ridout, Administrative Secretary, Baltimore Area, The Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.
 Dean Paul Roberts, Episcopal Cathedral, Denver, Colo.
 Rev. Charles W. Stewart, Peoples A.M.E. Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rev. Walter Carl Subke, San Francisco, Cal.
 Rev. Francis S. Tucker, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rev. R. Valenti, Presbyterian Church of the Holy Trinity, New York, N.Y.

RABBIS

Rabbi Moses J.S. Abels, former President Brooklyn Board of Rabbis, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Zvi Anderman, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Sidney Ballon, Nassau Community Temple, West Hempstead, N.Y.
 Rabbi Jerome S. Bass, Beth Emeth Cong., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rabbi Ben Zion Bergman, Burbank, Cal.
 Rabbi Samuel Bernstein, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi M. D. Bial, Temple Sinai, Summit, N.J.
 Rabbi Jerome B. Cohen, Englewood, N.J.
 Dr. Franklin Cohn, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Rabbi Benjamin Englander, Cong. B'nai Israel, Irvington, N.J.
 Rabbi Julian B. Feibelman, Temple Sinai, New Orleans, La.
 Rabbi Morris Fishman, Community Synagogue, Atlantic City, N.J.
 Rabbi Oscar Fleishaker, Ahavas Israel Synagogue, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Rabbi Seymour Freedman, Buffalo, N.Y.
 Rabbi Alfred L. Friedman, Union Temple, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, New York, N.Y.
 Dr. Emanuel Gamoran, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Daniel Goldberg, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Jacob Goldberg, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Sidney Greenberg, Temple Sinai, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rabbi Louis D. Gross, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Avery J. Grossfield, Florence, S.C.
 Rabbi Z. Harry Gutstein, Sons of Israel, Williamstic, Conn.
 Rabbi Harry Halpern, East Midwood Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rabbi Samuel Horowitz, Cong. Beth Aaron, Billings, Mont.
 Rabbi Mollie Kaelter, Temple Israel, Long Beach, Cal.
 Rabbi Jerome Keatenbaum, Cong. Rodoph Shalom, Tampa, Fla.
 Rabbi Aaron Kirachenbaum, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Raymond Leiman, Cong. B'nai Israel, Steubenville, Ohio
 Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, New York, N.Y.
 Rabbi Daniel Manies, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rabbi Israel Raphael Margolies, Cong. Beth Am, West Englewood, N.J.
 Rabbi Carl I. Miller, Temple Israel, Gary, Ind.
 Dr. Uri Miller, Baltimore, Md.
 Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, Far Rockaway, N.Y.
 Rabbi Dr. Phillip Rosenberg, Temple Beth Shalom, Santa Ana, Cal.
 Moses Rosenthal, Rabbi Emeritus, Cong. Sons of Israel, Suffern, N.Y.
 Rabbi Samuel Rodriguez, Temple Emanuel, Beaumont, Texas
 Rabbi Erwin Ruch, Flatbush Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rabbi Stephen A. Schafer, Collingwood Temple, Toledo, Ohio
 Rabbi Solomon Segal, Beth Israel Cong., Moose Jav, Cask., Canada
 Rabbi Sanford M. Shapiro, Elmira, N.Y.
 Rabbi David S. Shapiro, Cong. Anshe Sfard, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Rabbi Solomon Shapiro, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Rabbi David Wolf Silverman, TMAA Temple, Aurora, Ill.
 Rabbi Jacob Singer, Chicago, Ill.
 Rabbi Alan Mayor Sokobin, Temple Beth El, Laurelton, N.Y.
 Dr. Joshua Trachtenberg, Temple Emeth, Teaneck, N.J.
 Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein, KAM Temple, Chicago, Ill.

PROFESSORS

Prof. David Blackwell, University of California, Prof. Derk Bodde, University of Pennsylvania, Prof. Murray Branch, Moorehouse College, Atlanta, Ga.
 Dr. E. H. Brunquist, Prof. Emeritus, University of Colorado, Denver, Colo.
 Dr. Ephraim Cross, City College, New York
 Dr. Burris Cunningham, University of Cal.
 Prof. John J. DeBoer, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 Prof. Lloyd H. Donnell, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chesterton, Ind.
 Prof. Kermit Eby, University of Chicago
 Ada M. Field, Guilford College, N.C.
 Prof. Erwin R. Goodenough, Yale University, Dr. Eustace Haydon, Prof. Emeritus, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. Carroll P. Hurd, Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah
 Dr. Sumner M. Kalman, Stanford University
 Prof. Isaac Kolthoff, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 J. M. Kuehne, Prof. Emeritus, University of Texas, Austin, Texas
 Prof. Gerhard Loose, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
 Prof. Gardner Murphy, Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas
 Dean Francis M. Myers, U. of Denver, Denver
 Dr. Robert Reid Newell, Stanford U.
 Prof. Victor Paschke, Columbia University, Prof. Linus Pauling, Nobel Prize Scientist, Pasadena, Cal.
 Prof. George W. Plattsman, U. of Chicago
 Prof. Dale Pontius, Roosevelt U., Chicago
 Prof. Anatol Rappaport, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Prof. Oscar K. Rice, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.
 Prof. Harry R. Rudin, Yale University, Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, Prof. Emeritus, Wellesley College, Prof. Sidney J. Socolar, U. of Chicago
 Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize Scientist, Chicago, Ill.
 Dr. Frank Weymouth, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Prof. H. M. Wilson, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
 Arthur E. Woodruff, U. of Chicago
 Prof. Francis D. Wormuth, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

WRITERS

Elmer Davis, commentator, Washington, D.C.
 Dorothy Day, editor Catholic Worker, New York, N.Y.
 Waldo Frank, author, Truro, Mass.
 Maxwell Geismar, literary critic, Harrison, N.Y.
 William Harrison, editor Boston Chronicle, Boston, Mass.
 Harold V. Knight, Exec. Dir., Denver Branch ACLU, Denver, Colo.
 Lewis Mumford, Amenia, N.Y.
 Dr. Scott Nearing, author, Camp Rowley, Me.
 Al S. Waxman, editor and publisher, Los Angeles, Cal.
 William Appleman Williams, historian, Eugene, Oregon

OTHER EXCINENT SIGNERS

Emily G. Balch, Nobel Prize Winner, Wellesley, Mass.
 Helen Marston Beardsley, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Jessie F. Binford, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
 Pablo Casals, cellist, San Juan, Puerto Rico
 Mary H. Gleason, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
 James Imrie, Lawrenceville, N.J.
 Dr. Leo Mayer, physician, New York, N.Y.
 Culbert L. Olson, former Governor of California, who freed Tom Mooney and Warren Billings, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Dr. Clyde D. Phillips, physician, Chicago, Ill.
 Margaret T. Sinkin, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, physician, Chicago, Ill.
 Trevor Thomas, Legislative Rep., American Friends Service Committee, San Francisco, Cal.
 M. Lesley West, Syracuse, N.Y.

APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

President Dwight D. Eisenhower
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

It is because we share your deep concern for the spiritual health of our nation and for the principles of justice upon which it is founded that we address ourselves to you concerning the case of Morton Sobell.

Morton Sobell, now in his seventh year of imprisonment and confined in Alcatraz, is seeking a new trial to reverse his 30-year sentence on a charge of "conspiracy to commit espionage." Both he and his defenders maintain that he is innocent. Moreover, the trial record shows that the judge in passing sentence stated: "The evidence in the case did not point to any activity on your (Morton Sobell's) part in connection with the atomic bomb project."

We do not press upon you, Mr. President, the question of Morton Sobell's innocence or guilt--for we ourselves are not of one mind on that issue. Our faith in our democratic system of justice assures us that the truth will ultimately be established.

We believe it is vital that our nation safeguard its security, but it is important that we do not permit this concern to lead us astray from our traditions of justice and humanity. In this light, we further believe that Morton Sobell's continued imprisonment does not serve our nation's interest or security.

Therefore, most respectfully and earnestly, Mr. President, we look to you to exercise your executive authority either by asking the Attorney General to consent to a new trial for Morton Sobell or by the granting of Executive Pardon or Commutation. We take the liberty of urging your personal attention to this matter.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

- ☐ My signature may be made public along with other signers of the Appeal.
☐ I request that my signature not be made public.

Note:

The following have signed as individuals. Their associations are listed as means of identification only, and do not imply the sponsorship of their organizations.

JUDGES AND LAWYERS

Leo Beran, Chicago, Ill.
Robert L. Brook, Los Angeles, Cal.
Landon L. Chapman, Chicago, Ill.
Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School,
John F. Finerty, attorney in the Sacco-
Vanzetti and Mooney-Billings cases,
Judge Norval K. Harris, Sullivan, Ind.
Robert W. Kenny, former Attorney General
of California, Los Angeles, Cal.
Philip A. Klapman, Chicago, Ill.
Conrad Lynn, New York, N.Y.
Daniel Marshall, Los Angeles, Cal.
Louis McCabe, Philadelphia, Pa.
Judge Patrick W. O'Brien, Detroit, Mich.
George Olshausen, San Francisco, Cal.
Richard W. Petherbridge, El Centro, Cal.
Prof. Malcolm Sharp, University of Chicago
Judge Edward P. Totten, Santa Ana, Cal.
R. L. Witherspoon, St. Louis, Mo.

MINISTERS

Rev. David Andrews, Methodist Minister,
Greensboro, N.C.
Dr. Roland H. Bainton, Yale Divinity
School, New Haven, Conn.
Rev. William Baird, Essex Community
Church, Chicago, Ill.
Dr. Harold J. Bass, The Church for
Today, Tacoma, Wash.
Rev. Reginald H. Bass, Community Church,
Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. Howard C. Bushing, San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. Fred Cappuccino, Christ Methodist
Church, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. W. Sterling Cary, The Church of the
Open Door, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. Dr. J. Raymond Cope, Berkeley, Cal.
Rev. Henry Mitt Crane, Central Methodist
Church, Detroit, Mich.
Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Delmar Baptist
Church, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. G. Shubert Frye, Synod of New York,
Syracuse, N.Y.
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede, Los Angeles, Cal.
Rev. Curtis R. Gatlin, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Cornelius Greenway, Universalist
Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. Wesley H. Hager, Grace Methodist
Church, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. J. Stuart Innerat, Pasadena, Cal.
Rev. John Paul Jones, Union Presbyterian
Church of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rev. Joseph P. King, Baptist Church,
Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Dana Klotzle, Universalist Service
Committee, Boston, Mass.
Rev. Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Unitarian
Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Dr. Paul F. Lehmann, Harvard University,
Dr. Bernard M. Loomer, Divinity School,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Bishop Edgar A. Love, Baltimore Area,
The Methodist Church, Bal. A.S.C. Md.
Rev. Archie Matson, Broadway Methodist
Church, Glendale, Cal.
Rev. Peter McCormack, Protestant Chaplain
of Alcatraz, San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. Sidney G. Mank, University Heights
Presbyterian Church, New York, N.Y.
Rev. James Myers, New York, N.Y.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

- against -

MOTION FOR REDUCTION
OF SENTENCE

MORTON SOBELL,

Defendant.
----- X

MORTON SOBELL, the defendant above-named, respectfully moves this Court, pursuant to Rule 35, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, for an order reducing the sentence heretofore imposed upon him, and shows in support of this motion:

1- Sentence was imposed April 5, 1951, after defendant's conviction on his plea of not guilty, on a charge of conspiracy to commit espionage. (Former 50 U.S.C. Sec. 34) Sentence was imposed by Hon. Irving R. Kaufman. An order of the Supreme Court denying an application for a writ of certiorari and/or the mandate of the United States Court of Appeals affirming judgment of conviction was received by this Court November 19, 1952.

2- Defendant is now serving his sentence at Alcatraz Island Penitentiary, California, having been transferred to that place from the Detention Headquarters in West Street on November 27, 1952. He has been in the custody of the Attorney General or his representatives continuously from August 12, 1950, and thus has already been imprisoned for almost two and one-half years.

3- There is annexed to this motion and made part hereof, the following communications which the writers have desired brought to the attention of the Court:

- (a) Letter of Mrs. Helen Sobell, wife of the defendant dated December 26, 1952.
- (b) Letter of Mrs. Rose Sobell, mother of the defendant dated December 29, 1952.

4- This motion is an appeal to the discretionary power of the Court which, under Rule 35, is believed to be as broad as the power initially exercised at the time of the imposition of sentence. It is defendant's respectful submission that in the unique circumstances of this case, the Court should consider the question of sentence de novo. In support of such reconsideration, defendant urges the Court to take into account (a) matters that were not brought to its attention, or considered by it, at the time of the imposition of sentence; and (b) events subsequent to the imposition of sentence, which bear on the sentence imposed.

5- Insofar as defendant and his trial counsel are aware, the Court did not have the benefit of, and did not consider at the time of the imposition of sentence, any probation report or other independent study of the particular defendant's life, conduct and character. While the provisions of Rule 32, providing for such pre-sentence investigation, may not be mandatory on the Court, such an investigation would have been appropriate here. Counsel, in an effort to fulfill a duty to both court and client, have attempted to gather some data on the point. But a basic impediment--one with which the Court and its officers would not have been confronted

has existed--namely, that the business and scientific associates of Morton Sobell have been so affected by the "atom-spy" aura of his trial and convictions that they have declined to respond to inquiries on his behalf made by his wife, for the purpose of this motion. Among such individuals, whose opinion the Courts, through the Probation Office, might have solicited, are Lyman Fink and George Hobbs of the General Electric Company; Rawley McCoy, Edward Garrett and Harry Bellock of the Reeves Instrument Company, and Benjamin Taylor, an independent consulting engineer.

6- Morton Sobell is an individual whose personal character is reflected obliquely in the letters of his wife and mother annexed to this motion. The outstanding fact of his life has been his devotion to his own scientific studies; as a scientist his preoccupation with constructive contribution to the field in which he has specialized has always been characteristic of him. Even before entering college this motivation led him to apply for and secure from the Federal Radio Commission, December 16, 1932, a "ham" radio license to operate amateur station W 2DRH. His interest in his work and his desire to contribute to human knowledge led him to relinquish his comfortable civil-service government berth in the fall of 1941 and spend a year at the University of Michigan in studies leading to the degree of Master of Scientific Engineering.

7- His ultimate ambition to return to the academic field was later reflected in courses he took at N.Y.U. Graduate School of Arts and Science in 1949-50, while employed at Reeves Instrument Company. His qualification to do so was reflected in the "A" and "A-plus" grades he received at the University of Michigan while in attendance there in 1941-42. This resulted in the tender to him of a University Fellowship by the Regents of the University of Michigan on recommendation of the Executive Board of the Graduate School. His respectful response to this offer, addressed to Dean C.S. Yoakum of the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, speaks for itself as to the thoughts and emotion that led to the sacrifice of this career:

"612 E. Madison Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan
April 15, 1942

University of Michigan
Graduate School
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dear Dean Yoakum:

I am very sorry to inform you that I will not accept the fellowship so kindly offered me.

I hope you will forgive me for troubling you with my application. Perhaps sometime in the not too distant future I will return to the University, sometime when the country does not need its men as sorely as it does at this moment.

Sincerely yours,

MORTON SOBELL"

At this time. Mr. Sobell had already been registered for over two months from February 25, 1942, of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel of the War Manpower Commission, Reg. No. 8-27 194.

So it was, that Morton Sobell came to accept employment with the General Electric Corporation at Schenectady, N.Y.

8- During the war years, Morton Sobell made manifest his patriotism in ways. He communicated with the United States Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, (Truman Committee) on March 10 and March 20, 1944, in connection with a waste of capacitors, resistors, transformers and measuring instruments in the General Electric Plant. The files of the Truman Committee will show this correspondence under Reference W-3220s. It may be mentioned that throughout the period of hostilities, Morton Sobell was a regular Blood Donor of the American Red Cross in Schenectady; having contributed his blood over eight separate occasions, he became a member of the "Gallon Club" of the Red Cross. Among his contributions, through his work, to the war effort, was invention of a device which was such a significant contribution to the functioning of servomotors that it was awarded Patent No. 2 454980 by the United States Patent Office.

9- Morton Sobell has always been a devoted son, brother, husband and father. His personal and family life have not only been above reproach; he has justified the love and devotion reflected in the letters of his wife and mother annexed to this petition. Such matters are not uncommonly taken into account in the imposition of sentence or on motion for reduction. It is appropriate that they be considered here.

10- As a defendant in this prosecution, Morton Sobell still maintains his innocence of the crime of which he was convicted. The action of the jury and appellate courts have closed this question for consideration on this motion. Yet, as the Court of Appeals pointed out, in affirming the conviction of his co-defendant a trial judge should consider the quality of the evidence on which a defendant has been convicted as one of the factors on which the severity of a sentence should be measured. Even on the worst aspect of the case made against him, by the single witness against him, there was no occasion testified to by Elitcher on which alleged overtures were made, where Sobell had taken the initiative in bringing about the visit or interview. On each of the few occasions involved, Elitcher had been the one to seek out and visit with Sobell.

11. The trial of the charge against Morton Sobell was an instance of an oppressive use of the charge of conspiracy to bring about a result which was inhumanly unfair and prejudicial. The fact that the Court of Appeals affirmed the conviction as legally permissible does not change the reality of the situation. Can it be safely said that in the absence of the misleading pre-trial publicity characterizing Sobell as an atom-spy and on consideration of the evidence against him separately on a trial from which the awful implication of atomic espionage would have been subtracted, that Morton Sobell would have been found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

12. A most significant circumstance which we commend to this Court's consideration, is the dissent of Judge Frank of the Court of Appeals from Sobell's conviction. In his sensitiveness to oppressive conduct affecting human freedom, Judge Frank perceived how the conjunction of the atomic espionage testimony with the testimony against Sobell had an adverse effect on him. His dissent points out that at the very least, it should have been made clear to the jury that even if they believed the testimony of Elitcher, it did not necessarily follow that Sobell had joined the grave over-all espionage conspiracy which was the object of the prosecution. Moreover, he spoke for the entire court, at the portion of his opinion wherein he pointed out that if ~~two~~ conspiracies were proved, then prejudicial error had been committed, for Sobell was jointly tried with major atomic energy spies whose acts and declarations were held binding upon him".

13- Though it has been held that there was no error, it cannot be denied that there was prejudice. And the administrative convenience which led the United Attorney to merge the initially separate accusations of conspiracy in this case is not necessarily to be condoned merely because it has been held legally correct for him to proceed as he did. Likewise, the course of conduct which included the misleading pre-trial publicity, the misleading bill of particulars, the kidnapping from Mexico, the use of loaded questions and ill attempts at "humor", the violation of the court's direction against exclusion of witnesses, the "reprehensible" comments on the Perl indictment -- none of which, separately, were sufficient "error" to vitiate the conviction, did not result in a judgment so impeccable and so clear that maximum prison sentence should necessarily follow.

14- The sentence imposed on Morton Sobell was the maximum term provided by statute. While his crime was of a type which is always regarded as serious, it is not necessarily of the sort that should have resulted in such exceeding severity on one (a) whose character and conduct have been as indicated above; (b) whose guilt was based on testimony which may have been sufficient to go to the jury and yet did not conclusively indicate individual heinousness (c) whose complicity was so limited under any aspect of the record. The circumstances of Morton Sobell's case were such that the severity of the sentence imposed upon him can only be explained by the terrible burden imposed on the Court in connection with the sentencing of the defendants Rosenberg. On the recent motion of the Rosenbergs for reduction of sentence imposed on them, however, the United States Attorney made, for the first time, the point that Sobell has unsuccessfully tendered repeatedly as reflecting the unfairness of his trial: "Ordinary espionage is one thing; atomic espionage is another". (Snm. 94)

15- Turning to the recorded sentences imposed in other cases of "ordinary espionage"--where the indictment was on the same statute as that involved here; where the conviction was not on a plea of guilty; a tremendous disparity is revealed. In all cases other than the mass trial involved in the Heine case, the average sentence imposed for violation of former 50 U.S.C. 34 was slightly over eight years' imprisonment. Gorin himself was sentenced to six years, Frances Gros (138 F 2d 254) to one and one-half years, for wartime espionage. In the Heine case, the average sentence imposed on the defendants who entered a plea of guilty was eleven years; even there, where sentence was imposed in the trying period, one month after Pearl Harbor, the average sentence on the defendants who had pleaded guilty was two and one-half years. The information on the basis of which these statements are made is as follows:

A. Reported espionage sentences:

John S. Farnsworth	4 to 12 years	98 F (2d) 541
Mikhail N. Gorin	6 years	312 U.S. 19
Hans H. Gros	10 years*	136 F (2d) 254
Frances Gros	1½ years*	138 F (2d) 261
Frank Grote	15 years**	140 F (2d) 413
Kurt Molzahn	10 years*	135 F (2d) 92
Hafis Salich	4 years	312 U.S. 19
Frederick W. Thomas	16 years***	151 F (2d) 183

(* Wartime sentence, beneficiary being wartime enemy.)

(** Actual "intent to injure" proved.)

(*** Leader of wartime ring for wartime enemy.)

B. Judge Byer's sentences in Brooklyn, Mass trial (wartime sentence).

(Cases reported 73 F. Supp. 858; 146F (2d) 254 and 151 F (2d) 813)

Ebeling, 5 years; Erlers, 5 years; Walen, 12 years; Scholz, 16 years; Klein, 5 years; Munck, 10 years; Stigler, 16 years; Dold, 10 years, Duquense, 18 years; Walischewsky 2½ years; Heine, 18 years; Wheeler-Hill, 15 years; Ruper, 16 years.

(Sentence reported; based on N. Y. Times Jan. 3, 1942).

16- Morton Sobell, as an individual, by the destruction of his career and reputation and by the terrible consequences already visited on his family, has been punished severely for the crime of which he has been convicted. The court may well consider whether the function of a criminal's sentence--whether as deterrent, reformatory or even retributive--has not been amply served in respect to him. It is the crux of our whole democratic philosophy and of our moral idealism that the dignity and soul of the individual human being is put on the highest plane of social values.

A reduction of Morton Sobell's sentence so that freedom and rehabilitation will be within endurable reach would be in accord with all that is just and humane in our tradition. The amesty of the law will be sufficiently vindicated by a sentence not greater than the average referred to above--with credit for the period of confinement already suffered. To have the sentence reduced to time already served would not be unreasonably lenient, when it is considered how Sobell and his family have already been punished.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD N. MEYER
HAROLD M. PHILLIPS
EDWARD KUNTZ
Attorneys for Defendant
205 West 34 Street
New York 1, New York

Judge Irving R. Kaufman
Federal Court Building
New York City

Honorable Sir:

I am the wife of Morton Sobell. I know him as a husband, father, son and brother. As my husband he has loved and cherished me, helped me at every turn of the road in performing my duties as a woman, a wife and a mother. Before his incarceration, his devotion to the children found expression in loving care and attention with no thought for his own comfort or well being.

As a son he helped his parents from the time it was first possible for him to do so, and continued to bring them comfort and honor in his work and in his life.

To his sister he rendered assistance, both financial and human.

We who are his family believe in his innocence of the crime with which he is charged. Knowing him as we do we must stand by him in this hour of great need. For us the sentence of thirty years is a sentence for each one of us, and we must suffer each day of his imprisonment.

For us the burden is triply hard because we are now separated from our loved one by a distance of 3000 miles, and do not have the financial resources to overcome this great hardship. Even the name of Alcatraz Prison is one which strikes terror into our hearts.

As a Judge who holds in his hands the disposal of human lives, will you not temper your justice with mercy so that we who have suffered, and who must suffer more, will at least be able to look forward to some termination of our misery. May we at least have the hope of some day being reconstituted as a family so that the children who may not now even visit their father will know a father while they are in their formative stages. May it be granted to me that I may again feel the love of my husband about me before my life withers.

Please find it in your heart to reduce the living death of thirty years in prison to something which comes within the compass of human endurance.

Respectfully,

HELEN SOBELL (Mrs. Morton Sobell)

- - - - -

Judge Irving R. Kaufman
Federal Court Building
New York City

I am the mother of Morton Sobell, am almost reaching old age, having lived all my life honorably. I was raised as an orphan in a family of eight children. Worked hard all my life, but had a happy and fruitful life.

I have raised two children under extreme difficulties but tried to give them a good education. My son, Morton Sobell, was an outstanding boy, he graduated all schools with the greatest honors, the last one was Michigan University of which he was admitted the mathematical honor society where Einstein is also a member.

I will swear before God and man of my son's innocence, therefore honorable Judge Kaufman, will you listen to a mother's crying heart and make his burden lighter. Believe me, I would rather go to prison instead of my son. I will go to Temple every holy day and pray for you and your family.

I am appealing to you as a father help me, a mother whose eyes are never dry and whose heart is broken.

May God bless you.

MRS. ROSE SOBELL

January 1953

Your Honor:

Many, many months have passed since the fateful day upon which you sentenced me to thirty years imprisonment. Obviously, my thoughts have often dwelt upon this sentence; I have tried to understand it and reach that degree of comprehension which could make it possible to adjust to it. I have not been able to do so.

I cannot be so presumptuous as to attempt to pass "judgment" upon a judicial act. But I do not see how it can be that my entire life- for, in substance, that is what it is - should be forfeit, without hope or opportunity of redemption. I do not ask that it be taken into account that I still maintain my innocence of the grave crime of which I have been convicted; but I ask your Honor to consider (even within the limitations of the judgment of conviction) whether due regard has been given to my own past life and character in imposing a maximum sentence.

I have worked under, and by the side of many responsible scientists in my career. I ask that the court investigate and consider what their opinion of me, my work, my contribution to national defense has been, even in the period of the "cold war".

I respectfully suggest, that even though the case against me may have been enough, by legal standards, to warrant submission to a jury, that the Court should reconsider whether that case against me was so strong as to make me out a hopeless, confirmed criminal, one who is beyond possibility of rehabilitation?

May I not hope to be freed when I would still have some chance of living as a productive human being? Is it so clear that the verdict against me was not a product of the atom-spy atmosphere, which court and counsel could not contend with, that society must irrevocably decide that a sentence such as five or seven years- serious enough in many similar cases - would not be enough?

Respectfully yours,

LIGHTON SOBELL

February 14, 1958

Mrs. Helen L. Sobell
30 Charlton Street
New York 14, New York

Dear Madam:

In reply to your letter of February 7 informing me that you had just finished reading the book by Giles Playfair and Derrick Sington entitled "The Offenders", and that you find my name listed among those to whom the authors acknowledge their indebtedness for help in the preparation of a very important and timely book, I wish to inform you that I was not of any assistance whatsoever to the authors of this book and, as a matter of fact, I wrote to the publisher on December 13, 1957 that the book made inaccurate statements in the Rosenberg account pertaining to myself and this institution, and that if the rest of the book was not any more accurate than that particular account, I could not help but wonder how accurate the rest of the material written would be.

I also wish to state that I have received a letter from one of the co-authors acknowledging that they are to blame for a seriously inaccurate statement and that I was fully justified in calling the attention of the publisher to it.

The authors and publisher of this book did not have my permission at any time to use my name in connection therewith, nor did they receive any assistance from me in writing this book.

Very truly yours,

W A R D E N

W.D:cm

4

SAC, New York (100-37158)

March 6, 1958

Director, FBI (101-2483) - 1422

EX-136

REC-38

HUNTON SOKLE
ESPIONAGE - R

Reurlet 2-20-58.

Enclosed find to reflect any identifiable information concerning Derrick Stinson. Enclosed to reflect one [redacted]

It is not known if this person is identical with the author of the book entitled "The Offenders." You should obtain a copy of this book and review the same. The book and your review should be furnished to the Bureau promptly.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 4/23/87 BY 3042 [signature]

JPL:jds
(4)

NOTE: New York furnished Photostat of a letter written by Warden Denno of Sing Sing Prison to the authors of the book entitled "The Offenders" pointing out an inaccuracy in the book. New York also forwarded a Photostat of the reply received by Warden Denno from Giles Playfair. Warden Denno stated he was planning to institute civil suit against the authors for unauthorized use of his name on the acknowledgment page of this book. The book stated that tiers of seats were erected in the execution chamber to accommodate an invited audience of record size for the execution of the Rosenbergs and that the Warden was responsible for inviting witnesses. Warden Denno pointed out that actually there were 3 witnesses, one from each of the major news services and the United States Marshal invited these witnesses to attend the execution. This book is entitled "The Offenders" and was written by Giles Playfair and Derrick Stinson and was published by Sign and Schuster, New York City. It is believed the Bureau should obtain this book and have the contents reviewed.

Tolson _____
Nichols _____
Boardman _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Parsons _____
Rosen _____
Tamm _____
Trotter _____
Nease _____
Tele. Room _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

MAIL ROOM ☒

64 MAR 11 1958 214

FBI - WASH DC
REC.D DEPT OF JUSTICE

RECEIVED MAR 11 1958
MAR 11 1958

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (101-2483)

DATE: 4/8/58

FROM : SAC, NEW YORK (100-37158)

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL
ESP - R

ReBulet, 3/6/58.

The book "The Offenders" has been reviewed from the standpoint of possible Bureau interest and what appears to be relevant is being set out below. The book is being forwarded as an enclosure to this letter.

Brief biographical sketches of the authors appear at the end of the book. GILES PLAYFAIR is referred to as an English barrister who served with a British Government wartime agency in New York between 1942 and 1946. He was a visiting professor at the University of North Carolina in 1953 and 1954. He is at "present" Professor of Drama and Director of the Adams Memorial Theater at Williams College, Massachusetts. DERRICK SINGTON was the chief witness for the prosecution at the trial of the Belsen war criminals and is a former foreign correspondent and editorial staff writer for "The Manchester Guardian" and a regular contributor to "The New Statesman."

With reference to the statement by WARDEN WILFRED DENNO, Sing Sing Prison, that he was contemplating civil action against the publisher, Simon and Schuster, Inc., and the authors for unauthorized use of his name, the following is set out:

② Bureau (101-2483) (Encl. 1) (RM)
1 - New York (100-37158)

RTP:jad
(3)

REC-40

APR 10 1958

EX-128

EX-128
ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 put-DK

57 APR 29 1958

1423

Detached & retained
in Bureau Library
(JHS)

New Braun to Belmont
4-16-58
JPL:jdb

NY 100-37158

In the last paragraph of the preface, the authors state they received invaluable help and cooperation from ".....government officials, prison administrators, criminologists, psychiatrists and others in several countries." It is then indicated that the names of these individuals are listed at the end of the book. Included among a long list of such persons at the end of the book are the following:

Hon. JAMES V. BENNETT, Director of U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons, and his staff.

WILFRED DENNO, Warden of Sing Sing Prison.

DOUGLAS RIGGS, Warden of Stillwater Prison, Minnesota, and his staff.

RUSSELL TEMPLE, Deputy Warden of the State Penitentiary of North Carolina.

Also related to the statement of Warden DENNO the authors on page 227, in commenting about the execution of the ROSENBERGS, state ".....it was as nearly public as the law could allow it to be. Tiers of seats were erected in the execution chamber at Sing Sing Prison to accommodate an invited audience of record size." The authors go on to say that the warden was responsible for inviting the witnesses and, "He would presumably have been instructed or advised to limit the number to the minimum required by law." (This is an apparent reference to previous statements alleging that President Eisenhower and his advisers were "defeated" by their refusal to stop the execution and also by not taking steps to limit the publicity that accompanied the execution.) It is mentioned that several press reporters were guests of the warden and they ".....shared their experience with

NY 100-37158

proceedings with their readers, describing how the ROSENBERGS had amazed the prison officials with their calmness in the face of death..... The American people were permitted a sadistic orgy, and thus the defiance of world opinion was intensified and the victory for Communist propaganda made more resounding."

"The Offenders" is an argument against capital punishment. The reasons supporting the major premise that capital punishment is morally wrong are developed around six case studies--four involving crimes against the person, one of crime against International Law (Nuremberg war crime prosecution) and the case of the ROSENBERGS. This is basically a sociological work and in a more specialized sense deals with criminology. The discussion concerning the ROSENBERGS appears to contain the only material of interest to the Bureau.

Although the authors at one point concede that for the sake of argument the question of guilt or innocence of the ROSENBERGS is irrelevant from their point of view, a large part of their discussion and analysis has political overtones which suggest that the conviction and execution of the ROSENBERGS may not have been just and that the government being over-zealous for a conviction encouraged the GREENGLASSES ".....to embroider their story in places....." The authors do not directly state the latter point but observed that anyone who reads with an open mind the book "Was Justice Done?" by Professor MALCOLM SHARP, may suspect this to be the case.

NY 100-37153

In addition to recounting the essential historical background of the case, discussing the principal characters and the overt acts of the conspiracy, considerable interpretation is set forth in an effort to reinforce the basic argument that the execution was wrong. The following are some of the more significant reasons the authors develop by direct statement or suggestion to support their contention:

1) That the part played by ETHEL ROSENBERG was no more serious than that played by RUTH GREENGLASS and the part played by JULIUS ROSENBERG no more serious than that played by DAVID GREENGLASS. (p. 219)

2) That Judge IRVING R. KAUFMAN in sentencing the ROSENBERGS to death had the weight of American public opinion behind him at the time, but, "Whether he had justice behind him, too, is another matter." (p. 220) (p. 238)

3) That the question of guilt or innocence of the ROSENBERGS was not settled beyond dispute at the trial. (p. 221) The discussion of this topic is based largely on "The Judgement of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg" by JOHN WEXLEY, and "Was Justice Done?" by Professor MALCOLM SHARP. The authors dismiss the argument of WEXLEY that the ROSENBERGS espionage case was a hoax, as untenable. It would presuppose the FBI wished to engineer a sensational spy trial for political reasons and persuaded HARRY GOLD to implicate the GREENGLASSESS in order that they might be persuaded to implicate the ROSENBERGS.

NY 100-37158

It is with reference to Professor SHARP's book that the authors imply that the GREENGLASSES made perjurious statements at the instigation of Government officials.

4) That the people duped by the campaign to save the ROSENBERGS were not those who supported this movement but those who believed the objective of this campaign was to actually save the lives of the ROSENBERGS. (p. 225) President EISENHOWER and his advisers, according to the authors, were defeated by Communist propaganda activities on behalf of the ROSENBERGS, by failing to stop the execution and by not having the execution carried out as quietly as possible.

5) That the purpose of the death sentence was not one of prevention, deterrence or retribution, but of reformation--to force them to confess and repent. (p. 230-235).

6) That Judge KAUFMAN used an erroneous justification for imposing the death sentence by indicating the activities of the ROSENBERGS resulted in Communist aggression in Korea. (p. 235)

7) Imposing the death sentence on the ROSENBERGS was a violation of the spirit of the 1917 Espionage Act under which the ROSENBERGS were convicted. (p. 237) The authors argue that the framers of the legislation had not intended that the discretionary power be used in peacetime against person who spied on behalf of a wartime ally.

Following the six cases, the authors present a summary of their arguments against capital punishment which includes one which they call the danger of irremediable injustice through the execution of innocent persons. (p. 291)

NY 100-27158

The authors regret the fact this argument has been used by abolitionists in cases of crime against the person to the neglect of treason where innocence is more likely to exist. The authors reason that the state has its vested interest in conviction in cases of treason and thus there is greater danger of a "frame-up". They then ask if it is not true that in time of crisis, people are not more inclined to give credence to informer's false testimony. The case of HARVEY MATUSOW is then cited as an example of "....the young American ex-Communist who, on his own confession, made a living for two years by feeding the FBI with fabricated information....."

The paragraph which follows the above argument is devoted to an attempt to define treason. As an example of the relativity characteristic of treason, it is stated that the expression "The Crime of the Century" used by J. EDGAR HOOVER to describe the ROSENBERG espionage case, is likely to be accepted only in communities which sympathize with his own attitude toward Communism. They state that in Communist nations HOOVER's title is regarded as a misnomer and in non-Communist ones the term is not widely accepted.

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

4 TO : A. H. Belmont

1 - Belmont
1 - Branigan
1 - Lee

DATE: April 16, 1958

FROM : W. A. Branigan

SUBJECT:

MORTON SOBELL

ESPIONAGE - R

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED

HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042

By letter dated 2-26-58 the New York Office advised that it had received information from Warden Wilfred Denno, Sing Sing Prison, that a book entitled "The Offenders" made some comments concerning the Rosenberg case. These comments dealt with the arrangements for the execution of the Rosenbergs and were untrue. Denno advised that he was contemplating taking civil action against the publishers and authors of this book for the unauthorized use of his name. By letter dated 3-6-58 the New York Office was instructed to obtain a copy of this book and to review same and forward to Bureau.

By attached letter dated 4-3-58, New York Office forwarded a copy of the book entitled "The Offenders" written by Giles Playfair and Derrick Singleton. This book discusses several cases of crimes against property, the person and the State. These particular crimes resulted in the execution of the criminals and this book argues against capital punishment. One of these cases discussed is the Rosenberg case. In this chapter, the authors conceded that the question of the guilt or innocence of the Rosenbergs is irrelevant from their point of view. The only question with which they are dealing is the sentence imposed upon the Rosenbergs. They feel that the Rosenbergs should not have been executed. They suggest that the Government should have attempted to cure the Rosenbergs. They state that the Rosenbergs upon their conviction should have been committed for an indefinite period to some type of treatment or education center and be placed in the custody of people with an expert knowledge of their political thinking and a genuine insight of the workings of their minds and that they should have been held in this center while a prolonged attempt was made to win them over to loyalty to the United States and democratic ideas. The authors admitted that no such establishment exists but that it could have been and still could be created and they suggest that in this work ex-communists could perform a valuable service of atonement rather than sending their discarded associates to jail or to execution chambers.

The authors concede that they do not know if this method have worked in the case of the Rosenbergs but feel that as a broad deterrent it would have been more sensible than execution.

Enclosures
101-2483
JPL:jdb
(4)

*Playfair is reportedly an English barrister who formerly practiced criminal law in London. Bufiles reflect 622

*Singleton is reportedly the first officer to enter Belsen concentration camp and was chief witness for the prosecution at the trial of the Belsen war criminals. He is former foreign correspondent and writer for "Manchester Guardian." Bufiles have no ident info re this individual.

Tolson
Nichols
Boardman
Belmont
Mason
Mohr
Parsons
Rosen
Tamm
Nease
Winterrowd
Tele. Room
Holloman
Gandy

62-135
JPL:jdb
4-63 APR 30 1958
378

Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
Re: Morton Sobell
101-2483

The statements which Warden Denno objected to occurred during a description of the execution in which the authors state that it was as nearly public as the law could allow it. The book states that tiers of seats were erected in the execution chamber at Sing Sing to accommodate an invited audience of record size and the Warden was responsible for inviting the witnesses. The truth of the matter is the only witnesses to the execution was one representative each of the 3 major news services and these witnesses were invited by the United States Marshal. The warden is considering instituting civil suit against the authors for the unauthorized use of his name on the acknowledgment page of the book.

The chapter on the Rosenberg case recounts the essential historical background of the case fairly accurately and contains no unfavorable comments concerning the Bureau.

ACTION:

For your information. It is recommended that the attached book be placed in the Bureau Library.

[Handwritten signatures and initials]

NC

4/17/58

x Mr. Edgar Hoover;

Listening to a speech on behalf of justice
in the case of Morton Sobell; And then reading
the enclosed paper; Kind of puts the F.B.I. in
the same light as the dreaded Russian
L.M.P.A. and the post German Gestapo.

I have always held the F.B.I. in high
esteem. I always believed that the F.B.I.
protected & helped the innocent and prosecuted
the guilty. The truth will always come out
on top, regardless how anyone tries to suppress it;
And God's judgment will be righteous
forever. Psalm #145

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 put-DE

(17) The Lord is just in all his ways;
And kind in all his doings.

(18) The Lord is near to all who call upon Him,
To all who call upon Him in truth.

(19) He fulfills the desire of all who love Him,
He also hears their cry, And saves them.

(20) The Lord preserves all who love Him,
But all the wicked He will destroy.

ENCLOSURE

REC-95

APR 24 1958

I pray that truth & justice will prevail on this
earth; as I am sure it is in the Kingdom of God
Almighty.

James B. Brinson to Belmont

ENCLOSURE
95 EX-135

4-23-58

JPL: jdb

100 JJ

Harvey M. Permut

CRIME-REC.

18 Photostat made & sent L.A.
by letter 5-2-58 JPL: jdb

The facts say:

Dr. Morton Sobell has steadily



the fairness of the trial being."

attested against him.



which might not have produced the same results in other times—

Editorial Comment: "An investigation and a social work study."

• •

10-10-1964

101-2483-1425
enclosure

[illegible]

For the Rosenberg trial that Julius Rosenberg had delivered information about a "space platform" to the Russians. The implication was that the Russians can be given as accurate intel for launching the Sputniks during International Geophysical Year because in all probability they simply copied stolen plans.

"Unanswered to the question: 'Why didn't we use our own plans?'"

THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE was equally biting. In an editorial on Nov. 20, it said:

"Command Robert Merritt of the Senate Internal Security Committee said convicted atom spy David Greenglass told them that Julius Rosenberg gave earth scientists secrets to the Russians shortly after World War II."

Asked the **TRIBUNE**: "What secrets were these? If none carbon copies of them are still left in the Defense Department files, maybe they could be dusted out from the archives and put into action. This is certainly useful information that we had there, wasn't it?"

The same rule of faith and of policy was observed when the **WALL PAULKE JOURNAL**, headed by Midwesterners daily, in 26 articles of Nov. 22, the **JOURNAL** wrote: "Whether the State Department or the Senate Internal Security Committee has a more far way to go, we predict that they ~~will~~ do so." The Committee passed down to the Federal Judiciary at Louisville, Pa., and talks with David C. Gonsky, assistant secretary of the **JOURNAL**, plays his part by telling the readers that whatever the action, James Connelley cannot be made a scapegoat by his brother-in-law, James Connelley, charged as an spy. Connelley, the Committee says, was a member of the Communist Party after World War II. Connelley carried out state intelligence work in this country in the 1930s and 1940s. The **JOURNAL** says that the **JOURNAL** will not be the only one to do so.

"Maybe. But many Americans are beginning to wonder whether our rockets and missiles mean anything that was ahead of us in Russia." —*Washington Post*, "Soviet state, what do they know?"

SINCEHAPLOS STAR has moved his headquarters to the downtown district where he conducted outright talk between Gold and Gold "very hot by some reliable witnesses" and called for an investigation of the General Security Committee.

While none of the above or others challenge the official

tion left to the committee of the Rosenberg and Sobell, their advocates of suspicion aims to the magazine "Chastity" in the authenticity of the prosecution witnesses.

It was David Greenglass who, having failed all his science courses at school, claimed to the Rosenberg-Sobell trial to have shared together the "Secret" of the A-bomb in his mind by overstepping on the conversations of scientists at Los Alamos. After reading the record, Dr. Harold C. Urey, one of the scientists who built the A-bomb, said Greenglass' mother's possibly have transmitted the information, physicist and chemist of the bomb, and that the Soviet

editor was using printed matter.

THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN, noted newspaper in the Northwest, recommended a review of the Salsol case in an editorial on October 14, titled "We Stand to be Sarsd".

"Although the paper said it would not promise to try to answer whether or not Salsol was guilty, the *Companion* wrote:

"Although he was heavily identified in pre-trial headlines as an 'A-Sop', he actually was employed in a New York electronics plant where presumably there were no machine controls to be stolen. The sole testimony

In the *Offenders*, the *Case Against Legal Vengeance*, a new book published by Simon and Schuster, authors Glen Frydland and Derrick Binyon present as one of their chapters a provocative discussion of the Rumsfeld-Schles case.

Making him with the Kassenbergs came from one Max Kitcher, himself an espionage suspect and hence a witness of dubious reliability.

"In 1961," the magazine continued, "we were at war in Korea and the Nation was alarmed at reports of Communist activity in the federal government. The publication of public opinion automatically swung against anyone labeled as a threat, regardless of the weight of evidence to sustain the charge."

The *Washington Journal* on Monday
wrote an editorial criticizing the Justice Department for its "gross ineptitude" and "obvious propagandizing" in getting Louis Brandeis on "misleading" grounds of material on the Sabbath day at the very time the Sabbath argument was before the Supreme Court.

proving of the conviction of the Rosenbergs." The authors say that for the purposes of their argument, they are willing to assume guilt. "We maintain, even so," the authors state, "that no question was ever more illustrative than theirs of some of the barbarity and futility of capital punishment."

The work, understanding the American government for their efforts, continued, as opposed to the harsh treatment of those who make the same. Their ignorance, commented: "Wages Klitter," who confessed and bore testimony against Julius Rosenberg and Marvin Sobell, admitting that under circumstantial evidence, initially, that he was hoping for almost any of his reward, was neither present nor even named a co-conspirator. Morton Sobell, who pleaded innocent, got 30 years—a sentence with the minimum served already is serving in Alcatraz, the largest of the Federal maximum security institutions. The Rosenbergs, who pleaded innocent,

A widely-circulated book, *The Supreme Court*, by law professor Bernard Schwartz of New York University contains many criticisms of the Supreme Court's handling of appeals by the Government. While the book's criticisms of the Justices were daring, the former Schwartz contains the facts with which the Court disposed of the Rosenberg case and the book can serve as the basis for a debate on the merits of the case.

A growing interest in business history has been reflected recently by the book *Was Jackson Democracy?*, a study of the Remondberg-Schall case, by Professor Malcolm P. Sharkey of the University of Chicago Law School. The book contains a foreword by scientist Dr. Harold C. Urey and traces in an objective manner how Professor Sharkey through his study of the case progressed from his belief that the Remondberg and Schall were guilty to a conviction that they were innocent.

For years penologists, writers and legislators have been discussing the slaying of Alvin Karpis. It has been called a "throwback to the dark ages, to the days of the stocks and the rack," and it has been called a "crime against civilization, not just a crime against man. This is where scientist Morton Schell, understanding his importance, endured more than five of the nearly eight years he has spent in prison. He was finally transferred to Atlanta on Feb. 24 of 1935. Thousands of Americans signed petitions and wrote letters of protest.

A cell block in Alcatraz, where Morton Sobell was imprisoned from Thanksgiving Day, 1953, until he was transferred to Leavenworth in February after public protest. Thousands of Americans are convinced that Morton Sobell is an innocent man who does not belong in any prison.

The following obituary from the
New York Times was written by Morton Sobell
for his wife and was possible the most
sympathetic on his subject.

"It will be a long journey, and I hope that a thousand are both in love and on the way to heaven."

Sept. 22, 1962
 Most dearest, dearest beloved,
 Tonight I write in a late collage
 Stripped of all my possessions. This
 Is my last night in Alamosa. My

In terms of program, imagination is to see the length and breadth of the land give such a period of class assignment. To see the people, at work, at play, the mountains, the rivers, the fields.

In the early hours of the morning I have this lengthy letter, so long, a very long survey distance, about 3 or 4 weeks ago I had an intuition that it might be leaving. But now, after all this time, I am still here, and I am still writing having been without letters finally, on Friday, I was told by my dear friend, but I still don't know what ground I'm walking on, really, it was only the morning when I was told to go back to my old home, but I have made up my mind that I have no more to do, I will leave tomorrow.

The dawnlight, the day night I
stood in this cell, in shadow, too

much for me, you'll thank me very much for this, as well as for yourself and the children. For this is the first time I have ever seen you. I am sure you will be much happy there. I am. Good night, sweet, sweet night. I love you with all.

—Emma's Mary—

"I have not written, but I have been so busy, that I have not had time to do so. I am sure you will be much happy there. I am. Good night, sweet, sweet night. I love you with all."

"that justice shall be done"

A NEWSPAPER TO SECURE JUSTICE IN THE CASE OF MORTON SOBELL

April, 1958

Published by the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell

Scientist Morton Sobell Wins First Step Toward Justice—Transfer From Alcatraz

In the early morning hours of February 24th, scientist Morton Sobell, who for eight years has been fighting to prove his innocence of espionage charges, finally left the grim Alcatraz prison in San Francisco Bay.

This was an historic moment of new hope in the case which has aroused the public conscience in our country and throughout the world and has been called "the American Dreyfus case." Thousands believed that Morton Sobell's imprisonment in Alcatraz symbolized the injustice that has marked his case and stepped for his transfer.

No authority has ever claimed that Morton Sobell was an intractable offender requiring the harsh discipline of Alcatraz. His transfer was greeted as a long overdue first step toward correcting a great wrong.

More and more people are becoming convinced that Morton Sobell does not belong in any prison, that he is an innocent man, and that his transfer is a key to the moral well-being of our country.

Over since the Russian satellite began spinning around the earth, a deep soul-searching has been taking place among the millions to crumble the idea that we could make our nation more secure at the expense of justice and civil liberties.

Today people are asking: Is our nation more, or less, secure because we have driven outstanding scientists from government service? Are we stronger, or weaker, for having punished innocent people? Are we more, or less, respected throughout the world for the period of McCarthyism?

One by one, the charges of "security risk" and "subversion" are being removed from innocent scientists, writers and citizens persecuted during the McCarthy era. There remains one special case still to be decided. It was the trial of Morton Sobell, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg and what of Morton Sobell? That stirred the graduate

tional and international revolution during the McCarthy period.

Not only was this trial tainted by fraud and perjury, as proven by a mountain of new evidence, but it was in this trial that the public had looked upon it the costly hoax that continues to haunt our hearts. That Russia obtained the atomic bomb by leading our "spies." Today scientists warn that this was a false idea harmful to our nation. Today the word of the witnesses was twisted to this myth is looked upon as worthless.

One American This War? Look at home in Rosenberg-Sobell book, page 2 and 3.

Yet tonight this world case is clearly tied to the support of the public period and because two persons have already been executed, there is a great reluctance in high places to re-open the case. But we cannot let the courage of our own past years and our own conscience be lost.

And what of Morton Sobell? It is a terrible thing to wrong



"I am innocent"—Morton Sobell

to deprive a citizen of his liberty. It is the worse not to make arrests when the truth is out. America is our country. Its progress is ours. Its future is ours. Can we live with our conscience so long as we know that Morton Sobell remains a prisoner of the time in which we live? The hope for Morton Sobell is that throughout our national life there is a deepening desire for justice, justice with the humanity that has been the backbone of our American tradition. This imprisonment is a symbol of a period we wish to leave behind. His freedom will be a measure of our capacity to face the future with courage and integrity.

"You freed my husband From Alcatraz—Will you Now help bring him home?"

By Mrs. Margaret Sobell
I wish to thank with all my heart those who, by their work and prayers, have helped bring about the transfer of my husband, Morton Sobell, from Alcatraz to the prison at Atlanta.

To those who are not familiar with the inhumanity of Alcatraz, it may seem a minor victory. But it is a great joy to know that after five years, the children, Morton's mother and I can once again touch our loved one's hand and speak to him face to face. In Alcatraz, we could see him only through a few inches of glass and had to talk through state-written telephones.

It is a blessing that he could visit us and no longer have to travel 4,000 miles back and forth across the country, and that Morton can now at least read newspapers and have some company. We hope that he will soon be free.

Ever since his arrest eight years ago, my husband has been trying to prove his innocence. With the aid of thousands of Americans, I have been sending every sample of my change to establish the truth. What is the truth? He has been sentenced to 30 years. The truth is that I don't know. My husband doesn't know. Some of our country's most eminent citizens, including scientific advisor Dr. Edward Teller, have signed the record, and they don't know. The high words charged "spy" and "subversion" that put our nation every page of the record of his trial and nowhere will we find a single word of evidence that he has been over such a case. We are asking you to help us bring him home.



Morton Sobell

What can you do for the information for all who have agreed to help continue this work? In addition to the Sobell family, we are asking you to help us bring him home. We are asking you to help us bring him home. We are asking you to help us bring him home.

Law Authority Urges Inquiry Into "Our Dreyfus Case"

By Professor Francis B. Warren

When Mr. Warren was one of America's outstanding political scientists, and is the author of "The Origins of Modern Constitutionalism" and other basic works in his field.

Reading from the Los Angeles article, Mr. Warren's study is superficial, even fraudulent. He is a very serious question mark. It is a whitewash of the prosecution against the critics it employs when the United States is in a position to be characterized as "the old slave technique." Critics are characterized as simple-minded dupes of Communism—like of Albert Einstein, Harold C. Urey, Bernard Baruch, and Jean-Paul Sartre.

The Department of Justice has requested the widespread demand for a review of the case. Yet has demonstrated its own inability to plan such a review. There should be an impartial inquiry by private citizens whose ability and integrity are beyond question. We are asking you to help us bring him home.

What is the truth? He has been sentenced to 30 years. The truth is that I don't know. My husband doesn't know. Some of our country's most eminent citizens, including scientific advisor Dr. Edward Teller, have signed the record, and they don't know. The high words charged "spy" and "subversion" that put our nation every page of the record of his trial and nowhere will we find a single word of evidence that he has been over such a case. We are asking you to help us bring him home.

On the 10th of December, 1957, the Warren Commission, which was set up to investigate the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, was asked to look into the case of Morton Sobell. The Commission was asked to look into the case of Morton Sobell. The Commission was asked to look into the case of Morton Sobell.

101-2482-100

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : A. H. Belmont

DATE: April 23, 1958

FROM : W. A. Branigan

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL, was.
ESPIONAGE - R

Tolson	_____
Nichols	_____
Boardman	_____
Belmont	_____
Mason	_____
Mohr	_____
Parsons	_____
Rosen	_____
Tamm	_____
Nease	_____
Winterrowd	_____
Tele. Room	_____
Holloman	_____
Gandy	_____

The attached letter was received from Henry Miernicki, 10435 Birchdale, Downey, California. This letter enclosed a copy of a fact sheet edited by the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell captioned, "That Justice Be Done." Miernicki's letter is hostile and states that the facts set out in the attached paper put the FBI in the same light as "dreaded Russian G.U.P.A.," (probably means "OGPU") and the past German Gestapo. The letter concludes with a lengthy Biblical quotation.

Bureau indices contain no identifiable information concerning Miernicki. Inasmuch as this letter is hostile toward the Bureau, no acknowledgment is being made.

ACTION: For your information. A copy of this letter Enclosures will be forwarded to Los Angeles Office for its information. 101-2483

JPL:jdb
(4)

1 - Belmont
1 - Branigan
1 - Lee

REC-95

101-2483-1425
23 APR 24 1958

EX-13

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 put-OK

let to LA
5-2-58
JPL:jdb

SAC, Los Angeles

May 2, 1958

REC-33

Director, FBI (101-2483)-1425

mb

MORTON SOBELL, was.
ESPIONAGE - R

EX-100

There are attached Photostats of a letter dated 4-17-58 which was addressed to the Director by one Henry Hienrich, 10435 Birchdale, Downey, California, and the envelope in which this letter was contained. Due to the writer's expressed hostile attitude toward the Bureau, no acknowledgment was made of this letter. These Photostats are furnished to you for your information.

Enclosures (2)

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 7-28-87 BY 3042 Jut-B/c

RECEIVED
MAY 22 1958
COMM-FBI

Tolson _____
Nichols _____
Boardman _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Parsons _____
Rosen _____
Tamm _____
Trotter _____
Nease _____
Tele. Room _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

62 MAY 7 1958

F-84
WEM

MAY 2 - 1958

WAT
Jut

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Director, FBI (101-2483)

DATE: 5/7/58

FROM : *Est. New York* (100-37158)

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL, was
ESPIONAGE - R

"UNAVAILABLE SECTION"

Card U.T.D.
MAY 15 1958

☐ It is recommended that a Security Index Card be prepared on the above-captioned individual.

☒ The Security Index Card on the captioned individual should be changed as follows: (specify change only):

Name		
Aliases		
<input type="checkbox"/> Native Born	<input type="checkbox"/> Naturalized	<input type="checkbox"/> Alien
<input type="checkbox"/> Communist	<input type="checkbox"/> Socialist Workers Party	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent Socialist League
<input type="checkbox"/> Miscellaneous (specify) _____		
<input type="checkbox"/> Tab for Detcom	Race	Sex <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female
Date of Birth	Place of Birth	
Business Address (show name of employing concern and address)		
<p>ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE 4-28/87 BY 3042 <i>fwc-DK</i></p>		
Key Facility Data		Responsibility
Geographical Reference Number		101-2483-
Interested Agencies		NOT RECORDED
Residence Address		5 MAY 8 1958
<p>✓ U.S. Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia</p>		

HQ:ecf

63 MAY 15 1958

REGISTERED MAIL

ESP. SEC.

ad

A. H. Belmont

1 - Belmont
1 - Branigan
1 - Nease
1 - Lee

May 9, 1958

W. A. Branigan

SYNIE GARFINKEL, nee Schwartz, was.

Mrs. Sidney Garfinkel

Synie Amittin

Mrs. Harry Amittin

INTERNAL SECURITY - R

By letter 10-21-57 Ben Mandel, Research Director, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, sent Mr. Nichols undated anonymous letter received by Committee stating the activities of Synie Amittin should be checked due to connection between her and Morton Sobell, convicted Soviet agent, while both worked at Reeves Instrument Corporation. Letter stated Amittin's brothers-in-law, Benjamin Henlock and Dr. Julius Jaffe, were procommunists. Mandel requested information to supplement this so it could be used for a hearing. Bufiles reflected no information on subject and certain information reflecting CP sympathies on part of Henlock and Jaffe. Mr. Mandel was orally contacted on 10-29-57 by Mr. Nichols.

Attached report and letter made at New York 4-29-58 by SA T. Chandler Jessy reflects subject and her husband, Sidney Garfinkel, are engaged in divorce proceedings with sensational type accusations being made by both parties. Garfinkel admitted he wrote anonymous letter and that he had no reason to believe his wife knew about Sobell's espionage activities. Garfinkel stated his wife was very liberal but he has no information she was a CP member; states Jaffe and wife stated that they believed the Rosenbergs were innocent and that Benjamin Henlock, according to his wife, was once arrested for distributing CP literature.

ACTION:

1. It is recommended this memo and attached report and letter be forwarded to Mr. Nichols for his information in the event further inquiry is received from Mr. Nichols relative to his previous communication.

101-2483-✓

NOT RECORDED
199 MAY 20 1958

2. There is attached a copy of a letter to the Internal Security Division transmitting copies of reports in instant case and requesting the prosecutive opinion concerning the files of Title 18, Section 800 on the part of Sidney Garfinkel in that he furnished false information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

INITIALS ON ORIGINAL

Tolson
Nichols
Boardman
Belmont
Mohr
Parsons
Rosen
Tamm
Trotter
Tele. Room
Holloman
Gandy

52 MAY 23 1958 F108

105-88146 MAIL ROOM ☐

Enclosures
① - 101-2483(Morton Sobell)

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 put/ck

1 - De. [unclear]
 1 - [unclear]
 1 - [unclear]
 1 - Lee

Assistant Attorney General
 Internal Security Division

May 12, 1958

Director, FBI

STINE GARTINKEL, nee Schenck, with aliases
 Mrs. Sidney Gartinkel
 Duane Smith
 Mrs. Harry Smith
 INTERNAL SECURITY - R

There is attached one copy each of the
 report of Special Agent T. Chandler Jessy made
 at New York, April 29, 1958, report of Special
 Agent William B. Donahue made at New York,
 February 22, 1958, as well as a memorandum dated
 February 20, 1958, in the above-captioned matter.

You will note that Sidney Gartinkel,
 estranged husband of the subject, admitted he wrote
 an anonymous letter to the Internal Security
 Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of
 the United States Senate, which letter contained
 false allegations concerning the subject.

You are requested to furnish a prosecutive
 opinion concerning the actions of Sidney Gartinkel
 in connection with Title 18, Section 1001, United States
 Code.

105-62148

Enclosures (2)

① 101-2483 (Morton Sobell)

101-2483-1

NOT RECORDED
 149 MAY 13 1958

NOTE: Four more, same caption, transcripts as Belmont was
 prepared by JTB:jah 5-9-58 in connection with outgoing mail

File _____
 Room _____
 man _____

52 MAY 16 1958

MAIL ROOM ☐

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
 HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
 DATE 4/23/87 BY 3042

MAILED
 1958

ORIGINAL FILE 105-62148-9

~~SECRET~~

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Reporting Office NEW YORK	Office of Origin NEW YORK	Date 6/18/58	Investigative Period 3/4,5,17,19;5/28,29/58
TITLE OF CASE MORTON SOBELL, was.		Report made by HERBERT D. CLOUGH, JR.	Typed By mat
		CHARACTER OF CASE ESPIONAGE-R	

Synopsis:

REINO HAYHANEN reinterviewed, 3/5/58. Advised the message "Mark" received instructing him to give HELEN SOBELL \$5,000.00, did not contain mention of a beauty parlor and made no mention of HELEN SOBELL as the proprietor of a beauty parlor.. HAYHANEN reiterated he never determined if subject's wife was the proprietor of a beauty parlor as he never actually met HELEN SOBELL nor did he give her any money. Subject transferred from Alcatraz to Federal Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia in February, 1958.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 302 JET-PK

- C -

Approved 88P JET	Special Agent in Charge	Do not write in spaces below	
Copies made: 7-Bureau (101-2483) 3-New York (100-37158) COPIES DESTROYED 1-5-1 10-10-58		101-2483-1426	REC-31
		21 JUN 20 1958	EX-124

AGENCY **PAB**
REL. REC'D
DATE FORW. **6-25-58**
HOW FORW. **By R/B**
BY **JPL/jr**

~~SECRET~~

52 JUN 26 1958

NY 100-37158

DETAILS:

Reinterview of REINO RAYHANEN, Defected
Illegal Soviet Intelligence Agent,
March 5, 1958

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
INTERVIEW REPORT

March 19, 1958

REINO HAYHANEN advised that "MARK", RUDOLF IVANOVICH ABEL originally received the first message from Moscow saying that HELEN SOBELL lived in the vicinity of 137th Street and 139th Street, off Broadway, New York City. "MARK" told HAYHANEN that he was afraid of a cop he had seen on a corner near SOBELL's residence. HAYHANEN stated that he and "MARK" drove by SOBELL's residence on one occasion in HAYHANEN's car and "MARK" pointed out the residence to HAYHANEN. On this occasion, according to HAYHANEN, there was a cop on the corner and "MARK" told HAYHANEN that a cop was there on several occasions, when he, "MARK" went by SOBELL's residence. In fact, HAYHANEN stated "MARK" informed him that on one occasion he had actually entered the doorway of the residence of HELEN SOBELL, but left when he could not locate her name on the house directory list.

HAYHANEN advised when "MARK" was unable to find SOBELL's name in the house directory he checked the New York City Telephone Directory for her name without success. HAYHANEN then checked the Telephone Directory himself and found the name HELEN SOBELL, followed by beauty parlor, 1200 or 1400 block on Broadway, New York City. HAYHANEN advised he was later in the vicinity of 42nd Street on Broadway and checked the numbers of the buildings in that area, thus finding that the 1200 or 1400 block was near 42nd Street and Broadway. HAYHANEN stated he did not actually see the beauty parlor, as he was in a hurry at the time. HAYHANEN added that the message "MARK" received instructing him to give HELEN SOBELL \$5,000 did not contain any mention of a beauty parlor.

Interview with REINO HAYHANEN File # 100-37158
on 3/5/58 at Alexandria, Virginia Dictated: 3/14/58
3/17/58
By Special Agents LAWRENCE MC WILLIAMS and EDWARD J. MURPHY; meb/mmg

Property of FBI-This is loaned to you by the FBI, and neither it nor its contents are to be distributed outside the agency to which loaned.

NY 100-37158

In relation to the address and location of the SOBELL beauty parlor, HAYHANEN advised he cannot now accurately recollect whether he received the impression that the beauty parlor was in the vicinity of Broadway and 42nd Street either by walking through the area or obtaining that impression from the telephone directory.

HAYHANEN opined that he obtained the number 1482, 1492, or 1494 Broadway as the location of HELEN SOBELL's beauty parlor from the New York City Telephone Directory, when looking up HELEN SOBELL. He stated that the reason he had previously advised that the beauty parlor was in the vicinity of 139th Street or 142nd Street and Broadway was due to the belief that each block on Broadway contained only 100 building numbers. HAYHANEN added that thus the 1400 numbers on Broadway would be at 140th Street and Broadway, according to this reasoning.

HAYHANEN stated that the HELEN SOBELL listed in the New York City Telephone Directory as the proprietor of a beauty parlor was not necessarily identical with HELEN SOBELL, the wife of MORTON SOBELL, since he, HAYHANEN, did not find the HELEN SOBELL, of the beauty parlor in the Telephone Directory and had no way of knowing if this HELEN SOBELL was identical with the wife of MORTON SOBELL. In addition, HAYHANEN pointed out that the message "MARK" received instructing him to give \$5,000 to HELEN SOBELL made no mention of HELEN SOBELL as the proprietor of a beauty parlor. He added he was never able to resolve this point since he never actually met HELEN SOBELL and never gave her the \$5,000.

HAYHANEN stated that, after he had advised Moscow by a message that he had made contact with HELEN SOBELL and had given the \$5,000 to her, he received an inquiry from Moscow in a message as to how he had arranged contact with "HELEN". HAYHANEN told Moscow in a message that he had met

NY 100-37158

HELEN SOBELL near an Eighth Avenue Subway station located in the vicinity of her residence. He told Moscow that he had recognized her from the photograph and information he had received from "MARK". HAYHANEN stated he did not tell Moscow he met her near the beauty parlor. HAYHANEN told Moscow that he tailed HELEN SOBELL on the street, met her as set out above, talked to her, gave her the \$5,000, instructed her to spend the money very carefully and then gave her a letter which she read and understood perfectly.

Concerning the letter HAYHANEN was instructed to give to HELEN SOBELL, HAYHANEN advised that "MARK" had originally received this letter and that before "MARK" left for Moscow in June of 1955, he gave HAYHANEN the letter and instructed HAYHANEN to give the letter and the \$5,000 to HELEN SOBELL in his absence. HAYHANEN stated that the letter was supposedly from HAYHANEN's brother in Russia requesting HELEN SOBELL to accept as a favor the money he, HAYHANEN, the brother of the writer of the note, would give to her. HAYHANEN explained to the interviewing agents that actually whoever gave the letter to HELEN SOBELL would allegedly be the brother of the writer in Russia. HAYHANEN emphatically stated that the letter was supposedly from the bearer's brother, not from HELEN SOBELL's brother. When queried regarding differences in statements concerning the letter being from the brother and his prior statement that the letter was purportedly from HELEN SOBELL's brother, HAYHANEN advised that he was confused at the time he furnished the original information. He is positive in his opinion that the letter was not from the purported brother of HELEN SOBELL, but was a letter from the brother of the bearer of the money.

HAYHANEN stated that he read this letter as "MARK" stated he could do so in order to be fully aware of what it contained in the event any questions were asked by HELEN SOBELL. He related that the letter described an event that occurred some years prior wherein the writer

NY 100-37158

of the letter had visited MORTON and HELEN SOBELL in their apartment, at which time MORTON and HELEN SOBELL were viewing slides on a wall in their apartment. HAYHANEN stated that the letter mentioned that the writer and the SOBELLs then conversed for some length.

HAYHANEN stated that while he cannot recall the exact wordage of the letter, he definitely recalls that while no such word as recruitment was set forth in the letter, the definite impression was obtained that the scene depicted of the meeting between the writer and the SOBELLs was the night they were either recruited or agreed to perform operations for the Soviets. HAYHANEN stated he is positive that the letter referred to both the husband and wife as regards to the meeting set forth in said letter and not to the husband alone.

HAYHANEN advised that the handwriting in the letter was unknown to him and the writing was not fluent English. He believed that the writing was disguised. He added that he does not know if the letter came from Moscow or if "MARK" wrote it or whether Soviet officials furnished this letter to "MARK". HAYHANEN stated that "MARK" had told him he received the letter, but he did not tell HAYHANEN how or where or from whom he had received it.

HAYHANEN was also unable to recall if the aforementioned letter was signed, though it is his indistinct impression that it was unsigned.

HAYHANEN stated that he received a message, in "MARK's" absence, and after the message inquiring as to how he had contacted HELEN SOBELL, in which he was instructed to see HELEN SOBELL again. HAYHANEN stated that this message contained no money. He added that this message told him to decide with "MARK" if HELEN SOBELL could be used as an agent. HAYHANEN advised that about this time "MARK" returned from Russia and told HAYHANEN to arrange a contact in

NY 100-37158

Van Cortlandt Park, Bronx, New York, with HELEN SOBELL. HAYHANEN stated that he, "MARK", would see her there with HAYHANEN introducing them to each other. HAYHANEN stated that he told "MARK" he would again try to contact HELEN SOBELL. He stated he waited awhile and then told "MARK" he could not find her.

HAYHANEN stated he told "MARK" about a cop on a corner of the street where HELEN SOBELL lived and that possibly she was being watched. He stated that "MARK" dropped the idea of trying to contact HELEN SOBELL and told HAYHANEN it was time for HAYHANEN to go to Moscow. HAYHANEN added that "MARK" told him that they would work it out upon HAYHANEN's return to the United States. HAYHANEN stated that in regard to this second attempt to contact HELEN SOBELL, "MARK" had told him that he, "MARK", was to give HELEN SOBELL an additional \$5,000, which he had in a New York City bank.

With reference to HAYHANEN's prior remarks concerning HELEN SOBELL, wherein he on one occasion told interviewing agents that her name was ROSA SOBELL, HAYHANEN advised he does not know why he used such as her first name. He stated that the possibility exists that "MARK" made reference to her in this manner, though he is positive that "MARK" also made reference to her first name as HELEN.

- 7 -

NY 100-37158

Subject transferred to Federal Penitentiary,
Atlanta, Georgia, February, 1958

On March 4, 1958, T-1 advised that at a meeting of the New York City Committee to Secure Justice for MORTON SOBELL on February 28, 1958, it was announced that MORTON SOBELL was transferred from Alcatraz to the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia.

~~SECRET~~

APPENDIX

NY 100-37158

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SECURE JUSTICE FOR MORTON SOBELL
IN THE ROSENBERG CASE

1. Following the execution of atomic spies Ethel and Julius Rosenberg in June 1953, the "Communist campaign assumed a different emphasis. Its major effort centered upon Morton Sobell," the Rosenbergs' codefendant. The National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case—a Communist front which had been conducting the campaign in the United States—was reconstituted as the National Rosenberg-Sobell Committee at a conference in Chicago in October 1953 and "then as the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case." National headquarters remained at 1050 6th Avenue, New York City. Co-chairman of the newest organization were Daniel Marshall and Joseph Brainin.

(Committee on Un-American Activities, Report, "Trial by Treason: The National Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell," August 25, 1956, pp. 118 and 120; also cited in Annual Report for 1955, House Report 1648, January 17, 1956, originally released January 11, 1956, p. 30.)

- C -

9
~~SECRET~~

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (101-2483)

DATE: 6/18/58

FROM : *ESP*
get SAC, NEW YORK (100-37158)SUBJECT: *0*
MORTON SOBELL, was.
ESPIONAGE-R

Enclosed herewith to the Bureau are 7 copies of the report of SA HERBERT D. CLOUGH, Jr. dated and captioned as above as well as 7 copies of a letterhead memorandum reflecting the reliability of the informant utilized.

REFERENCE

Report of SA WILLIAM D. DONOHUE, dated 2/17/58 at New York. *sur 1420*

ADMINISTRATIVE

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/30/87 BY 3042 *Int-PHC*

REINO HAYHANEN reinterviewed on 3/5/58, advised the message "Mark" received instructing him to give HELEN SOBELL \$5,000, made no mention of a beauty parlor and made no mention of HELEN SOBELL as the proprietor of a beauty parlor. HAYHANEN reiterated that he had never determined if the subject's wife was the proprietor of a beauty parlor as he never actually met HELEN SOBELL and never gave her the \$5,000.

A review of the information furnished by REINO HAYHANEN failed to indicate that additional investigation is warranted in this case. This case will be placed in a closed status until such time as information is received which would warrant the reinstitution of investigation.

INFORMANT

Identity of Source	Date of Activity and/or Description of Information	Date Received	Agent to Whom Furnished	File Number Where Located
T-1				

EX-124

EX-124 101-2483-1421

62,670

REC-31

21 JUN 20 1958

100-37158-
Serial 1909

2-Bureau (101-2483) (Encls. 74)
3-New York (100-37158)

HDC:mat 52 JUN 26 1958 *7346*

65b

ESP/SEC

1. ☒ Subject's name is included in the Security Index.
2. ☒ The data appearing on the Security Index card are current.
3. ☐ Changes on the Security Index card are necessary and Form FD-122 has been submitted to the Bureau.
4. ☐ A suitable photograph ☐ is ☐ is not available.
5. ☒ Careful consideration has been given to each source concealed and T symbols were utilized only in those instances where the identities of the sources must be concealed.
6. ☐ Subject is employed in a key facility and is charged with security responsibility. Interested agencies are _____
7. ☒ This report is classified Secret because (state reason) information furnished by CIA was so classified.
8. ☐ Subject was not reinterviewed because (state reason) _____

9. ☐ This case no longer meets the Security Index criteria and a letter has been directed to the Bureau recommending cancellation of the Security Index card.
10. ☒ This case has been re-evaluated in the light of the Security Index criteria and it continues to fall within such criteria because (state reason).
MORTON SOBELL is still incarcerated and his wife and the Committees to "secure justice" for MORTON SOBELL are actively engaged in efforts to have him released.



United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
New York, New York
June 18, 1958

Re: Morton Sobell, with aliases

Reference report of Special Agent Herbert D. Clough, Jr., dated and captioned as above.

T-1 utilized in reference report has furnished reliable information in the past.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4-28-87 BY 3042 *put-DLC*

THIS IS LOANED TO YOU BY THE FBI,
AND NEITHER IT NOR ITS CONTENTS
ARE TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE
THE AGENCY TO WHICH LOANED.

AGENCY *RAB*
REQ. REC'D
DATE FORW. *6-25-58*
HOW FORW. *by R/S*
BY *JLD/jst*

COPIES DESTROYED
B2 1 MAR 10 1961

101-2483-1427
ENCLOSURE

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

1 - Lee

Assistant Attorney General
Internal Security Division

July 2, 1958

Director, FBI

MORTON SOBELL
ESPIONAGE - R

Information has been received from an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past that the Philadelphia branch of the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell held a meeting on June 30, 1958, at the residence of [redacted] which was attended by thirty to thirty-five people. [redacted] has been reported to this Bureau in the past as a Communist Party member. Sarah Hammond, national functionary of the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell, acted as chairman and showed moving pictures of a reproduction of the television program "Nightbeat" in which Helen Sobell, wife of Morton Sobell, was interviewed by John Wingeat. Rose Sobell, mother of Morton Sobell, was present at this meeting and mentioned that she and Sarah Hammond had been in Washington, D. C., where they visited Senators and Congressmen regarding a new trial for Sobell. Rose Sobell indicated that they were unsuccessful in their efforts to see some Congressmen. She mentioned they tried to speak with John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers but could not do so. They spoke with two of Lewis' attorneys and left some literature with them.

According to the informant, Rose Sobell is of the opinion she had made progress in her efforts and believes that the public is beginning to feel Sobell was "framed." She believes that reprints of portions of the trial that have been distributed are misleading the public.

The informant also advised that it was announced at the meeting that Rose Sobell had been to Mexico and talked with a former President of Mexico who agreed with Rose Sobell that Morton Sobell was kidnapped.

The above is furnished to you for your information.

101-2483

1 - 100-387835 (Natl. Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case)

Tolson _____
Boardman _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Nease _____
Parsons _____
Rosen _____
Tamm _____
Trotter _____
Clayton _____
Tele. Room _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

APL:jdb
(5)

JUL 10 1958

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SEE NOTE PAGE 26

DECLASSIFIED BY 3042 PWT-P/C
ON 4/20/81

MAILED 9
JUL 2 - 1958
COMM-FBI

100-387835-1

do

EC-9101-2483-1488

RECEIVED
JUL 10 1958

WOLF

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Assistant Attorney General
Internal Security Division

NOTE: It is believed the above information should be
furnished to the AAG, IS Div., for his information in
connection with future court action that might be taken
by Sobell. Classified Confidential to protect informant
[REDACTED] b2, b7D

- 3 -
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXXFEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOIPA DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET

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

- ☐ Deleted under exemption(s) _____ with no segregable material available for release to you.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.
- ☐ Documents originated with another Government agency(ies). These documents were referred to that agency(ies) for review and direct response to you.

_____ Pages contain information furnished by another Government agency(ies). You will be advised by the FBI as to the releasability of this information following our consultation with the other agency(ies).

2

Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

Disposition of document handled by CIA in 1975

☐ For your information: _____

☒ The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:

101-2483-1429

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X DELETED PAGE(S) X
X NO DUPLICATION FEE X
X FOR THIS PAGE X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (101-2483)

DATE: 8/4/58

FROM : SAC, ATLANTA (65-1361)

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL, was.
ESPIONAGE - R

The following is transmitted for the Bureau's information.

On 7/28/58, Associate Warden VIRGIL BRELAND, Atlanta Penitentiary, advised SA GEORGE TREADWELL that mail shows subject's wife, HELEN SOBELL is in Mexico City, Mexico, staying with the family of Dr. Souchez Ponton at La Emilio Castellar.

2 - Bureau (101-2483) (RM)
1 - Atlanta (65-1361)

RRN/emb
(3)

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/23/87 BY 3042 flut-DTC

101-2483

REC-75

101-2483-1430

REC'D

12 AUG 7 1958

AUG 11 1 50 PM '58

60 AUG 12 1958

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION **FOIPA DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET**

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

- ☐ Deleted under exemption(s) _____ with no segregable material available for release to you.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.
- ☐ Documents originated with another Government agency(ies). These documents were referred to that agency(ies) for review and direct response to you.

 1 Pages contain information furnished by another Government agency(ies). You will be advised by the FBI as to the releasability of this information following our consultation with the other agency(ies).

_____ Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

☐ For your information: _____

☒ The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:

101-2483-1431

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 X DELETED PAGE(S) X
 X NO DUPLICATION FEE X
 X FOR THIS PAGE X
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

TO: W. A. Branigan *WAB*
FROM: J. P. Lee *JPL*
SUBJECT - MORTON SOBELL, was
ESP - R

fill
Date 9/25/58

E. M. Gregg
Rm. 1522

10
Captioned case has been reviewed and careful consideration given to the advisability of any reinterviews, interviews or other action which may now appear warranted. In the event such now appears desirable, necessary action is being initiated.

Bureau file: 101-2483

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4-28-87 BY 3042 *Int-OK*

101-2483

NOT RECORDED
11 SEP 26 1958

16
Espionage Section

55-
63 SEP 29 1958

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. Tolson *Keyser*

DATE: January 12, 1959

FROM : G. A. Nease *gan*SUBJECT: *Morton Sobell*

Tolson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Belmont	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mohr	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Nease	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parsons	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rosen	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tamm	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trotter	<input type="checkbox"/>
W.C. Sullivan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tele. Room	<input type="checkbox"/>
Holloman	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gandy	<input type="checkbox"/>

There is attached a copy of the report on the 85th Congress and Civil Liberties which Irving Ferman's Office prepared. He calls particular attention to the history of the Jencks legislation.

There is also attached a release put out by the Sobell Committee which he, Ferman, thought we might be interested in.

RECOMMENDATION:

That these matters be referred to the Domestic Intelligence Division for appropriate analysis.

SEPARATE MEMO being prepared on this.

MEMO to BELMONT from BAUMYAN
1-20-59 - JDC

Enclosures

- 1 - Mr. Belmont
- 1 - Mr. Jones

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4-28-87 BY 3042 Jut-DIC

GAN:sak

(4)

ADDENDUM: (GAN:sak) 1-13-59: Irving Ferman called me this morning to inquire if I had received the Sobell report. I told him I had but had not yet reviewed it. He stated he wanted to talk to some of his Congressional sources about the matter but would like to first get our reaction after reviewing the matter. It is therefore recommended that this be reviewed promptly.

1-ENCLOSURE

*Memo to Belmont
from Baumyan
1-14-59
JPL*

REC-21

101-2483-1432

JAN 21 1959

105

ESP REC

67 JAN 29 1959

A memo
from

IRVING FERMAN

Dear Gordon: *gn*

Thought you
might be interested in the
Report on the 85th Congress
and Civil Liberties which my
office has prepared.

I especially
thought you might be interested
in the history of the Jencks
legislation, which appears on
page 61.

IF

*Int. Aff.
O'Connor*

*New to lson
1-12-59
gan*

I thought you might
be interested in the attached
material which the Sobell Com-
mittee has released.

ENCLOSURE

101-2483-1432

25 JAN 21 1959

3-ENCLOSURE *REC-27*

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE *4-28-87* BY *3042 Jut-DT*

101-2483-1432

Committee To Secure Justice For Morton Sobell

940 BROADWAY (Entrance on 22nd Street) NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

Algonquin 4-9983

December, 1958

Dear Sir:

We, Morton Sobell's wife and mother, together with members of our committee, are personally concerned with Morton's rights and well being. But beyond that, we feel a deep responsibility to the issues involved in the case as they affect our entire country. We have long been aware of the concern of many Mexican people and officials of the Mexican government because of the abduction of our family from Mexico City.

When we learned that the United States Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs was conducting an inquiry into our country's relations with the Latin American nations, we felt it our duty to call the Senate's attention to a vital aspect of our case bearing on this inquiry.

Our committee therefore proceeded with the necessary research and prepared the enclosed memorandum which we hope will not only underscore the meaning of our case, but will contribute toward a better understanding and resolution of an important national and international problem. Naturally we expect that the facts presented here will result in a further investigation of the case of Morton Sobell and of the many requests for his freedom which have been made.

We ask you to read the enclosed memorandum which our committee has prepared for submission to the Senate Subcommittee. If you feel that the points raised merit consideration, we ask that you make your views known by writing directly to the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. We would appreciate a copy of your letter if you care to make it available.

The enclosed prepared letter is for your convenience and, if you prefer to sign it, will be included among those brought to the attention of the Senate Subcommittee when we submit our memorandum.

The issues of the case have troubled our country for nine years. Our country and an innocent man can be helped by your consideration. We urge your attention.

Sincerely,

Rose Sobell
Rose Sobell

Helen Sobell
Helen Sobell

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 *Just*

RE 101-2082-1432

Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs:

The Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell has sent me a copy of its memorandum addressed to your inquiry into relations with Latin American countries. I have read the memorandum and my conclusion is that it would be in the public interest for you to give careful consideration to the points which are raised.

Yours truly,

(name)

(address)

(city and state)

(date)

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 *Det-DC*

101-2483-1432
ENCLOSURE

MEMORANDUM
to the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AMERICAN REPUBLICS AFFAIRS
Foreign Relations Committee
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

Submitted in behalf of:

Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell
940 Broadway
New York City 10, N.Y.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 *put JTC*

ENCLOSURE

111-2472 1432

INTRODUCTION

This statement is submitted in behalf of the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell. The concern evidenced herein stems from the interest we have as Americans in the development and securing of good relations with our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, as well as our particular interest in seeking justice in the case of Morton Sobell.

These dual interests are closely interrelated. At the core of the problem of friendly relations between countries is the mutual respect and observance of territorial sovereignty. We hope to show that the practice of international kidnapping of a person from the territory of a Latin American country so as to effectuate his return to the United States is a naked violation of the principle of territorial sovereignty and a source of suspicion and distrust between nations. In spite of frequent official pronouncements disclaiming and criticizing such forcible seizure, the law of the United States, established by Ker v. Illinois, 119 U.S. 436, has permitted the United States to assert jurisdiction over the person of an individual who has been kidnapped from a foreign country. Our attention is directed to this doctrine as a continuing incentive for international kidnapping and thereby an important cause for the deterioration of international relations and friendship with our neighbors. In this context the Sobell case, involving assertions of such international kidnapping with the participation of the United States government, that have never been answered on the merits, takes on importance and significance. We hope to show that this very case provides an opportunity to bring our national policy into conformity with the principle of territorial sovereignty by abolishing the Ker doctrine. To this end and with this interest the following statement is submitted.

RESPECT FOR NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

One of the most significant, if not the single most important guarantee of good relations between the United States and its Latin American neighbors is the scrupulous regard and respect for national sovereignty. Only this indispensable approach, manifested in both actions and attitude, can thoroughly dispel the suspicions, fears, and often aversion to the United States that are exhibited by official and un-official reactions of Latin American countries.

Our country has long recognized the basic principle of international law of the inviolability of national sovereignty. Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State, wrote the French ministry in 1793 that:

"A sovereign according to modern international law, cannot exercise the prerogatives of sovereignty in any dominions but his own." 1

Specifically this doctrine of respect for national sovereignty has found expression in the area of unlawful intrusion upon a sovereign's territory to capture and return to the United States one accused of a violation of United States law. Mr. Moore, Secretary of State to President Madison, wrote as early as 1815:

"No principle is better established than that no government has a right to pursue offenders against its laws, or deserters from its service, into the dominions of another: that such persons can be recovered by applications only to the government within whose jurisdiction they take shelter, and in obedience to its laws and treaties applicable to such a case. A departure from this principle being a violation of sovereignty, seldom fails to produce disagreeable consequences." 2

Subsequent Secretaries of State have reiterated this principle of non-violation of national sovereignty to recapture a "fugitive." Secretary of State Buchanan in 1845 stated:

"A nation claiming a fugitive from justice cannot invade the territorial waters of another state for the purpose of arresting such fugitive." 3

And in 1881 Secretary of State Blaine wrote in respect to the extradition treaty between the United States and Mexico:

"The treaty of extradition between the United States and Mexico prescribes the forms for carrying it into effect, and does not authorize either party, for any cause, to deviate from those forms, or arbitrarily abduct from the territory of one party a person charged with crime for trial within the jurisdiction of the other." 4

These pronouncements represent a recognition of the importance of respecting sovereign integrity. History reveals, though, a pattern of violations of sovereign territorial rights which have always brought as a consequence strained and tense relations between the United States and its neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. We do not deal with the numerous expeditions and sorties of United States marines to the various Latin American countries including Nicaragua, Honduras, Haiti and Cuba in the early twentieth century when these countries rocked with the tide of popular revolutions. Nor do we deal with the American Expeditionary force that entered Mexico in pursuit of Francisco Villa and remained stationed in that country from March 9, 1916 to February 6, 1917, when its final withdrawal was obtained. 5

Further, we only note in passing, the border incidents constituting violations of sovereign rights that have occurred in the past, involving military encroachments and encounters. As early as the Civil War we were made aware of the fact that respect for national sovereignty required that national boundaries be strictly recognized. Thus, when in December, 1863, an American man-of-war entered Sambro Harbor in Nova Scotia to recover the Union steamer Chesapeake, the three remaining members of the crew of the Chesapeake who were delivered over to British authorities in Halifax were subsequently released "in view of the irregularity of their seizure by a foreign man-of-war in British water." 6

Mexican-American border violations involving troops and armed might have a long and extensive history. As far back as 1888 the United States registered protests over Mexican troops passing into United States territory. 7 And five years later the protests were coming from Mexico to the United States complaining of United States troops firing on a Mexican official in Mexican territory. 8 The period 1914-1918 witnessed countless incidents of firing across the border between United States and Mexican troops. 9 Even after the Expeditionary Force had left Mexico, there were incidents involving United States troop crossings into Mexico. 10

INTERNATIONAL KIDNAPPING AND TERRITORIAL SOVEREIGNTY

In this statement we are concerned with a separate but related aspect of the problem of recognition and respect for national sovereignty which we respectfully submit lies at the core of our relations with Latin American countries. This aspect is the unlawful and irregular kidnapping of persons in Latin American countries to obtain their return to the United States. This situation sharply raises the important issues of violation and total disregard of solemn extradition treaty obligations, violation of the internationally recognized right of asylum, and disregard for the established policies governing law enforcement and the administration of justice in the country whose sovereignty is so violated.

As already indicated, our State Department has officially stated the importance of recognizing the national sovereignty of a nation by not participating in an unlawful kidnapping of a person in such nation in defiance of its sovereignty and authority. In fact, Secretary of State Gresham characterized such activities as being "subversive of the fundamental principles of sovereignty." 11 Yet here again the history of our relations with Latin American countries reveals a not infrequent resort to kidnapping, often with all the dressings of international intrigue, that has caused resentment and tension to grow.

A. EXPERIENCES IN INTERNATIONAL KIDNAPPING

Some of the more well known of these kidnappings primarily concerning Mexico deserve mention.

In 1905 one Martinez was kidnapped from Mexican soil by one Felix and delivered to United States officials to stand trial for an offense against the laws of California. The Mexican government protested the trial and demanded Martinez's return to Mexico stating that it was obvious that his seizure was without foundation in view of the fact that the United States had extradited Felix to Mexico to stand trial for the irregular seizure.¹²

In the 1930's one Luis Lopez, then in Mexico, was forced to cross the border into Texas where he was wanted for violating the Harrison Narcotic Act. It was stated that his abduction was planned with the previous arrangement of a United States deputy marshal and a Texas constable. After the Mexican authorities requested extradition of the kidnappers, which request was denied, the Mexican Embassy strongly requested the return to Mexico of Lopez on the basis that he "was brought into American territory in a manner which constitutes an invasion of jurisdiction by American officials committed in Mexican territory." ¹³

Back in the 1890's Mexico had occasion to register an official complaint against the invasion of its territory by six armed men in pursuit of one Jesus Holguin. The Mexican minister asked the United States to issue instructions "to prevent the future repetition of acts no less disagreeable than offensive to the sovereignty of the United States of Mexico." ¹⁴

Our relations with Latin America improved greatly during the 1930's and 1940's, when the policy of "big stick" diplomacy was formally renounced. But subsequent actions, including the Sobell case, have given rise to fears in Latin America that aspects of "big stick" diplomacy were being resorted to again.

Our relations with our Canadian neighbors have not been without several incidents of irregular return of persons which has aroused ill-feeling and tension.¹⁵ The Mexican pattern is also paralleled in our relations with other Latin American countries.¹⁶ Incidents involving the inviolability of territorial sovereignty have also occurred between European countries and the United States.¹⁷ ==

On the other hand, our government has emphatically and quite rightly protested any violation of United States territorial sovereignty for the purposes of abduction of a person, whether by an old imperial power during the period America was growing,¹⁸ by our Mexican neighbor,¹⁹ or by other countries.²⁰

B. EXTRADITION TREATIES

These incidents provide the living background to the inconsistent pattern that has emerged from the conflict between the principle of respect for territorial sovereignty and the doctrine of self-help which has allowed the United States to assert jurisdiction over a person it has kidnapped from another country. The principle of territorial sovereignty has been embodied in solemn extradition treaties and numerous statements affirming the right to asylum.

The Extradition treaty represents, in an advanced and formalized sense, the recognition by the contracting parties of the importance of abiding by certain rules and procedure to protect the territorial sovereignty and integrity of the nations involved. The extradition treaty transforms what was a matter of comity and discretion into "a matter of duty, and the measure of that duty is the treaty." 21 Extradition treaties by our country may be traced back to article 27 of the Jay treaty with Great Britain on November 19, 1794. The first treaty wholly devoted to extradition was made with France on November 9, 1843. Since then we have executed treaties with almost every nation in the Western Hemisphere. Our courts have long recognized the status of the extradition treaty as part of the supreme law of the land and that obedience to its mandate is necessary to effectuate its policy. See, for example, United States v. Rauscher, 119 U.S. 407; United States v. Hurligan, 74 F2d 220, 221 (CA 2); Dominguez v. State, 234 S.W. 79 (Ct. of Crim. Appeals of Texas).

If the practice followed the admitted principle so that any violation of territorial sovereignty was promptly and effectively thwarted by refusing to recognize the jurisdiction of the offending nation that had participated in the international kidnapping over the kidnapped person, the problem of international kidnapping would be minimized. In obtaining this result, the right of sovereignty is conserved by precisely determining the only conditions and limitations under which the fugitive shall be delivered up and by which a nation shall obtain valid jurisdiction over the person.²² Most important to our present consideration, it would wipe away an area of distrust and tension by taking the profit out of the state supported international kidnapping by forbidding the kidnapping nation from asserting jurisdiction over the kidnapped fugitive.

C. CRITICISM OF THE DOCTRINE OF KER V. ILLINOIS

But, the anomalous situation has arisen that such international kidnapping does not deprive the nation of jurisdiction over the kidnapped fugitive. The case of Ker v. Illinois, 119 U.S. 436, involving the kidnapping of one Ker from Lima, Peru, to the United States and his trial therein for larceny, is generally regarded as

establishing the concept that irregular removal of the fugitive involving a violation of territorial sovereignty and disregard of treaty obligations does not deprive the abducting nation of jurisdiction.

This doctrine has been the subject of extended and bristling criticism. The criticism has fundamentally been directed at the result of the Ker case in the abrogation of solemn treaty commitments and equal and fair relations between nations on an international law basis. The most thorough expression of the policy behind the inviolability of territorial sovereignty which must override and set aside the Ker doctrine is presented in the "Draft Convention of Jurisdiction With Respect to Crime" prepared by the special Harvard Law School Research In International Law.²³ Both the proposed extradition provision on the lack of jurisdiction in the irregular seizure situation and the comment in support thereof eloquently present the role that such a rule would play in creating better relations between the United States and our Latin American neighbors by firmly committing ourselves to the faithful observance of international obligations. We take the liberty of quoting extensively from the Draft Convention.

"Art.16. Apprehension In Violation of International Law.

In exercising jurisdiction under this Convention, no State shall prosecute or punish any person who has been brought within its territory or a place subject to its authority by recourse to measures in violation of international law or international convention without first obtaining the consent of the State or States whose rights have been violated by such measures."

COMMENT

(1) "...The principle...is in part a restatement of existing practice and in part a reconciliation of conflict between contemporary doctrines. It is believed that its inclusion in a comprehensive convention in the subject of international penal competence is indicated by the most persuasive considerations of policy.

"It is everywhere agreed, of course, that 'recourse to measures in violation of international law or international convention' in obtaining custody of a person charged with crime entails an international responsibility which must be discharged by the release or restoration of the person taken, indemnification of the injured State, or otherwise. It is not everywhere agreed that there may be no prosecution or punishment in reliance upon custody thus obtained 'without first obtaining the consent of the State or States whose rights have been violated by such measures.' Thus the present article assures an additional and highly desirable sanction for international law in the matter of recovery of fugitives from criminal justice. It removes much of the incentive to such irregular or illegal recoveries as have been the source of international friction in the past. [c.o.] It provides an added incentive for recourse to regular methods in securing custody of fugitives. And if, peradventure, the custody of a fugitive has been obtained by unlawful methods, the present article indicates an appropriate

procedure for correcting what has been done and removing the bar to prosecution and punishment. The desirability of such a provision in a convention which embodies a comprehensive statement of the broad penal competence supported by contemporary practice would seem to require no emphasis." 623-24 (4) "It will be seen that the practical effect of the Anglo-American rule...is that the national law lends no support whatever to the observance of admitted international obligations. On the contrary, it takes advantage of an admitted violation of international obligation to proceed with the prosecution and punishment of a person of whom custody has been illegally obtained." 630

The outstanding international law authorities have joined in the criticism by appealing to the overriding principles of international law and justice. Professor Edwin D. Dickinson has stated:

"If the person or thing which is the subject of controversy has been brought within reach of the court's process by a breach of treaty or international law, the court should approve no arbitrary or face-saving distinctions. The court is an arm of the nation and its jurisdiction can rise no higher, by virtue of process served within the territory, than the jurisdiction of the nation which it represents. If there was no jurisdiction in the nation to make the original seizure or arrest, there should be no jurisdiction in the court to subject to the nation's law. In terms of American precedents, this means that the underlying principle of United States v. Rauscher is correct and that the distinction attempted in Ker v. Illinois is arbitrary, unsound, and should be repudiated;..." 24

It may be noted that the element of urgency that may sometimes be involved in this area can never serve as a bona fide reason for blatantly violating the territorial sovereignty of another nation. The principle violated is of such importance, particularly in securing good relations between the United States and its neighbors, that it overrides other considerations. Further, as a practical matter, provisional detention "in urgent cases" is often supplied by the extradition treaty provided that "the provisional arrest shall be made according to the rules established by the laws of the country of which extradition is requested." 25

The Ker policy reflects a political legacy and diplomatic approach of the United States government which is most harmful, which has become outdated, which has been previously renounced, and which should be abandoned.

D. THE SOBELL CASE

As we have pointed out in the introduction our interest in this matter stems, in part, from the role that we believe self-help or international kidnapping played in the trial of Morton Sobell. It has been and is the contention of Morton Sobell that the United States was a party to and participated in his unlawful seizure from Mexican territory and his subsequent removal to and prosecution in the United States. It has further been, and is, his contention that the Mexican Government never consented to or participated in the abduction and, in fact, agents of the United States were informed of Mexico's objections to the invasion of its sovereignty. Further, it is contended that the irregular return was a clear violation of the extradition treaty between the United States and Mexico. 26

The abduction was squarely raised by Sobell in an application in the nature of habeas corpus (technically an application under Title 28 United States Code Section 2255). To our consternation and misgiving, the government never squarely answered these contentions on the merits. Rather, it rested on the criticized doctrine of the Ker case. Thus, the Sobell case presents a full-blown example of the type of situation that has and continues to cause suspicion and distrust of the United States. One may well ask why has the United States insisted on resting on the dry technical basis of the Ker case rather than fulfilling its duty to conform to international law and treaty obligations. As long as the United States insists on applying the Ker case, at the price of the territorial sovereignty of sister nations and in abrogation of extradition treaties, the suspicion persists that international kidnapping is indeed utilized by our country. In fact, the circumstances surrounding Sobell's return to the United States have aroused much feeling in Mexico. An official inquiry was made. Various newspaper articles appeared castigating the United States for the abduction and refusal to meet Sobell's charges. Protests have been registered by prominent Mexicans. Clearly, all these factors operate to the injury of the United States' name and interests in Mexico and all of Latin America.

The Sobell case provided and provides a dramatic vehicle for an affirmative declaration by our country that we will not tolerate the unlawfulness of international kidnapping, that the territorial sovereignty of our neighbors will not be violated and that treaty obligations are to be scrupulously observed. Such an affirmation of fundamental principles could have been readily achieved by accepting the principle that international kidnapping of an individual in violation of international law and in disregard of treaty obligations does not vest jurisdiction in the United States over the abducted person. Accepting that principle, the United States could have then preserved its jurisdiction by meeting the issues on the merits, particularly whether agents or representatives of the United States participated in the abduction.

The Sobell case would provide a uniquely opportune occasion for our adoption of the above fundamental principles. The very publicity given to this case, the partisanship which it roused in a period of

great emotionalism, and the international support that Morton Sobell has received--all have kept this case in the spotlight. By identifying our country with the principles of territorial sovereignty and respect for treaty obligations, we assert the primacy of these elements which are indispensable for a successful good neighbor policy over all other considerations.

Finally, until we have proved by deeds that the sovereignty of our Latin American neighbors cannot be violated even when we deem the individual sufficiently "important" to warrant his abduction we have not accorded the Latin American nations the respect for their territorial sovereignty which is the rock-bottom guarantee for the development of friendly relations between nations. Those who have been actively engaged in securing justice for Morton Sobell present his case as a striking example of the invasion of the territorial sovereignty of Mexico and a golden opportunity to destroy the ill-feeling toward our country exhibited in Latin America by using his case to repudiate the doctrine of Ker v. Illinois and firmly commit the United States to the faithful observance of sovereignty and treaty obligations.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we respectfully request the Senate Committee to direct a part of its deliberations and investigations to the effect that the doctrine of the Ker case, permitting the assertion of jurisdiction over the person of a fugitive who has been kidnapped from another country, has had upon our relations with Latin American countries. We do not intend or imply that this Committee should review the Sobell case or make any findings thereon which is strictly the function of our Judiciary. Rather, we do urge that the paramount issues of foreign policy and international relations be used as a yardstick in determining whether the Ker doctrine has been detrimental to the best interests of the United States, as we believe it has. The question of corrective legislation with respect to the Ker doctrine is a paramount issue. In coming to grips with this issue, the Committee should judge both the protests that have been raised concerning the circumstances surrounding Morton Sobell's return to the United States and the benefits to be obtained by rectifying, by legislation or other authorized means, the violation of territorial sovereignty that occurred. These benefits go straight to the heart of our relations with our Latin American neighbors. In the diligent discharge of the obligation to our country and to its position as a moral and political leader in the world, we dare not disregard these benefits.

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, to M. Ternant, French Minister, May 15, 1793; II Moore, Digest of International Law.
2. Mr. Monroe, Secretary of State, to Mr. Anthony St. John Baker, Dec. 6, 1815, MS Notes to Foreign Legations II, 113; II Moore, Digest of International Law.
3. IV Moore, Digest of International Law, p. 329; Mr. Buchanan, Secretary of State, to Mr. Weri, Sept. 27, 1845, MS Inst. Brazil, XV 119.
4. Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, to Mr. Roberts, May 3, 1881, 137 MS Dom Let 326; IV Moore, Digest of International Law.
5. See II Hackworth, Digest of International Law, pp. 289-298.
6. II Moore, Digest of International Law, p. 366; see also the incident of the Confederate cruiser Florida, seized in October 1864 by the Union ship Wachusett in the port of Bahia, Brazil. Secretary of State Seward conceded the violation of Brazilian territorial waters and announced the proposed court-martial of the Wachusett personnel, dismissal of the United States consul who advised the attack, release of the parties on the Florida, and a salute to the Brazilian flag. Moore, ibid., at 367; see Dana's Wheaton, Sec. 430, note 209.
7. Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, to Mr. Bragg, Minister to Mexico, April 26, 1888, MS Inst. Mexico, XXII .189.
8. II Moore, Digest of International Law, p. 370; For. Rel. 1893, 448, 449, 450, 452, 453.
9. II Hackworth, Digest of International Law, pp. 282-289.
10. See, for example, the correspondence between Secretary of State Lansing and Ambassador Bonillas concerning the entrance of American forces into Mexico in 1919 to pursue the bandits of two American aviators who had landed in Mexico. Secretary Lansing to Ambassador Bonillas, Aug. 26, 1919, MS Dept of State, file 812.0144/151; Senor Bonillas to Mr. Lansing, Sept. 23, 1919, ibid., 812.0144/184.
11. Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State, to Mr. Broadhead, Minister to Switzerland, Oct. 31, 1894, For. Rel. 1894, 674.
12. II Moore, Digest of International Law, at 321.
13. The Mexican Embassy to the Department of State (aide-memoire), Apr. 12, 1935, MS Dept. of State, file 211.12 Hernandez, Tomas/152; quoted in IV Moore, Digest of International Law, 224-225.

14. II Moore, Digest of International Law, 379; For.Rel.1893, 455, 456, 462, 466, 467.
15. See, for example, the answer of Secretary of State Seward to the protest of the arrest of a United States Army deserter by a United States Army officer "within unquestioned Canadian territories of Great Britain." The Secretary of State admitted the violation of sovereignty and informed the British Government that the officer making the arrest would be discharged from the service and the captured deserter would be discharged from his enlistment. Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, to Mr. Stanton, Secretary of War, April 15, 1863, 60 MS Dom. Let. 231.
 In Oct.1872, Britain protested the seizure and abduction of a United States citizen in Ontario, Canada. When the protest was received "immediate steps were at once taken to have him returned to the authorities and jurisdiction of Canada."
 I Moore, Extradition, Sec. 190, pp. 283-284.
16. See, for example:
 - a. Panama: In 1915 one Bermudez was seized in Panama by United States Canal Zone police and brought to United States to stand trial. The Panama Government demanded his return and the United States acceded to the demand as a matter of comity. II Hackworth, Digest of International Law, 311-312.
 In 1933 the American-Panamanian Claims Comm. allowed a claim against the United States when Guillermo Colunje was induced by a Canal Zone detective to leave Panama and come into the Canal Zone where he was immediately arrested and detained. The case was subsequently noll prossed. II Hackworth, Ibid., 313.
 - b. Brazil: Seizure of Confederate ship and crew by Union cruiser in the port of Bahia, Brazil in October 1864. II Moore, Digest of International Law, 367.
 - c. Peru: Ker v. Illinois, 119 U.S. 436.
17. See, for example:
 - a. Spain: When it was alleged that an Algerian sloop was captured by the United States off the coast of Spain, Secretary of State Monroe, in response to protest, wrote to the Spanish ministry that if the jurisdiction of Spain had been infringed, the brig would no longer be detained. Mr. Monroe, Secretary of State to the Chev. de Onis, Span. Min., Feb. 7, 1816, MS, Notes to For. Leg. II, 128.
 - b. Great Britain: England, in 1891, refused the request of Secretary of State Blaine, to arrest a person who had escaped from jail at Constantinople and who was then supposed to be on his way from New York to England. IV Moore, Digest of International Law, 280.
 In 1894 the English authorities refused to allow a detective who had a United States Department of State arrest warrant for a person accused of violating the laws of New York to board a ship of the Hamburg-American Line. The boat was to touch Southampton. IV Moore, Ibid., 284.

18. See the case of Juan Garcia, a political refugee from Spanish Cuba who had escaped to New Orleans. In 1849 it was reported that he was kidnapped from New Orleans, by order of the Spanish or Cuban government and returned to Havana. Secretary of State Clayton informed the American Consul in Havana to investigate and if the story was verified that "the Spanish authorities ... had been concerned in so gross an outrage upon the sovereignty of the United States to demand ... the prompt surrender of the person in question, in order that he might be sent back to New Orleans, as well as the punishment of every individual concerned in the crime...." IV Moore, Digest of International Law, 329.

19. See, for example:

In 1911 two Americans, Converse and Blatt, were kidnapped on American territory, by Mexicans including soldiers and brought into Mexico to be held on a charge of sedition. The Department of State addressed a note to Mexico that if the facts as stated were established "The United States Government would be obliged to request that they be immediately returned" and if they had actually committed an extraditable offense "the Mexican Government would naturally possess the right to institute, in accordance with the treaty, regular proceedings for their return to Mexico and trial and punishment." II Hackworth, Digest of International Law, 309-310.

In 1886 one Arresures was arrested in Eagle Pass, Texas, without authority of law, by three Texas sheriffs, on an invalid extradition order. He was taken into Mexico and left with a Mexican police officer, Mondragon. The day after his kidnapping the United States consul asked for his release, without success. The next day Arresures was killed by members of Mondragon's force. Secretary of State Bayard, thereafter, wrote:

"... the fact that he was, at the time of his arrest and abduction, residing on the soil of the United States, would entitle this Government to call upon Mexico for redress. Had the case been presented to this Department in time, it is not doubted that Mexico would have admitted the right of this Government to ask for the prisoner's return; and as that has become impossible, it may be reasonably expected that she will not now deny the only reparation that may be made."

"It is no palliation of Mondragon's guilt that his co-conspirators in the abduction were officials of Texas, who wrongfully used the process of that State to effect the abduction."

Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, to Mr. Manning, Min. of Mexico, Feb. 26, 1887, MS Inst Mexico XXI 646.

20. See, for example:

a. Canada: The case of Laford who was returned to Illinois when it was revealed that he had been seized in that State and sent to Canada to stand trial without a warrant. IV Moore, Digest of International Law, 224.

The case of Peter Martin, a United States citizen, who had been convicted of various offenses in Laketon, British Columbia. He was being transported through Alaska to a jail in Victoria, B.D. when he assaulted one of his guards. Secretary of State Fish stated that Martin could not be tried for the assault since it was committed on United States territory. Further, if the guards actually passed over United States territory while transporting Martin "they committed, in so doing, a violation of the sovereignty of the United States, which rendered his further detention unjustifiable." II Moore, Digest of International Law, 371.

b. Switzerland: See the case of Constance Madeleine His, an American citizen, who was abducted from New York to Switzerland by her Swiss father. The United States protested the abduction and requested the child's return. Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1894, pp. 648-650.

21. Foreign Relations, 1890, pp. 560, 564.
22. See, II Moore, Digest of International Law, p. 757.
23. Printed in 29 Amer. J. of Int'l. Law Supp. (Sec. 2) (July 1935).
24. Dickinson, "Jurisdiction Following Seizure Or Arrest In Violation of International Law," 28 Amer. J. of Int'l. Law 231 (1934).
25. See: Article VII Central American Extradition Convention, 68 Bul. Pan. Amer. Union 416, 420 (June 1934).
26. Treaty on Extradition between the United States and Mexico, signed Feb. 22, 1899, 31 Stat. 1818.

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : A. H. Belmont
FROM : W. A. Branigan
SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL
ESPIONAGE - RUSSIA

DATE: January 14, 1959

1 - Belmont
1 - Branigan
1 - Nease
1 - Dalbey
1 - O'Connor
1 - Lee

Tolson _____
Boardman _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Nease _____
Parsons _____
Rosen _____
Tamm _____
Trotter _____
W.C. Sullivan _____
Tele. Room _____
Holloman _____
Gandy _____

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/28/87 BY 3042 *Int-DK*

By memorandum dated 1-12-59 from Mr. Nease to Mr. Tolson it was stated that Irving Ferman, Washington representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, furnished a copy of a circular letter put out by the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell (hereafter referred to as Committee) dated December, 1958. This letter states that the United States Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs was inquiring into our relations with Latin American countries. This letter enclosed a form letter addressed to the Subcommittee and a memorandum of the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell attached thereto. The form letter urged the Subcommittee to carefully consider the points raised by the Committee memorandum. On 1-13-59 Irving Ferman contacted Mr. Nease and stated he wanted to talk to some of his Congressional sources about this Sobell report but would like to get reaction of the Bureau after the matter has been reviewed.

Morton Sobell was convicted in 1951 along with Julius and Ethel Rosenberg of conspiracy to commit espionage and on 4-5-51 was sentenced to 30 years in prison. He is now incarcerated at the U.S. Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia. After the arrest of David Greenglass, Sobell fled the United States to Mexico. He was located there by Mexican authorities and was brought to the U.S. border and upon crossing the border into the United States was arrested by our Agents.

An analysis of this memorandum reflects that it reviews in detail various statements made by past Secretaries of State relating to violations of national sovereignty. It also reviews various cases involving alleged violations of Mexican and Canadian sovereignty. The references made to these statements and cases have not been checked for accuracy.

The Committee memorandum discusses the case of Ker versus Illinois, 119 U.S. 436 (decided in 1886). This case held that the United States citizen charged with a crime committed in the United States and apprehended on foreign soil is given no immunity by the United States courts, laws or extradition treaties to avoid trial on his forced return to the United States even though extradition was not used to return him. The Committee claims this decision has been the subject of much criticism but concedes it is governing law.

101-2483
JPL:jdb
(7)

REC-27 JAN 21 1959

101-2483-1433

67 JAN 26 1959

ESP/SEC

Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
Re: Morton Sobell
101-2483

The memorandum briefly reviews the Mexican portion of the Sobell case and contends that his irregular return to the United States violated the existing extradition treaty between Mexico and the United States. It also points out this question was raised in a motion for a new trial and the Government rested its case on the Ker doctrine. The Committee claims the Government should have fulfilled its duty to conform to international law and treaty obligations rather than resting on the dry technical basis of the Ker case. The Committee points out that as long as the United States insists on applying the Ker case the suspicion continues that international kidnaping is utilized by our country. The report states that Sobell's return to the United States aroused much feeling in Mexico and an official inquiry was made.

As of 10-17-56 the Department of State reported it had received no protest from the Mexican Government nor had it received any report of any investigation conducted by Mexican officials concerning Sobell's deportation.

The conclusion portion of this memorandum requests the Subcommittee to direct part of its deliberations and investigations to the effect which the Ker case doctrine has had on our relations with Latin American countries. The Sobell Committee states it "does not contend or imply" that the Subcommittee should review the Sobell case or make any findings thereon which is "strictly the function of our judiciary."

OBSERVATIONS:

The question concerning Sobell's deportation from Mexico was not raised at the trial. On the day of sentencing, 5 days after the conclusion of the trial, Sobell raised the question. The trial judge disposed of his motion as one not timely made. On 5-8 and 25-56 Sobell filed motions for a new trial in the U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York. District Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who was also the trial judge, prepared a 48-page opinion dated 6-20-56 which denied both motions. This opinion reviewed the entire Sobell case and specifically held that Sobell had no rights under the extradition treaty inasmuch as the treaty was not used to remove Sobell from Mexico. The judge held that treaties were made between countries and an individual did not become clothed with any of the rights of that treaty until such time as it was used. The judge also pointed out there is no question of the power of the court to try Sobell for the offenses charged.

Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
Re: Morton Sobell
101-2483

On 5-14-57 this decision was unanimously affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, in an opinion prepared by Judge Harold E. Medina. Judge Medina stated that the charges of the defendant were utterly groundless but in view of the serious and sensational character of the charges, the court would set forth its reasons for holding the trial judge was correct. Circuit Court of Appeals specifically relied on the Ker case in its opinion. United States Supreme Court refused to grant a writ of certiorari.

None of the information in this memorandum prepared by the Sobell Committee on the Sobell case is new. These charges have been raised and have been legally adjudicated on previous occasions. It should be noted that the Committee here is not asking for a review of the Sobell case but is asking the Subcommittee to consider the Sobell case in connection with any remedial legislation passed to reverse the doctrine of the Ker case.

ACTION:

It is recommended that this memorandum be routed to Mr. Nease for his information in connection with any discussions he may have with Irving Ferman about the facts of the Sobell case set out in the Sobell Committee memorandum.

WAB
per
JH

JH
DGM/

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr Tolson

FROM : G. A. Nease *GAN*

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL
ESPIONAGE - RUSSIA

DATE: January 19, 1959

Tolson ☒
Belmont ☒
Mohr ☒
Nease ☐
Parsons ☐
Rosen ☐
Tamm ☐
Trotter ☐
W.C. Sullivan ☐
Tele. Room ☐
Holloman ☐
Gandy ☐

It will be recalled that Irving Ferman called to our attention a letter and memorandum put out by the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell which has for its purpose to influence the Subcommittee of the U. S. Senate on American Republics Affairs to consider remedial legislation to reverse the doctrine of the Ker case.

Ferman spoke to me again this morning concerning this matter and stated he thought this was clever of this outfit to attempt to influence the Subcommittee and that he thought it was important enough for him to take the matter up with Senator Wayne Morse who he thinks can upset these plans.

He wanted to know if I agreed with him and I told him I certainly did in that I thought it would be detrimental to the country to have any remedial legislation passed to reverse the doctrine of the Ker case.

1 - Mr. Belmont

GAN:sak *SK*
(3)

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4-28-87 BY 3042 *put DTC*

REC-27

725 JAN 21 1959

ESP. SEC.

67 JAN 20 1959

Lee

1-27-59

CODE

~~SECRET~~

CABLEGRAM

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~URGENT~~

TO LEGAL ATTACHE LONDON
FROM DIRECTOR FBI (101-2483)
MORTON SOBELL, WAS, [ESPIONAGE - R.]

DECLASSIFIED BY 3042-PWT/vf
ON 3/5/87

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] SOBELL WAS CONVICTED WITH JULIUS AND ETHEL ROSENBERG OF CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ESPIONAGE AND IS NOW SERVING THREE ZERO-YEAR SENTENCE. PERLIN HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED AS TOP MEMBER ONE NINE FOUR FIVE-FOUR SEVEN AND HAS BEEN ACTIVE IN CP FRONT GROUPS SINCE THAT TIME. HE HAS MADE SEVERAL TRIPS TO MEXICO IN ONE NINE FIVE SIX AND FIVE SEVEN IN CONNECTION WITH INSTANT CASE. YOU MAY ADVISE YOUR SOURCES OF PERLIN'S TRIP AND PURPOSE OF SAME. ADVISE IF YOUR SOURCES OBTAIN ANY INFO RE THIS MATTER.

- 1 - Foreign Liaison Unit (route through for review)
- 1 - 100-354835 (National Committee to Secure Justice in the Sobell case)
- 1 - 65-58805 (Klaus Fuchs)
- 1 - 100-354897 (Marshall Perlin)

7 JAN 30 1959

Sent via State Department at no cost to the Bureau.

CODE ROOM

MAIL ROOM ☐ TELETYPE UNIT ☐

Confidential

- Olson
- Boardman
- Belmont
- Mohr
- Nease
- Parsons
- Rosen
- Tamm
- Trotter
- W.C. Sullivan
- Tele. Room
- Holloman

Classified by 3042-PWT/vf
Exempt from GDS, Category 3
Date of Declassification Indefinite
8/3/78 LEB/T4
100-334835
100-334835
65-58805

as
Liaison

101-3483

SECRET

Date: January 28, 1959

To: Director
Central Intelligence Agency
2430 E Street, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

#86-1840

Classified by 3042
Declassify on OADR
6/3/87

Attention: Deputy Director, Plans

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: MORTON SOBELL
ESPIONAGE - R

DECLASSIFIED BY 3042
ON 2/19/87

[REDACTED]

Fuchs was sentenced in March, 1950, to serve 14 years in prison for violation of the Official Secrets Act. According to recent newspaper publicity, Fuchs is due to be released from prison some time during the summer of 1959.

The above is furnished for your information. Our Legal Attache, London, is furnishing this information to the British.

1 - AAG, Internal Security Division (by Form 6-50)
1 - 100-387835 (National Committee to Secure Justice in the Sobell Case)

1 - 65-5884 (Klaus Fuchs)
1 - 100-354897 (Marshall Perlin)

FEB 3 1959

- Tolson _____
- Boardman _____
- Belmont _____
- Mohr _____
- Nease _____
- Parsons _____
- Rosen _____
- Tamm _____
- Trotter _____
- W.C. Sullivan _____
- Tele. Room _____
- Holloman _____
- Gandy _____

BY COURIER SVD
23 JAN 29
COMM - FBI

SEE PAGE, PAGE 2

Classified by 2355
Exempt from GDS, Category 1
Date of Declassification Indefinite

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

67 FEB 6 - 1959

65-5884-1
100-387835-1
100-354897-1
RECORDED COPY FILED IN 100-387835-1

b7D

b1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Director
Central Intelligence Agency

~~SECRET~~

NOTE: It is not known what Perlin intends to gain from the interview of Fuchs. Fuchs did not know Morton Sobell or Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. His only espionage contact was Harry Gold and Gold did not know Sobell or the Rosenbergs. Classified "Confidential" since it is information furnished by a confidential informant and it is not known how this informant obtained the information.

~~SECRET~~

1436

- 2 -

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Director, FBI (101-2483)

DATE: January 30, 1959

FROM ~~W/~~ Legat, London (65-915)

SUBJECT: MORTON SOBELL, WAS.
ESPIONAGE - R

ReBucable 1/27/59.

~~TOP SECRET~~

APPROPRIATE AGENCIES
AND FIELD OFFICES
ADVISED BY ROUTING
SLIP(S) OF
DATE 9/2/52

b6

TS

b1

TS

b

MS

b-1

TS

T S

10

Classified By **2042**
Declassify on: **OADR**
4-28-

6 - Bureau (Encls)
1 - London
ACM:mas
(7)

(7)
Cover memo
Brannigan to Belmont
2-25-59, V
SPL:mtb

100 Fleet & Mail 5/16/59
S. 9 x 8 1/2 5/16/59
50 100-22 5/16/59
26 100-22 5/16/59
TOP SECRET
let to Legat London
1-100-22 5/16/59
2-100-22 5/16/59
Classified by WFO
Exempt from GDS
Date of Declassification

FEB 6 1959



TOP SECRET **TEC 901**

United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D. C.
January 30, 1959

Re: MORTON SOBELL

T-1, a confidential source abroad, advised on

[REDACTED]

TS

T-1 further informed that this

[REDACTED]

TS

Classified by 3042 *Aut-OK*
Declassify on OADR
4/28/87

ENCLOSURE

TEC 901

TOP SECRET

~~TOP SECRET~~
~~RE 1 MAR 18 1959~~

101-2483-1432