FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/PRIVACY ACTS SECTION

COVER SHEET

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD (PAT) BROWN

FILE: 116-442786
UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PERSONNEL SECURITY QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS—All sections must be completed. Write "None" when applicable. Type or print all answers. If space is
not adequate for complete answers, use additional space provided under Item No. 27. All addresses must show street
number, street, city, and State.

1. NAME (Last, first, middle)

BROWN, EDMUND GERALD

2. OTHER NAMES (Include maiden name, if married woman)

3. PRESENT ADDRESS DATE

GOVERNOR'S MANSION 1/59 SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

4. ADDRESSES FOR PAST 15 YEARS DATE

460 MAGELLAN AVENUE PRIOR TO SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF. 1/59

5. DESCRIPTION (Check which)

RACE WEIGHT COLOR EYES COLOR HAIR

WHITE 5'10" 190 BROWN BROWN

6. (Check which) D.SINGLE D.MARRIED D.WIDOWED D.SPINSTER

MARRIED WIDOWED DATE: 4-21-1905

7. BIRTHPLACE (City, county, State, and country)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA, U. S. A.

8. BIRTH DATE

9. CITIZENSHIP: U. S. ALIEN I)

BY BIRTH

10. DRAFT BOARD NUMBER AND ADDRESS WITH WHICH REGISTERED

11. SOCIAL SECURITY NO.

NONE

12. PERMANENT STATION, RANK, AND ADDRESS IF NOW IN MILITARY SERVICE

12A. MILITARY SERVICE (Past or Present)

13. EDUCATION (All schools above elementary)

NAME OF SCHOOL ADDRESS DEGREES

LOWELL HIGH SCHOOL 1860 HAYES STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

SAN FRANCISCO LAW SCHOOL 1044 POST STREET, MCT.

14. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED (Since 1930) (Exclusive of military service)

COUNTRY DATE LEFT U.S.A. DATE RETURNED U.S.A. PURPOSE

NORTH AMERICA, FRANCE, ENGLAND, SWITZERLAND, HOLAND, DENMARK, ITALY, GREECE,
18. EMPLOYMENT (List all employment dates including present employment and all dates and addresses when unemployed. If any employment required AEC security clearance ("O"), indicate the company or organization which requested the clearance. Give name or names under which employed if different than name now used.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE FROM-TO</th>
<th>NAME OF EMPLOYER (COMPANY OR ORGANIZATION)</th>
<th>TYPE OF WORK</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>REASON FOR LEAVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP (Include all present membership and all past membership during the last 15 years in all organizations, except labor unions and religious organizations not covered by question 17 below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FROM-TO</th>
<th>OFFICE HELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. ARE YOU NOW, OR HAVE YOU EVER BEEN, A MEMBER OF ANY ORGANIZATION WHICH HAS BEEN DESIGNATED BY THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL AS REQUIRED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 10450? (For your convenience, there is attached to this questionnaire as Appendix A, the current list of such organizations. Appendix A is hereby made an integral part of this Personnel Security Questionnaire.)

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

18. ARE YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A MEMBER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A., OR ANY COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

19. ARE YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A MEMBER OF A FASCIST ORGANIZATION?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

20. ARE YOU NOW OR HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A MEMBER OF ANY FOREIGN OR DOMESTIC ORGANIZATION, ASSOCIATION, MOVEMENT, GROUP, OR COMBINATION OF PERSONS WHICH IS TOTALITARIAN, FASCIST, COMMUNIST, OR SUBVERSIVE, OR WHICH HAS ADOPTED, OR SHOWS, A POLICY OF ADVOCATING OR APPROVING THE COMMISSION OF ACTS OF FORCE OR VIOLENCE TO DENY OTHER PERSONS THEIR RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, OR WHICH SEEKS TO ALTER THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY UNCONSTITUTIONAL MEANS?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
22. RELATIVES (Parents, stepparents, foster parents, spouse, divorced spouse or spouses, children, stepchildren, brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, stepsisters, half brothers, half sisters, father-in-law, and mother-in-law, living or deceased. Name of spouse should include maiden name and any other name by which the spouse is known. In the event of marriage subsequent to the execution of this Questionnaire, it will be necessary that data concerning the new spouse be furnished on Form AEC-354.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>NAME IN FULL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COUNTRY OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PRESENT CITIZENSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Daniel Breuner</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7317 Wood Street, Oak, California</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sue Bertha Breuner</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7317 Wood Street, Oak, California</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>Daniel Mark Breuner</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7317 Wood Street, Oak, California</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Penny-Rue Breuner</td>
<td></td>
<td>2910 Parker Avenue, Oak, California</td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Vivian Jean-Reiniger</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oakland, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. REFERENCES (Name three persons, not relatives or employers, who are well acquainted with you.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME IN FULL</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>YEARS KNOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN ARRESTED, CHARGED, OR HELD BY FEDERAL, STATE, OR OTHER LAW-ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES FOR ANY VIOLATION OF ANY FEDERAL LAW, STATE LAW, COUNTY LAW, LOCAL LAW, OR ORDINANCE? DO NOT INCLUDE MINOR TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS. If your answer is, "Yes," give in item 25 for each case:

- (A) approximate date,
- (B) charge,
- (C) place, and
- (D) action taken

25. ARRESTS (Include all arrests and fines other than minor traffic violations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. DATE</th>
<th>B. CHARGE</th>
<th>C. PLACE WHERE ARRESTED AND NAME OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY</th>
<th>D. ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. PREVIOUS SECURITY CLEARANCE

A. TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE HAVE YOU EVER BEEN INVESTIGATED BY ANY BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No

B. TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE HAVE YOU EVER BEEN REFUSED CLEARANCE BY ANY BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

- (A) Yes
- (B) No

If your answer to either question A or B is "Yes," please furnish details.

CERTIFICATION

I HAVE READ ALL OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS AND REVIEWED THE LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS SET FORTH IN APPENDIX A HEREOF. I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED IN ANSWER TO THESE QUESTIONS IS CORRECT AND COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF AND I UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE IN THE CONSIDERATION OF MY ELIGIBILITY FOR SECURITY CLEARANCE. I MAKE THIS STATEMENT TO THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WILL BE USED BY THE COMMISSION IN CARRYING OUT ITS DUTY TO PROTECT THE SECURITY OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY PROJECT, AND WITH KNOWLEDGE THAT ANY FALSE STATEMENT OR OMISSION OF MATERIAL FACT MAY BE SUFFICIENT CAUSE FOR REJECTION OF MY APPLICATION OR DISMISSAL AFTER EMPLOYMENT; FURTHER, THAT ANY FALSE STATEMENT HEREIN MAY BE PUNISHED AS A FELONY UNDER SECTION 1001, TITLE 18, U.S. CODE.

[Signature]

To be filled out by agency or firm employing

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES (Description should not reveal classified information)

Clerk Stenographer

T. P. Mulholland, Assistant Director, Organization and Personal Division

NAME OF AGENCY OR FIRM

[Signature and title of official requesting clearance]
(PLEASE REMOVE AND REVERSE CARBON PAPER BEFORE USING THIS SPACE)

27. ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION REQUESTED IN ITEMS 1 TO 26. (Indicate item numbers to which answers apply)

ITEM NO.
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: MR. A. H. BELMONT  
FROM: X=b7c  
SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN  
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

Pursuant to approved recommendation in memorandum of July 20, 1959, Liaison contacted today Mr. John A. Waters, Director of Security, Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), and T. Earl Lane, Assistant Director of Security Intelligence of the Washington area, AEC, to determine if an investigation of captioned individual, Governor of California, should be conducted.

Initially, Waters stated that in the light of the fact that Brown, as a member of the Board of Regents at the University of California, occupies a position of a high degree of importance and sensitivity under the Atomic Energy Act, an FBI investigation prior to granting him clearance is automatically required by Section 145 of the Act. He and Lane added that no exceptions or exemptions are provided for in the Act. Reference was made by Lane and Waters to Brown's predecessor, Earl Warren, and they stated that AEC headquarters records reflect that FBI conducted applicant-type investigation on him in connection with the same position on the Board of Regents in 1951 when Warren was Governor of California.

A check of our files on Warren, however, reflected that the Bureau did not investigate Warren for AEC but rather wrote Waters a letter of November 8, 1951, stating that Bureau files did not reflect any derogatory information regarding Warren's character, loyalty, and associates and that no further inquiry would be conducted unless specifically requested by Waters. When this letter was brought to the attention of Waters, he said that he had based his original statement as to our alleged investigation of Warren on the clearance cards on file at AEC headquarters and that he had no present recollection of the letter mentioned above. He said that this letter should be on file in the San Francisco AEC office; that he would check into the matter further; that in the meantime we should hold the AEC request on Brown in abeyance until we hear from Waters.

ACTION: EX.

JMF:jlk (6)  
1 - Mr. Rosen  
1 - Mr. DeLoach  
1 - Mr. Belmont  
1 - Liaison Section

b7c
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: THE DIRECTOR
FROM: A. ROSEN

DATE: July 20, 1959

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

This is to advise the Atomic Energy Commission has requested a background investigation of the above-captioned individual, who is presently the Governor of California. Because of his position as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, which position has been classified as a highly sensitive position by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that a full investigation be conducted by the Bureau. Governor Brown, as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, will have access to restricted data.

Even though the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that a full investigation be conducted concerning individuals having a highly sensitive position, it is believed that the Director of Security, Atomic Energy Commission, should be contacted to determine whether an investigation of Governor Brown should be conducted. If the Director of Security, Atomic Energy Commission, reaffirms the request for the investigation, it is believed that the investigation should be ordered, since it is felt that the Bureau would have no alternative, in view of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In event the investigation is ordered, it is felt that Governor Brown should be advised of the reason for the investigation and the fact it is being conducted at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Bureau files reflect that Governor Brown has never been investigated by the FBI. In an article in the San Francisco Examiner, a California newspaper under date of 7-16-58, Brown, then Attorney General of California, charged the FBI Uniform Crime Reports presented California in an "unjustifiable and unfavorable light," because of the manner in which the statistics were compiled. He subsequently stated the article was not, in any manner, meant to be derogatory of the "great work" being done by the FBI. (62-76249, 62-21610-5-132)

1 - Mr. DeLoach
1 - Liaison Section

EMB: Ch/1lw

[Handwritten notes and signatures]
Memorandum to The Director

Our files also reflect allegations received in the past indicating he sought the aid of communists and communist infiltrated organizations during his political rise. In 1945 he reportedly opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges, a West Coast labor leader accused of membership in the Communist Party. (62-76249)

On the Personnel Security Questionnaire which he submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission for the instant investigation, Brown admits past membership in the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) in 1946. An article in the San Francisco Chronicle, a California newspaper, under date of 8-9-49, announced Brown had been elected vice president of the San Francisco chapter of the NLG. The NLG has been cited as a communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (62-76249)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the investigation of Governor Brown be held in abeyance pending contact with the Director of Security at the Atomic Energy Commission by liaison to determine if an investigation of Governor Brown should be conducted.
Office Memorandum

TO: MR. A. H. BELMONT

FROM: [Name redacted]

DATE: August 12, 1959

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

My memorandum of July 21, 1959, reflected that the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) had advised us to hold in abeyance its request for an investigation of Brown, Governor of California, in connection with his need for AEC clearance as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California. It may be noted that AEC so advised us after being informed by us that when Earl Warren was Governor of California, which automatically carries with it membership on the Board of Regents, the Bureau did not investigate Warren for AEC clearance. In the Warren case, clearance by AEC was based on a letter from us stating that Bureau files did not reflect derogatory information on Warren’s character, loyalty, and associates, and that no further inquiry would be conducted unless specifically requested by AEC.

On July 24, 1959, AEC Security Director, John A. Waters, said there was nothing new on the Brown situation and that we should continue to hold the matter in abeyance. On August 12, 1959, the Liaison representative was again in touch with Waters about the Brown case. Waters said that there was nothing new; that he had mentioned the problem to the General Manager at AEC; that presumably it was still under consideration in the General Manager’s Office; and that he, Waters, had not yet followed it up but would now do so. Waters said that he would let us know as soon as a decision in the case has been reached at AEC.

ACTION:

For information.

JMF:Jlkgh

1 - Mr. Rosen
1 - Mr. DeLoach
1 - Mr. Callan (Attention: Mr. Connell)
1 - Mr. Belmont
1 - Liaison Section

[Redacted]
EDMUND GERALD BROWN
Born: April 21, 1905
San Francisco, California

In response to your request for the results of any investigations conducted concerning the captioned individual, you are advised that no investigation concerning Mr. Brown has been conducted by the FBI.

SEE COVER MEMO CAPTIONED AS ABOVE SCATTERDAY TO BELMONT
8/27/59 DR#: FBI

ORIGINAL AND 1 - ONI
Request received: 8-13-59

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI, and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency. This is in answer to your request for a check of FBI files.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Serial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116-442786a</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-96249</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-14700</td>
<td>11-1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-76249-35</td>
<td>2/4/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-76249-11</td>
<td>3/5/44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx. 250 dec. cards

Subj: Mt. Pleasant
URGENT  7-16-59  4-43 PM PDT

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, CA, AEAA. REQUESTED TO SAN FRANCISCO JULY FOURTEEN, FIFTYNINE. FOR INFO BUREAU, BROWN IS CURRENTLY GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA AND THE BUREAU MAY RECEIVE INQUIRIES FROM THE PRESS.

END AND ACK PLS  7-16-59
7-44PM OK FBI WA CRA.
TU DISC PLS
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO (116-52286)
SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN - CA - 15757

Re Bureau telephone call 7/17/59 by Supervisor advising instant investigation should be discontinued.

No investigation conducted. No report being submitted.

RUC.

3 - Bureau (AM)
1 - San Francisco (116-52286)

RDR: wap
(4)
MEMORANDUM TO: 
Liaison Representative
Federal Bureau of Investigation, Headquarters

From: 
P. F. Gaughran, Deputy Director
Division of Security

Subject: 
EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AEC No. CA-15757

It is requested that the above-entitled case be handled in the same manner as the case of Earl Warren, AEC No. BE-3941.
Date: October 6, 1959
To: Atomic Energy Commission
From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
Subject: EDMUND GERALD BROWN,
Also Known As "Pat" Brown
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

Reference is made to your letter dated September 30, 1959. No investigation has been conducted by this Bureau relative to Edmund Gerald Brown; however, the following information received by this Bureau may be pertinent to your inquiry:

The February 13, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle," a San Francisco newspaper, reported that Brown, then District Attorney, opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges, a west coast labor leader accused of membership in the Communist Party. (62-76249-11, pg 7; 39-915-2560)

An article appearing in the August 9, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle" announced that Brown had been elected vice president of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild. The National Lawyers Guild has been cited as a communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (100-7321-879)

This Bureau is in possession of a letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee," which was a committee, according to the letterhead, to sponsor a second anniversary dinner of the American Youth for Democracy (AYD) at San Francisco. This letterhead lists Brown as a member of the Committee in formation. The informant who made the letterhead available to this Bureau stated that Brown was being considered by the Communist Party in San Francisco as a speaker for this committee (no further details available). (62-76249-18)

In March, 1946, this Bureau was furnished a copy of a letter dated January 10, 1946, written by a veterans group at the University of San Francisco, which criticized Brown for
permitting his name to be listed as a sponsor of a banquet on November 10, 1945, at the St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, in honor of the AYD. In reply, Brown by letter dated February 1, 1946, stated that he knew that the Young Communist League (YCL) or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the AYD. He then called an official of the AYD to determine if it was communistic in either origin or intent. According to Brown, the official advised him that the AYD "was not in any manner, shape or form communistic although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged." Brown added, "I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background." The AYD and the YCL have been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to EO 10450. (62-76249-13)

The Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, U. S. Army, has advised this Bureau that on June 14, 1946, the Mobilization for Democracy sponsored a public meeting at the Olympic Auditorium in Los Angeles, California, at which Brown spoke. The Mobilization for Democracy has been cited as one of the "key communist fronts in California," by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1947. (100-343748-9)

Brown advised this Bureau on July 5, 1956, that he was opposed to any provision giving the individual states the right to prosecute subversives. He felt that they were incapable and inadequately equipped to handle such a job. He added, "I assure you that I recognize the menace of subversive activities and I desire to do all in my power to aid and assist you as well as other security agencies of our Government." (62-76249-32)

The foregoing information is furnished to you as a result of your request for an FBI file check and is not to be construed as a clearance or non clearance of the individual involved. This information is furnished for your use and should not be disseminated outside of your agency.
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: THE DIRECTOR
FROM: A. Rosen

DATE: October 5, 1959

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN
Also known as "Pat" Brown
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

SYNOPSIS:

Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) requests name check in lieu of investigation of Edmund Gerald "Pat" Brown, Governor of California, who is under consideration for AEC clearance as Regent of the University of California. AEC is being advised in proposed letter FBI has never investigated Brown. Letter points out in 1945, according to San Francisco Chronicle, Brown opposed deportation of Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader, accused of membership in Communist Party (CP); in 1945 same source stated Brown elected vice president, San Francisco chapter National Lawyers Guild, which is cited as communist front; in 1945 his name appeared on letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee," a committee sponsoring 2nd anniversary dinner for American Youth for Democracy (AYD), cited by Attorney General (AG) under E.O. 10450; when criticized by veterans group for allowing name to be listed Brown disclaimed knowledge AYD was communistic; in 1946 he spoke at public meeting sponsored by Mobilization for Democracy, cited as communist front; in 1946 Brown stated he opposed states prosecuting subversives and pledged his cooperation to FBI and other accredited agencies in prosecuting subversives. Above information can be substantiated.

AEC because some received from highly confidential sources, some hearsay, and information received years ago during Brown's political rise reflecting his attempts to use communists and their attempts to use him.

If disseminated to AEC and Brown's clearance held up he would be furnished statement of charges by AEC Our sources should not be divulged and if divulged could not be substantiated.

During the period 1939 to 1948 Brown was variously reported to have assisted communists in legal matters; solicited and received political assistance from communists and communist organizations; listed as member of advisory committee for Daily Peoples World, west coast communist newspaper; close personal friend of a known communist and reportedly willing to endorse the California Labor School, cited by AG under E.O. 10450. In 1943 when advised by a CP member the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) was giving a luncheon for Brown, latter reportedly stated, "in my heart I agree with you people, but I sometimes differ with your method." He was listed as a 'honor," in 1948, to the Joint Anti-
Memorandum to The Director  
Re: Edmund Gerald Brown

Facist Refugee Committee, cited by AG under E.O. 10450. In 1954 he reportedly agreed to discuss death sentence of Negro, in California, with a delegation from local Civil Rights Congress (CRC) because of votes controlled by delegation. CRC cited by AG under E.O. 10450.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the attached letter be transmitted to AEC through liaison channels.

DETAILS:

Under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) on 7/13/59 requested an investigation of Edmund Gerald Brown, aka "Pat," the present Governor of the State of California. The investigation was requested because Brown, as Governor, is a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, and as such would have access to restricted data within the meaning of the Atomic Energy Act because the University of California has Atomic Energy contracts.

We have never investigated Brown. It was pointed out to AEC through liaison that Brown is the present Governor and has been for over six months, and that when Earl Warren was Governor, AEC accepted the results of a file search rather than an investigation. Brown is also prominently mentioned as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1960. AEC asked us to hold the request for an investigation in abeyance and on 9/30/59 requested that the Brown case be handled in the same manner as the Earl Warren case.

We propose that certain items be furnished to AEC in order that it can reach a decision as to whether Brown should be granted an AEC clearance.

The attached suggested letter to AEC contains the following information disseminated to CIA in 1957 which can be substantiated from public sources or other material:

The February 13, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle," a San Francisco newspaper, reported that Brown, then District Attorney, opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges, a west coast labor leader, accused of membership in the Communist Party. (62-76249-11, pg. 7) and (39-915-2560)
Memorandum to The Director
Re: Edmund Gerald Brown

An article appearing in the 8/9/45 issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle" announced that Brown had been elected vice president of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild (NLG). The NLG has been cited as a communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (100-7321-879)

This Bureau is in possession of a letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee," which was a committee, according to the letterhead, to sponsor a second anniversary dinner of the American Youth for Democracy (AYD) at San Francisco. This letterhead lists Brown as a member of the Committee in Formation. The informant who made the letterhead available to this Bureau stated that Brown was being considered by the Communist Party (CP) in San Francisco as a speaker for this committee (no further details available). (62-76249-19)

In 3/46, this Bureau was furnished a copy of a letter dated 1/10/46, written by a veterans group at the University of San Francisco, which criticized Brown for permitting his name to be listed as a sponsor of a banquet on 11/10/45, at the St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, in honor of the AYD. In reply, Brown by letter dated 2/1/46 stated that he knew that the Young Communist League (YCL) or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the AYD. He then called an official of the AYD to determine if it was communist in either origin or intent. According to Brown, the official advised him that the AYD "was not in any manner, shape or form communist although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged." Brown added, "I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background." The AYD and the YCL have been designated by the AG of the U. S. pursuant to E.O. 10450. (62-76249-13)

The Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, U. S. Army, has advised this Bureau that on 6/14/46, the Mobilization for Democracy sponsored a public meeting at the Olympic Auditorium in Los Angeles, California, at which Brown spoke. The Mobilization for Democracy has been cited as one of the "key communist fronts in California," by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1947. (100-343743-9)

Brown advised this Bureau on 7/5/56 that he was opposed to any provision giving the individual states the right to prosecute subversives. He felt that they were incapable and inadequately equipped to handle such a job. He added, "I assure you that I recognize the menace of subversive activities and I desire to do all in my power to aid and assist you as well as other security agencies of our Government." (62-76249-32)

It is not believed the following information should be disseminated at this time to AEC because while it constitutes intelligence information, it relates for the most part to "fringe" activity on the part of Brown many years ago; namely, the efforts of the communists to use Brown for their purposes and to enlist his aid on behalf of...
Memorandum to The Director  
Re: Edmund Gerald Brown

The names of Edmund Gerald Brown and Communist fronts and of Brown's efforts to enlist communist support of his political endeavors from communists and from communist fronts. It has been obtained from highly confidential sources, in some instances quoting Brown's own words, and some are hearsay. If AEC denies Brown a clearance it will have to furnish him a statement of charges and back them up with witnesses. The sources of this information would not be available for use in any resulting hearing, cannot be divulged, and while reliable for intelligence purposes, cannot be substantiated even if they could be divulged:

On 12/10/43, an informant advised this Bureau that members of and attorneys for the CP, San Francisco, actively campaigned for Brown in his candidacy for San Francisco District Attorney in the fall elections of 1943. The informant further advised that after the election Brown said, "Thank you a million for all your fine work on my behalf."

An informant has advised this Bureau that a close personal friend of San Francisco, a known communist who was active in the affairs of the California Labor School. The California Labor School has been designated by the AG of the U. S. pursuant to E.O. 10450. (Tesor, 62-76249-19)

An informant has advised this Bureau that in 11/44, one known communist, was requested to obtain publicity and aid for District Attorney Edmund Brown in connection with Brown's investigation of the "Mothers, Wives and Sisters of USA," allegedly an "antiadministration" organization in San Francisco. (62-76249-11, pg 3)

A highly confidential source has advised this Bureau that in 12/44, an unknown man had been contacting prominent people in San Francisco and informing them that the California Labor School was dominated by communists. This source further advised that...
Memorandum to The Director
Re: Edmund Gerald Brown

and "an old-time communist," called on District
Attorney Edmund Brown and after a long chat was allegedly assured that
Brown would give the school and a "clean bill of sale to any-
body in town." (Tesur, 62-76249-11, pg. 8)

In 9/44, an informant reported that the California Labor School, contacted Brown and asked for
a contribution. Brown replied that he was unable to contribute at that
time but would allow the school to state that he, Brown, approved and endorsed the school. (Tesur, 62-76249-19)

In 1/45, an informant made available a list of names prepared
at the California State Communist Party headquarters at San Francisco.
The list was captioned "Names for 'People's World Advisory Committee.'" Brown's name was included in this list along with other public, union
and clergy officials. The "People's World," also known as the "Daily
People's World," is a west coast communist newspaper.

An informant has furnished information to this Bureau indicating
described above, during a political discussion at
a meeting of the State Board of the Communist Party of California (of
which he is a member) held on 3/23/46, at San Francisco, stated that
Brown, then a candidate for the office of State Attorney General, had
called upon him and wanted him to help write a couple of speeches
(no further details available). (Tesur, 100-33425-91)

According to an informant, a meeting of the Whitney Club,
Communist Political Association, Alameda County, California, was held on
5/2/46, at Oakland, California. According to the informant, the
members were instructed to vote for Brown for State Attorney General.

In 10/46, an informant advised this Bureau that the Hollywood
Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions
(HICASCP) was devoting its main efforts toward the 11/46 elections and
was going to intensively support a number of candidates, including
Edmund G. Brown, who was running for State Attorney General. The
HICASCP is an affiliate of the Independent Citizens Committee of the
Arts, Sciences and Professions, which is cited as a communist front by
the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. (100-138754-136)

According to a highly confidential source, the name of
Edmund G. Brown, 460 Magellan Avenue, San Francisco, appeared in the
indices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, San Francisco, as
of 3/17/48. According to the informant, this file is labeled "Donors," and purports to reflect the names of individuals who have contributed to
the organization or who can be influenced to contribute money. The Joint
Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has been designated by the AG of the U. S.
pursuant to E.O. 10450. (100-7061-1753)
Memorandum to The Director
Re: Edmund Gerald Brown

An informant advised this Bureau on 2/24/54 that at a special executive board meeting of the East Bay Civil Rights Congress (CRC), held the previous day at Oakland, California; it was stated that a delegation of individuals (unidentified) had contacted Brown regarding the Wesley Robert Wells case, concerning which the CRC was extremely active. (Wells is a Negro life-termer at San Quentin Penitentiary sentenced to die in 3/54 for assaulting a prison guard.) Brown reportedly asked the delegation if the implications in the Wells case were political. He was informed that they were; that the delegation controlled votes in various local unions in Oakland and San Francisco and that these votes might be helpful to him if he wanted to be governor some day. Brown reportedly agreed to meet for further discussion of the Wells case (no further details available). The CRC has been designated by the AG of the U. S. pursuant to E.O. 10450. (100-3-72-1061)
RADIOGRAM

URGENT

TO SAC SAN FRANCISCO (116-52286) PERSONAL ATTENTION
FROM DIRECTOR FBI (116-442786)
EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA PAT BROWN, AEAA. REBULET JULY FOURTEEN, FIFTYNINE. CHAIRMAN JOHN A. MC CONE OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PAREN AEC END PAREN HAS REQUESTED THAT THE BUREAU CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION OF ABOVE HYPHEN CAPTIONED INDIVIDUAL WHO IS THE GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA. IMMEDIATELY CONTACT GOVERNOR BROWN AND ADVISE HIM THAT THIS BUREAU IS INITIATING AN INVESTIGATION OF HIM AT THE REQUEST OF CHAIRMAN MC CONE OF AEC INASMUCH AS HE, BROWN, AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA WILL HAVE ACCESS TO AEC RESTRICTED DATA AND WILL REQUIRE CLEARANCE FROM AEC. THE INQUIRY OF GOVERNOR BROWN SHOULD BE LIMITED TO A DISCREET NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS AND NECESSARY AGENCY CHECKS. NO NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED. PERSONS INTERVIEWED SHOULD BE SPECIFICALLY ADVISED THAT THE INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNOR BROWN IS BEING CONDUCTED AT THE REQUEST OF AEC. WASHINGTON FIELD SHOULD CONDUCT NECESSARY AGENCY CHECKS. INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY NATURE EXPERIENCED SAS AND IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT YOUR REPORTS REACH BUREAU BY MAY EIGHTEEN, NEXT, WITHOUT FAIL.

5/6/60

CODE
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EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA PAT BROWN, AEAA. REBULET JULY FOURTEEN, FIFTYNINE. CHAIRMAN JOHN A. MC CONE OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PAREN AEC END PAREN HAS REQUESTED THAT THE BUREAU CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION OF ABOVE HYPHEN CAPTIONED INDIVIDUAL WHO IS THE GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA. IMMEDIATELY CONTACT GOVERNOR BROWN AND ADVISE HIM THAT THIS BUREAU IS INITIATING AN INVESTIGATION OF HIM AT THE REQUEST OF CHAIRMAN MC CONE OF AEC INASMUCH AS HE, BROWN, AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA WILL HAVE ACCESS TO AEC RESTRICTED DATA AND WILL REQUIRE CLEARANCE FROM AEC. THE INQUIRY OF GOVERNOR BROWN SHOULD BE LIMITED TO A DISCREET NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS AND NECESSARY AGENCY CHECKS. NO NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED. PERSONS INTERVIEWED SHOULD BE SPECIFICALLY ADVISED THAT THE INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNOR BROWN IS BEING CONDUCTED AT THE REQUEST OF AEC. WASHINGTON FIELD SHOULD CONDUCT NECESSARY AGENCY CHECKS. INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY NATURE EXPERIENCED SAS AND IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT YOUR REPORTS REACH BUREAU BY MAY EIGHTEEN, NEXT, WITHOUT FAIL.

5/6/60

CODE

RADIOGRAM

URGENT

TO SAC SAN FRANCISCO (116-52286) PERSONAL ATTENTION
FROM DIRECTOR FBI (116-442786)
EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA PAT BROWN, AEAA. REBULET JULY FOURTEEN, FIFTYNINE. CHAIRMAN JOHN A. MC CONE OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PAREN AEC END PAREN HAS REQUESTED THAT THE BUREAU CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION OF ABOVE HYPHEN CAPTIONED INDIVIDUAL WHO IS THE GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA. IMMEDIATELY CONTACT GOVERNOR BROWN AND ADVISE HIM THAT THIS BUREAU IS INITIATING AN INVESTIGATION OF HIM AT THE REQUEST OF CHAIRMAN MC CONE OF AEC INASMUCH AS HE, BROWN, AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA WILL HAVE ACCESS TO AEC RESTRICTED DATA AND WILL REQUIRE CLEARANCE FROM AEC. THE INQUIRY OF GOVERNOR BROWN SHOULD BE LIMITED TO A DISCREET NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS AND NECESSARY AGENCY CHECKS. NO NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED. PERSONS INTERVIEWED SHOULD BE SPECIFICALLY ADVISED THAT THE INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNOR BROWN IS BEING CONDUCTED AT THE REQUEST OF AEC. WASHINGTON FIELD SHOULD CONDUCT NECESSARY AGENCY CHECKS. INVESTIGATION SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY NATURE EXPERIENCED SAS AND IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT YOUR REPORTS REACH BUREAU BY MAY EIGHTEEN, NEXT, WITHOUT FAIL.

5/6/60

CODE
Honorable John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, called to discuss a problem with me. He stated that Pat Brown, Governor of California is Chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of California, which University handles several of the projects for the Atomic Energy Commission at Livermore and Los Alamos, and, of course, the Regents have access to many of these operations and use the laboratories to discuss their programs. He stated that Pat Brown has never been given a 'Q clearance' which involves a routine check which this Bureau makes.

Mr. McCone stated that our office had advised him that in this instance we did not like to make such a check because of the individual's position, which he understood would be a little awkward especially in making inquiries of his acquaintances and associates. On the other hand he stated the Commission can issue a clearance without such a check, however, they have not made a practice of doing this. He wondered if I could in some way arrange to have a check made or which he could base action for a clearance, since he did not care to make an exception. I told him I was not aware that we were reluctant to do this check and I would have this taken care of immediately to see what can be done.

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

cc-Mr. Ingram

I have spoken to Parsons to proceed.
AIRTEL

To SACS, San Francisco (116-52286) (Enclosure)
Washington Field (Enclosure)

From Director, FBI (116-442786)

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA PAT BROWN, AKA.

Re: Bulletin dated 7/14/59, and radiogram this date.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of a letter from the Bureau to AEC dated 10/6/59, which sets forth the information furnished to AEC concerning above-captioned individual.

Include in your reports any information appearing in enclosed letter that comes from the files of your office. Also include in your reports any new pertinent information appearing in files of your office. All other information which is not new information or that which has not been previously furnished to AEC in Bulletin to AEC dated 10/6/59, should be set forth under administrative data in your report.

EMH:jpr
(6)

REC. 77. 15 MAY 10 1960
URGENT 5-11-60 2:43 PM PDST LCM
TO DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM SAC, SAN FRANCISCO 1116-52286/1P
EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA. PAT BROWN, AEAA. BUFILE ONE SIXTEEN DASH FOUR FOUR TWO SEVEN EIGHT SIX. REBURAD MAY SIX, SIXTY. INTERVIEWED THIS DATE REGARDING GOVERNOR BROWN. COMMENTS REGARDING BROWN FAVORABLE. HE SAID HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS INVESTIGATION WAS INITIATED AT THE REQUEST OF AEAA, HOWEVER, HE DID NOT FEEL THAT THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF THE STATE SHOULD BE SUBJECTED TO THIS TYPE OF INVESTIGATION, THAT THESE INVESTIGATIONS ARE BENEATH THE DIGNITY OF THE FBI AND HE FEELS THE FBI HAS MORE IMPORTANT WORK TO DO. HE COMPLIMENTED THE BUREAU FOR ITS CONDUCT IN SUCH INVESTIGATIONS BUT FELT THAT THE MONEY AND MAN HOURS PURSUING SUCH INVESTIGATIONS WERE WASTED. HE SPECIFICALLY ASKED THAT HIS COMMENTS BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE DIRECTOR. AIRTEL OF COMPLETE DETAIL FOLLOWS. END AND ACK PLS.
WA 5-46 PM OK FBI WA RAM TU DISC PLS 5-11-60 15 MAY 13 1960
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Parsons
FROM: Mr. Rosen

DATE: May 6, 1960

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA PAT BROWN
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

Pursuant to the request made by Honorable John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, on 5/5/60, for an investigation of Governor Brown of California, the San Francisco Office is being instructed to contact Governor Brown immediately and advise him that the FBI is initiating such an investigation of him at the request of Chairman McCone inasmuch as he, Brown, as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California will require access to restricted data and a clearance from the Atomic Energy Commission.

The San Francisco Division is also being instructed to initiate such investigation immediately; however, its inquiry should be limited to a discreet number of interviews and necessary agency checks. No neighborhood inquiry will be conducted. Persons being interviewed will be specifically advised the investigation is being conducted at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Washington Field Office is also being instructed to conduct necessary agency checks.

With reference to the statement made by Chairman McCone that our office had advised him that in this instance we did not like to make such a check because of the individual's position these are the facts:

Memorandum dated July 20, 1959, (attachment #1) sets forth that the Atomic Energy Commission had, at that time, requested background investigation of Governor Brown. Since the request for the investigation was received directly from the San Francisco area operations office of the Atomic Energy Commission, it was recommended that the Director of Security, Atomic Energy Commission, be contacted through liaison to determine if the investigation of Brown should be conducted.

Enclosures:
1 - Mr. DeLoach
1 - Liaison Section
Memorandum for Mr. Parsons
RE: EDMUND GERALD BROWN

Memorandum to Mr. Belmont dated July 21, 1959, (attachment #2) advised that during the discussion between our liaison representative and the Director of Security, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., the latter stated that the FBI had previously conducted a similar investigation on Brown's predecessor, Earl Warren, when the latter was Governor of California. It was pointed out to the Director of Security that we had not conducted such an investigation of Governor Warren but had furnished the Atomic Energy Commission with a letter reflecting the results of a file check on Warren. The Director of Security advised that he would check into the matter further and that in the meantime the Bureau should hold the request for an investigation of Brown in abeyance.

By memorandum dated September 30, 1959, (attachment #3) the Division of Security, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., requested that the matter concerning Governor Brown be handled in the same manner as we had previously handled its request on Governor Warren, i.e., a file check only.

Memorandum dated October 5, 1959, (attachment #4) sets forth a summary of the information appearing in Bureau files concerning Governor Brown and pursuant to the recommendation in the memorandum information believed to be pertinent to Atomic Energy Commission's inquiry was furnished to them by letter dated October 6, 1959, (attachment #5).

RECOMMENDATION:

None. For information.

I suggest use
Straighten McCon
out on this
- 2 -
Bureau, at request of White House, 1-6-59, conducted full-field investigation of [redacted] who was being considered for membership on the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure. Investigation generally favorable; however, two or three professional associates questioned his ability to fill position because of lack of experience in international law. Two individuals commented on his drinking habits as social in nature and, on occasions, slightly excessive.

Bureau files disclose [redacted] active in "Citizens for Victory" in California in early 1940s. This organization ceased to function in 1944, and was heavily infiltrated by members of Communist Party. [redacted] reportedly a member of National Lawyers Guild latter part of 1940; however, resigned from this organization in 1950. National Lawyers Guild cited as communist front by Special Committee on Un-American Activities.
Memorandum

TO: MR. A. H. BELMONT

DATE: May 10, 1960

FROM: 

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka. PAT BROWN
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

Enclosed memorandum Rosen to Parsons, 5-6-60, reflects investigation initiated on Brown, Governor of California, as basis for Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) clearance action, pursuant to 5-5-60 request of AEC Chairman John A. McCone to Director. Memorandum also sets out earlier facts in matter in view of McCone's statement that we had advised him we did not like to make such a check because of the individual's position. Director approved Mr. Tolson's suggestion Liaison straighten McCone out on this.

On 5-9-60 SA Liaison Section, informed McCone of facts in enclosed memorandum, i.e., that when we received original request for Brown investigation in July, 1959, directly from AEC, San Francisco, it was brought to attention of AEC Security Division at headquarters to determine if investigation should be conducted; that when we pointed out Earl Warren, Brown's predecessor as Governor and Chairman of Board of Regents of University of California, had not been subject of investigation, but AEC clearance action then was based on letter setting forth Bureau file check results, AEC Security told us to hold Brown request in abeyance while they checked further; and that by memorandum of 9-30-59 AEC Security requested we handle Brown matter in same manner as Warren case, i.e., file check only, which was done by our memorandum to AEC 10-6-59. McCone was further informed that we had not stated we were reluctant to conduct Brown investigation.

McCone said that he appreciated being advised as outlined above and that his remark was probably based on misinformation. He added important thing is that investigation is now in progress, as he was also informed. He said he is very grateful for Bureau assistance regarding Brown.

ACTION:

Enclosed for approval is letter to McCone in reply to his 5-6-60 letter, confirming that expedite investigation of Brown has been initiated for AEC.
PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Confirming my telephone discussion with you on May 5, I understand that you will undertake the background investigation of Governor Edmund G. Brown, of California. This is, of course, necessary to permit the Atomic Energy Commission to make the required findings to grant Governor Brown a clearance.

You are aware that Governor Brown in the performance of his duties as a Trustee of the University of California needs to have access to restricted data of the most sensitive type. Trustees of the University in their capacity as members of the governing body of the University, which is the operating contractor of the Commission's weapons laboratories, are naturally called upon to make many decisions; and these decisions must, of course, be based on complete information about all of the activities of the University.

We will sincerely appreciate the assistance of the Bureau in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

John A. McConal

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
U. S. Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

24 May 16 1960
Honorable John A. McConne
Chairman
Atomic Energy Commission
Washington 25, D. C.

My dear Mr. McConne:

Reference is made to your telephone call to me on May 5, 1960, and your letter of May 6, 1960, concerning your request for background investigation of Governor Edmund G. Brown of California, in order that the Atomic Energy Commission may make required findings to grant Governor Brown a clearance.

As you were informed by Special Agent of this Bureau on May 9, 1960, the desired investigation has been initiated on an expedite basis. The Atomic Energy Commission will be furnished the results.

This will also confirm statements referring you to this Bureau's memorandum of October 6, 1959, setting forth information resulting from a check of our files pursuant to letter from the Atomic Energy Commission dated September 30, 1959. As indicated in the last-mentioned communication, the Atomic Energy Commission requested that the Brown matter be handled in the same manner as that regarding Earl Warren, Brown's predecessor as Governor of California.

You may be assured of this Bureau's continued willingness to cooperate in all matters of mutual interest.

Sincerely yours,

TO: SAC, LOS ANGELES
FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO (116-52286)
SUBJECT: EDMUND OGERALT BROWN, aka, "Pat" Brown
      AEA

Rebutel dated 5/6/60, no copy to Los Angeles, which
advised that chairman JOHN A. MC CONE of the Atomic
Energy Commission (AEC), has requested that the Bureau conduct an in-
vestigation of EDMUND OGERALT BROWN the Governor of California,
inasmuch as Governor BROWN is a member of the Board of Regents
of the University of California and will have access to AEC
restricted data and will require clearance from AEC. The
Bureau instructed that the inquiry of Governor BROWN should be
limited to a discreet number of interviews and necessary agency
checks. No neighborhood investigation should be conducted.
Persons interviewed should be specifically advised that the
investigation of Governor BROWN is being conducted at the re-
quest of AEC. The Bureau further instructed that investigation
should be conducted by mature, experienced SIS and it is impera-
tive that reports reach the Bureau by 5/13/60, without fail.

By airtel dated 5/6/60, no copy to Los Angeles, the
Bureau enclosed a copy of a letter from the Bureau to AEC, re-
dated 10/6/59, which set forth the information furnished by AEC
concerning Governor BROWN. A photocopy of this letter is en-
closed herewith to Los Angeles.

Bureau airtel to San Francisco dated 5/6/60, contains
the following instructions:

2  Los Angeles (AM)(REG)(1 Encl.)
1  Bureau (AM)(REG)(116-11,12786)
  San Francisco
EOR/imp
(h) #7

NOT RECORDED
4  MAY 11 1960
"Include in your reports any information appearing in enclosed letter that comes from the files of your office. Also include in your reports any new pertinent information appearing in files of your office. All other information which is not new information or that which has not been previously furnished to AEC in Bureau letter to AEC dated 10/6/59, should be set forth under administrative data in your report."

LEAD:

LOS ANGELES OFFICE:

Will interview
OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, WFO

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, CA

116-442786
116-132564

FILE 116-442786
FILE 116-132564

DATE: 5/24/60

Date of Bureau deadline: 5/18/60
Reason for the delinquency: CIA outstanding.

Date the report or necessary communication will reach the Bureau: 5/31/60.

AEC zone designation, e.g., OR, CH, etc.: CA
(This applies only to 116 cases.)

No administrative action recommended.

RJH:
From SAC, San Francisco 102101

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA. AEAA. RE BUREAU AIRTDL TO SAN FRANCISCO AND WASHINGTON FIELD OFFICE, MAY 6, LAST.

WASHINGTON FIELD IS REQUESTED TO INTERVIEW THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS:

Tolson        Parsons        Belmont        Callahan        DeLoach    Malone        McGuire        Rosen        Tamm        Trotter        W.C. Sullivan

Radio O III Teletype

DIRECTOR AND SAC, WASHINGTON FIELD

TO

FROM SAC, SAN FRANCISCO

5-10-60

URGENT

7:26 PM RADIO

RECEIVED:

7:57 PM CODING UNIT

2 CC: WASHINGTON FIELD

If the intelligence contained in the above message is to be disseminated outside the Bureau, it is suggested that it be suitably paraphrased in order to protect the Bureau's cryptographic systems.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (116-442786)
FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO (116-52286)
SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka. Pat Brown

ReBurad to San Francisco dated 5/6/60.

On 5/11/60 San Francisco, California, furnished information concerning Governor EDMUND G. BROWN, all of which information was favorable. It was advised that this investigation was conducted at the specific request of the AEC.

remarked, however, in connection with the investigation that "some day the people of California will learn of such investigations and will bitterly resent them. It is a disgrace that the Chief Executive of the sovereign State of California should be subjected to an investigation of this kind. Once he is elected, the Government has no right to go behind this unless it is for some reason that has developed after his election." He stated he had no criticism of the Bureau whatsoever but rather complimented the Bureau for the manner and conduct in which it makes such investigations. He said, however, that he feels the Bureau should decline to accept such cases, and to give thought to avoiding them completely. said he understood thoroughly that regulations provided that the FBI conduct such investigations and that, flattering as the demand for such investigations may be, it was his opinion that the FBI nevertheless should attempt to avoid the imposition of such regulations.

commented on his friendship and fondness for the Director and remarked that he felt such investigations as this are beneath the dignity of the FBI and that the high calling of the FBI calls for more important work. stated that it was his personal opinion that a request for this type of investigation by Chairman JOHN A. McCONYE of the AEC was instituted primarily for the purpose of relieving McCONYE of responsibility and shifting this responsibility to the FBI.
noted that he, himself, had been the subject of an investigation a few months ago in spite of the fact that he had specifically told former Attorney General BROWNELL and Attorney General ROGERS that he would not accept an appointment to a committee on international law because it would require extensive travel in Europe and he could not afford the time from his present position. He said that he felt considerable Bureau time and money was, therefore, wasted in this futile investigation. (aka., Special Inquiry; investigation conducted January, 1959; File 77-79858.)

Since I am personally acquainted with and I know his fine reputation, I felt that his comments should not be allowed to sit as is without additional clarification and, accordingly, I made contact with him. Stated he wanted to reemphasize the fact that he had no criticism whatsoever of the FBI but that his criticism was directed primarily at Congress which would pass such legislation which thereupon put a responsibility on AEC, which subsequently "passed the buck" to the FBI. He said that, to explain his remarks that sometime the people will rebel against such investigations, he meant that he felt Congress did not give adequate consideration to the importance and prestige of the Governor of an independent state duly elected by the people. He said that despite the fact that such Governorship might be only a temporary situation and might have rascals in it, such as Governor LONG of Louisiana who undoubtedly was a mentally incompetent, since the man was their Governor, he was, in his mind, the most important expression of home rule the country has.

went on to state he felt the FBI was being made the scapegoat of all of the national Government in that we were required to spend our time in many piddling matters when we had such important work also assigned as our responsibility and to which we should give our whole attention.

I noted that the Director felt this also was true in the constant conferring on us of additional responsibilities in Congress after Congress, and that the Director many times had told Congressional committees how thinly we were spread and his desire to contain our responsibilities as they are. Said that he one day looked forward to the opportunity to sit down with the Director and "bet that the Director would not only agree with this point of view but, in addition, would enlarge upon it."

specifically asked that his comments concerning the involvement of the FBI in this type of investigation be brought to the attention of the Director.
Airtel

To: SAC, Washington Field
From: Director, FBI (116-442768)
EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka
Pat Brown - CA
AEA-A

ReBu airtel dated 5-6-60. Refer to your file 105-24305 and your airtel dated 1-27-60. Information in enclosure of referenced airtel has already been disseminated to other governmental agencies. Include in your report information set forth in enclosure of airtel suitable for dissemination to AEC. (100-363673-321)
AIRTEL

To: SAC, Washington Field

From: Director, FBI

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka
Pat Brown - CA 15557
AEA-A

Re San Francisco radiogram dated 5-10-60.
Investigation requested in referenced radiogram will be handled by the Bureau.

EMH:rvb (4)

116-442786  21
TO:  Mr. Rosen  
FROM: G. C. W. Allen  
DATE: 5-12-60  

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka "Pat" Brown  
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT  

During the current investigation of Governor Edmund "Pat" Brown of California for the Atomic Energy Commission, the San Francisco office has recommended that he be interviewed for their comments concerning Governor Brown.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this memorandum be routed to:

1. Crime Records Division so that a representative of that division may conduct appropriate interviews with concerning Governor Brown.

2. The Domestic Intelligence Division so that a representative of the Liaison Section may conduct an appropriate interview with concerning Governor Brown.

The results of the above-mentioned interviews should be furnished to the Special Inquiry Section of the Investigative Division.

1 - Mr. DeLoach  
1 - Liaison Section
**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Office</th>
<th>Office of Origin</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Investigative Period</th>
<th>Report made by</th>
<th>Typing by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>BUREAU</td>
<td>5/16/60</td>
<td>5/6/60 - 5/16/60</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>b7C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE OF CASE**

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka Pat Brown

**CHARACTER OF CASE**

AEAA

**Synopsis:**

REFERENCES: Bureau teletype to San Francisco, 5/6/60.
Bureau airtel to San Francisco, 5/6/60.
San Francisco airtel to Los Angeles, 5/9/60.
San Francisco airtel to Bureau, 5/11/60.
San Francisco radiogram to Bureau, 5/10/60.
San Francisco teletype to Washington Field, 5/13/60.

- RUC - SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR ADD. DISSEMINATION.

**ENCLOSURES TO BUREAU:**

One (1) Photostat of letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee."
2 cc to Atomic Energy Commission

Approved:

Reid

Copies made:

4 - Bureau (116-442786)(Enc.3)(AM-CRG)
1 - San Francisco (116-52286)
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* U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1960 0--344750
SF 116-52286
EOR/Jr

Four (4) Photostats of mimeographed document captioned "For Your Information and Use," together with a Photostats of envelope in which it was received bearing return address Northern California Headquarters, EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN.


Four (4) Photostats of letter of EDMUND G. BROWN dated February 1, 1946.

INFORMANTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Agent To Whom Furnished</th>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Where Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100-27623-A-H-1198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62-2767-1A1,10,11,12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/60</td>
<td></td>
<td>First reported here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Careful consideration has been given to each source concealed and T symbols were utilized only in those instances where the identity of the source must be concealed.

was not recontacted in this investigation because it appears he merely furnished documents which had been given to him.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA:

On May 11, 1960, SA reviewed the files of Information contained in these files relating to the Applicant was utilized. There was no information of pertinence in these files concerning the Applicant's immediate relatives.
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Reference is made to the letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee" referred to in the details. A photostat of the San Francisco copy of this letterhead is enclosed to the Bureau. This copy contains numerous notations on it. Only those in the extreme lower right hand corner were placed there by Bureau personnel. They were:

- 942 Market St.
- Nov. 5 1945
- ASW
- H-1198-1.

The other notations were on the letterhead when it was obtained from the trash at Communist Party (CP) Headquarters, 942 Market Street, San Francisco, California. In view of the notations on this letterhead, copies of it were not made exhibits to be attached to the details of this report.

The Communist Party, USA, has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

was interviewed by telephone at his request. An appointment had been made on May 10, 1960, to interview him at 11:00 a.m., May 11, 1960, but telephoned SA at 1:30 p.m., May 10, 1960, stating he would be unable to keep his May 11, 1960, appointment and requested the interview by telephone.
In view of the nature of this investigation and the prominence of California, he was not asked to furnish a signed statement or whether he would be willing to testify in any hearing in this matter.

On September 12, 1944, advised that on that day District Attorney BROWN gave permission to a person soliciting contributions to the California Labor School (CLS) to say that he approved and endorsed this School.

The California Labor School, Inc., 321 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, California, has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The February 14, 1945, issue of the "Daily People's World" (DPW), page 4, column 6, contained an article captioned "Alameda, SF Demos Back Bridges." Pertinent parts of this article read as follows:

"A resolution requesting President Roosevelt and Attorney General Francis Biddle to drop deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges, Pacific Coast Longshoremen's Union chief, was adopted today by the Alameda County Democratic Committee.

"At the same time it was announced that San Francisco District Attorney Edmund Brown has added his support to the 'citizenship for Bridges' drive. Brown termed the deportation order against the native born Australian 'as a threat to industrial peace'."

The "People's World," formerly known as the "Daily People's World" is a West Coast communist newspaper.

indicates that the material referred to in paragraph 2 of page 2 of this memorandum concerning the Mobilization for Democracy meeting of June 14, 1946, did not come from the San Francisco files.

The following information relating to this meeting found in the "Daily People's World" is being brought to the Bureau's attention for its information:

The June 17, 1946, issue of the "Daily People's World," page 3, columns 4-5, contained an article captioned "Stop The Klan," datelined at Los Angeles, California, on June 16, 1946. This article read as follows in its pertinent parts:

"Stop the Ku Klux Klan!

This message will go out formally today to city and county law enforcement agencies.

"It was unanimously approved by more than 8000 persons who attended Friday night's citywide mass meeting in Olympic auditorium.

"Called by the Mobilization for Democracy, the meeting asked that laws be enforced against Klansmen 'just as they would be enforced against suspected Reds if they perpetrated acts similar to those charged against the hooded order....'

"San Francisco District Attorney Edmund G. (Pat) Brown drew applause when he announced he would call an anti-Klan meeting in his city."

The California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1947, pages 48, 62, and 369, cited the Mobilization for Democracy as, "One of the largest, and certainly one of the most potentially potent front organizations created by California Communists" since 1945. "As an excuse for" its creation, the Communist Party seized
SF 116-52286
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upon the appearance of Gerald L. K. Smith in Los Angeles. It is "a Communist-inspired and dominated organization, carefully window-dressed and directed" and "engaged in inciting riots, racial hatred, and disrespect for law and order." It is one of the "key Communist fronts in California."

The October 10, 1946, issue of the "Daily People's World," page 1, columns 4-5, contained an article datelined October 9, 1946, which in its pertinent portions read as follows:

"The Tenney Committee's attempt to smear Edmund G. 'Pat' Brown, Democratic candidate for Attorney General fizzled out here today about 10 minutes after it started...."

"Brown, San Francisco district attorney, told the committee that he had promptly investigated what few Ku Klux Klan type incidents had occurred in his city.

"'I feel that any public official should be quick at rooting out bigotry and prejudice,' Brown said positively.

"Under examination by Richard E. Coombs, committee counsel, Brown refused to condemn the anti-Klan work here of the Mobilization for Democracy.

"Brown said he had never seen any reason to investigate the California Labor School, which Tenney claims is a 'Communist front' in San Francisco.

"GUILD UPHELD

"The district attorney upheld the National Lawyers Guild, of which he is a member...."

A characterization of the National Lawyers' Guild is contained in the appendix of this report. 62,670

On November 7, 1947, advised that an official of the Communist Party at San Francisco, California, stated on that day that he had recently congratulated PAT BROWN on his election and asked him if he would like to renew his subscription to the "Daily People's World." This
official advised that PAT BROWN said "he surely would."

In May, 1948, an anonymous source, who has furnished reliable information in the past and who is unavailable for recontact, advised that at that time a list of names and addresses was then maintained in the offices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and the Spanish Refugee Appeal in San Francisco, California, on 3" by 5" cards labeled "Donors." This informant added that on this list were the following names and addresses:

"Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Edmund G.
"460 Magellan Ave.
"San Francisco, Calif.

"SF District Attorney
"550 Montgomery St. SF 4."

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

In 1948 Former (concealed by request) advised that the above list was current as of March 17, 1948, and that this list contained names and addresses of all individuals who had contributed money to the San Francisco Chapters of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and its subsidiary group, the Spanish Refugee Appeal. Former advised that this list was also used as a mailing list by the Executive Committees of these organizations. Informant added that this list contained the names of regular contributors who subscribed to the aims and policies of the organizations, as well as the names of individuals who had been influenced to contribute money without being aware of the full scope of the organizations' activities.

Former California, had access to addressograph plates of the "Daily People's World" subscribers. On September 27, 1950, furnished the name and address made from an addressograph
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plate reflecting that E. G. BROWN, District Attorney, 550 Montgomery, Eighth Floor, San Francisco, California, was then a six month subscriber to the "Daily People's World" whose subscription would expire on November 11, 1950.

On May 7, 1951, furnished the name and address made from an addressograph plate reflecting that E. G. BROWN, District Attorney, 550 Montgomery, Eighth Floor, San Francisco, California, was then a six month subscriber to the "Daily People's World" whose subscription would expire on November 11, 1951.

On March 8, 1955, advised that she was willing to appear at hearings, but that she did not desire to furnish a signed statement concerning persons whose names appeared on the subscription plates because she did not recall the specific data appearing on any of these plates and because she could only state she made copies from these plates.
Page 22 of Section 1 of the "San Francisco Examiner" for October 27, 1958, contained a full page political advertisement which reflected it was paid for by the Citizens for the Right to Know, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles 17, California. This advertisement was captioned "Brown's Little Green Book That Turned Red." It states that the Division of Criminal Law and Enforcement of the Department of Justice of the State of California published a booklet entitled "Guide to Community Relations for Peace Officers" and that this booklet was published while EDMUND G. BROWN was Attorney General. The article then states that several of the authors of the recommended books, pamphlets, and audiovisual aids listed in the bibliography of the above pamphlet have been identified as members of the Communist Party or had been listed in front organizations. Inasmuch as this is one of the many publications issued by the California State Department of Justice during the time that EDMUND G. BROWN was the Attorney General, it is believed that the authors listed in the bibliography of this book are so remotely connected with Governor BROWN personally, that this material was not incorporated in the details of this report.

In view of the above material set forth on the administrative pages of this report relating to the loyalty of the Applicant, the usual statement indicating that other Confidential Informants have no information concerning the Applicant was not incorporated in the details of this report.

Newspaper libraries were not checked in this case in view of Bureau instructions that the inquiry of Governor BROWN should be limited to a discreet number of interviews and necessary agency checks.
Synopsis:
The 2/13/45 issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle" contained an article reflecting that District Attorney EDMUND G. BROWN opposed the deportation of HARRY BRIDGES. The 8/9/45 issue of the same newspaper contained an article reflecting that BROWN had been elected a Vice President of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild. In November, 1945, [REDACTED] furnished a letterhead which listed EDMUND G. BROWN as a member of the Committee in Formation to sponsor an anniversary dinner for the American Youth for Democracy. [REDACTED] stated that he felt Governor BROWN was lacking in character, ability, judgment, and integrity. All other persons interviewed commented favorably. Governor BROWN was interviewed at his request and explained certain allegations made against him.
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This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.
DETAILS:

AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

The February 13, 1945 issue of the San Francisco Chronicle, a daily newspaper in San Francisco, on page 7, column 8, contained an article entitled, "BROWN Aids Appeal of HARRY BRIDGES". In its pertinent parts this article read as follows:

"District Attorney EDMUND G. BROWN came out against the deportation of HARRY BRIDGES, CIO leader, in a statement announced yesterday.

"BROWN in a letter to the Bridges Victory Committee, termed the deportation order against the longshoremen's president 'a threat to industrial peace'.

"District Attorney BROWN concluded his letter with the hope that 'Mr. BRIDGES will soon be permitted the opportunity of becoming a U. S. citizen'."

From the time of the original petition for naturalization by HARRY RENTON BRIDGES in 1921, until ultimate disposition by the court on July 29, 1955, a series of trials and hearings were held concerning possible membership in and affiliation with the Communist Party on the part of BRIDGES. During the course of these trials and hearings, a second deportation warrant was issued on February 14, 1941. On June 12, 1941, finding against BRIDGES, the deportation warrant was upheld by the United States District Court. On January 3, 1942, the Board of Immigration Appeals disapproved the finding of June 12, 1941. On May 28, 1942, the Attorney General of the United States overrode the Board of Immigration Appeals and again ordered deportation, adopting the findings of June 12, 1941.

On February 8, 1943, the presiding Judge, in the United States District Court, denied a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on the part of BRIDGES. After this, a later series of trials and hearings, including an appearance before the United States Supreme Court, occurred. Ultimately, on July 29, 1955, in connection with civil denaturalization proceeding, the United States District Court found for BRIDGES, the presiding Judge concluding that "the government has failed to prove allegations...as to membership in the Communist Party by clear and convincing evidence."
The Communist Party, USA, has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

An article appearing in the August 9, 1945, issue of the San Francisco Chronicle, page 9, column 2, announced that District Attorney EDMUND G. BROWN had been elected one of the five Vice Presidents of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild.

A characterization of the National Lawyers' Guild is appended hereto.

In November, 1945, San Francisco, who is unavailable for recontact, furnished a letterhead entitled, "Salute to Young America Committee", which was a committee, according to the letterhead, to sponsor a second anniversary dinner of the American Youth for Democracy in San Francisco, California. The letterhead listed EDMUND G. BROWN as a member of the Committee in Formation. stated that EDMUND G. BROWN was being considered by the Communist Party in San Francisco as a speaker for this committee. furnished no further details.

A copy of the above mentioned letterhead is attached, marked "Exhibit D."

The American Youth for Democracy has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

In March, 1946, San Francisco advised that in January, 1946, the Omicron Epsilon Society, a student veterans society at the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, addressed letters to persons whose names appeared as sponsors for the banquet honoring the American Youth for Democracy held Saturday, November 10, 1945, at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, stating they could not believe they knowingly gave their consent to be used in support of the American Youth for Democracy and asking them for a written expression on their stand on the American Youth for Democracy. furnished a copy of the letter written to EDMUND G. BROWN which was dated January 10, 1946. also furnished a Photostat of the reply of EDMUND G. BROWN dated February 1, 1946, in which he stated he knew that the Young Communist League or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the American Youth for Democracy and that he had called an official of the American Youth for Democracy and asked her if it was Communist in either origin or intent. According to BROWN, the official
advised him that the American Youth for Democracy "was not in any manner, shape or form Communistic although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged". BROWN added, "I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background".

A copy of the above letter of the Omicron Epsilon Society is attached, marked "Exhibit A".

A photostat of the above letter of EDMUND G. BROWN is attached, marked "Exhibit B".

The Young Communist League has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The following investigation was conducted by SA (name redacted)

On May 10, 1960, an advising that he has known Governor BROWN for 25 years or more and has had many social contacts with him. SA said that he has not always agreed with Governor BROWN'S statements nor does he always agree with his expressed thinking because of their different political views, but he said he has no reservations whatsoever about Governor BROWN'S loyalty to the United States.

SA stated he is quite aware of things that have been said about Governor BROWN'S "leanings to the left", but he dismisses them as unworthy of comment. He said such things gain publicity either by the wishful thinking of the "leftists" or from deliberate misinterpretation of what Governor BROWN would say. SA pointed out that this is the type of thing that confronts nearly everyone who runs for a political office.

SA stated that Governor BROWN'S social and private life are above question or suspicion; he knows him to be an excellent family man, a good father and a good husband. He stated that he has never heard one question of scandal raised in connection with Governor BROWN'S life.

SA advised on May 10, 1960 that he has
known Governor BROWN since 1944, when BROWN became District Attorney of San Francisco. He stated that he thinks very highly of Governor BROWN, both personally and professionally, and he has no doubts as to his character or morals and said that his loyalty to the United States was above question.

pointed out that he and BROWN differed professionally in one or two celebrated criminal cases in which there was much publicity and BROWN made him extremely "annoyed to put it very mildly". He remarked that with more sober reflection and the passage of several years, he concluded that BROWN acted to the best of his knowledge and ability and that his actions were the result of his good conscience and his knowledge as a prosecuting attorney, and that he has never felt BROWN was swayed by any evil influences.

stated that he knows Governor BROWN'S family and his brothers and has never heard anything that would reflect unfavorably upon any of them. except to note that

concluded by stating that in his opinion Governor BROWN is an outstanding figure.

of San Francisco, advised on May 10, 1960 that he has known Governor BROWN for 25 years and first knew him when BROWN was entering public life. He stated he has had innumerable contacts with him in social and professional matters. He stated he would have no question concerning Governor BROWN'S morals, character or loyalty to the United States. He remarked that, as a Catholic, Governor BROWN would be hard pressed to reconcile his religion with any Communist doctrines or beliefs, and he stated that Governor BROWN has never said or done anything that would cause him to doubt his loyalty for one moment. He remarked that Governor BROWN is impulsive in speech and sometimes ambiguous, but he believes him to be an honest and sincere person.

of San Francisco, advised on May 10, 1960 that his personal relations and friendship with Governor EDMUND G. BROWN go back to more than 20 years. He stated later carrying on the best of the administration and policy making for the entire District Attorney's Office. He stated that they are close personal friends and social acquaintances and have been for many years, and have confided in each other consistently on political and other matters.
 advised there is no question at all in his mind about Governor BROWN's loyalty, his thinking or his devotion to the United States. He advised he is a good family man and his associates are all people of the same type. He stated he is personally acquainted with all of Governor BROWN's family; his wife BERNICE, He advised he has two brothers who are lawyers in San Francisco, HAROLD C. and FRANK-M. BROWN, and a sister, Mrs. ARTHUR (CONSTANCE) CARLSON, and all are of good character, reputation and absolutely loyal to ANTHROPOSITE.

stated that he felt Governor BROWN is impulsive, both in speech and action, and that people have tried to take advantage of this characteristic. He stated that he did not believe Governor BROWN would welcome support of any kind from any Communist or left wing faction.

stated that in the late 1930s, the National Lawyers' Guild, local chapter, was organized by several young lawyers who were interested in obtaining recognition at conventions and Bar Association meetings. It had been traditional that only delegates of the San Francisco Bar Association would be recognized at meetings and conventions, and because of the control of the San Francisco Bar Association held by the "downtown" lawyers and the "old family" groups it was impossible to obtain recognition by young lawyers who were on the "outside". stated that several young lawyers conceived the idea they could achieve recognition by affiliation with some group like the National Lawyers Guild and stated that he had received an invitation to join and had attended several meetings, but for some reason failed to formally sign up. Subsequently, when it became apparent that the liberal and "left wing" groups were trying to get control, said many of the members resigned from the local National Lawyers' Guild and he believed that BROWN, who had been a member for sometime and who never subscribed to any of the "left wing" views, resigned about that time. According to Governor BROWN took little or no part in the proceedings of the National Lawyers' Guild.

also commented on a statement attributed to Governor BROWN in behalf of HARRY BRIDGES. stated that HARRY BRIDGES, a San Francisco labor leader who has long been accused of being a Communist and who has always been associated with "left wing" groups, was being threatened with deportation by the U. S. Government in the early 1940s. He advised BRIDGES was an acknowledged labor
leader on the waterfront and a strike was threatened, if he was deported. [redacted] stated that many prominent people, including Governor BROWN, objected to the deportation at that time in a community effort to help San Francisco and the war effort. He said they feared the strike and the possible slowdown of cargo handling on the waterfront and its very obvious effect on the war effort. [redacted] stated that the deportation objections were, ironically enough, motivated by patriotism even though "left wingers" and their organizations were behind the movement.

[redacted] advised that it was brought to his attention that Governor BROWN'S name had been used by the American Youth for Democracy or the Young Communist League around 1946. He stated that this was done without Governor BROWN'S permission and that BROWN had made a statement to this effect during his campaign for Governor and apparently had successfully repudiated any statements to the contrary.

[redacted] stated that [redacted] is well acquainted with Governor BROWN and, since they have been for several years, suggested he be interviewed. [redacted] said, however, that [redacted] would probably be unfriendly to Governor BROWN, because [redacted] feels [redacted] has visualized himself as the Attorney General, or Governor, and has blamed Governor BROWN for the fact that he is not. [redacted] explained that [redacted] approached him about running for Attorney General and that [redacted] explained he could not support [redacted] because of their different political affiliations. [redacted] indicated he blamed BROWN and protested that on the State level partisan politics was unimportant. [redacted] stated furthermore, that in his opinion [redacted] has become so conservative in his views on nearly everything, that he feels [redacted] has become overly scrupulous.

[redacted] advised on May 11, 1960 that he has known Governor BROWN for nearly 20 years and he considers him an honest, loyal American. [redacted] said he is willing to accept the edict of the people of the State of California who elected Governor BROWN and feels that the loyalty of such a person is not open to question. He commented that he and Governor BROWN were members of the same political party but that he had always felt Governor BROWN was much too conservative to be a "true" Democrat. [redacted] stated that his social contacts with Governor BROWN were rather limited, but that professionally he believes Governor BROWN enjowa a very fine reputation.

[redacted] remarked that he felt quite strongly against an investigation of this kind involving the Governor, and remarked that it was, in his opinion, an infringement upon the sovereign rig of the State of California.
advised that he has known Governor BROWN for 25 years and first became acquainted with him when Governor BROWN stated that he and decided to deliver to Governor BROWN in San Francisco. He stated that he was the "go-between" in the National Lawyers' Guild between that organization and the CIO for whom were doing legal work. He stated that it was only natural that he and should try to influence the labor vote in behalf of BROWN because BROWN was favorably looked upon by labor at that time. said that it was not so much a favorable view of BROWN but rather a protest against the incumbent MATT BRADY, who has since died and who prosecuted SAM DARCY who was a leader in Communist circles in the San Francisco Bay area. He said the CIO would have supported anyone against BRADY.

said he has never known Governor BROWN to be friendly with any "left wing" groups. further stated that Governor BROWN was an early member of the National Lawyers' Guild but that in the late 1930s so were a great many lawyers in San Francisco because it was only through this organization that a young or "unknown" lawyer could be heard. However, when "left wing" elements began to "take over" and attempt to dictate policy, many of the more conservative elements resigned, including BROWN. said that subsequent to this, the National Lawyers' Guild got the bad reputation it enjoyed for sometime because of the "left wing" elements that obtained and maintained control. stated he believes that BROWN quit the National Lawyers' Guild in 1941 or 1942.

stated he, , was a member of the Communist Party from 1936 to 1950 and that his former law partner, , was a member of the Communist Party from 1936 to 1950 and he believes that is still a member of the Communist Party.
Long and Levit, Attorneys, Merchants Exchange Building, on May 11, 1960 advised that his first association with Governor BROWN was nearly 25 years ago when they were both beginning their interest in politics and both were members of a good-government organization in San Francisco. Stated that they became friendly because he liked Governor BROWN'S straightforward manner and when Governor BROWN became District Attorney, he was re-organizing his office, and later when Governor BROWN was elected Attorney General, Long and Levit agreed to help organize the Attorney General's office.

He also noted that when Governor BROWN was elected Governor, he became friendly because he told Governor BROWN for the purpose of assisting him in organization. Stated that from this it can be seen he thinks very highly of Governor BROWN and put it in this manner: "A lawyer's greatest asset is his reputation and I would stake mine on Governor BROWN".

Stated that he is of a different political affiliation and has different political views than Governor BROWN and noted that things have been said in campaigns concerning BROWN'S "leanings". Stated, however, that he knows Governor BROWN well enough to state that all of these statements were either false or exaggerated and that he would never knowingly seek help from the "leftists" and would never give them aid or comfort. He stated that Governor BROWN often acts independently after getting advice. For example, stated that in the CHESSMAN case, the convict who was condemned for these many years, Governor BROWN sought his advice and he told him to remain aloof, except as the law required him to act. Stated that Governor BROWN did not take his advice and the case has put him in "continual hot water".

Attorneys at Law, Russ Building, on May 13, 1960 said he has known and been friendly with Governor BROWN for 25 years and has supported Governor BROWN in all of his campaigns. He characterized Governor BROWN as an honest, God-fearing man of strong character and integrity and one who would not even think of a disloyal thing. Former U. S. District Judge EDWARD MURPHY, who is now dead, and Governor BROWN joined the National Lawyers' Guild in the late 1930s. Stated this organization was formed so the rank and file lawyers could have a spokesman before the American Bar Association. After a
It appeared that the "Commies" were getting control of the organization in New York and the people in the West did not like it but found they were going to have a fight on their hands in San Francisco. [Redacted] stated that MURPHY was seeking re-election to the Superior Bench in San Francisco at the time and he and Governor BROWN were supporting him. They felt that if MURPHY resigned from the National Lawyers Guild, the local CIO would run a candidate against MURPHY so Governor BROWN, MURPHY and [Redacted] all agreed they would resign together when MURPHY was re-elected. [Redacted] stated that they all resigned shortly after Judge MURPHY's re-election and as far as he knows, Governor BROWN never re-affiliated with the National Lawyers Guild nor did he ever hold an office in this organization.

Watson Navigation Company, 215 Market Street, (San Francisco) advised on May 16, 1960 that he first knew Governor BROWN when he, [Redacted] San Francisco in 1944 and had many contacts with him, both socially and professionally, since that time. [Redacted] stated that he has not conversed with Governor BROWN for about one year and noted that both he and Governor BROWN differed politically, but he is convinced from the numerous talks and meetings he has had with Governor BROWN, that he would never knowingly say or do anything that would not be to the best interests of the United States. [Redacted] stated he does not think that Governor BROWN would ever be "soft" toward Communism or anything else that would undermine or attempt to tear down the Government of the United States.

[Redacted] said Governor BROWN is a good family man and is honest and sincere. [Redacted] commented on the recent publicity Governor BROWN received concerning capital punishment, and stated he is convinced that Governor BROWN acted in good conscience and to the best of his ability, even though, in his opinion, he damaged himself politically.
advised on May 14, 1960, that he has known Governor EDWARD BROWN since he was eight or nine years of age and that they have had numerable contacts during his life time. He said he considers Governor BROWN a close personal friend and noted that both are members of the same political party. He said that they have been in each other's company on countless occasions in social gatherings as well.

He stated that he had absolutely no concern that Governor BROWN would be permitted access to very highly classified material and said that it is unthinkable to question his loyalty or devotion to the United States and its democratic form of government.

He stated that BROWN's personal attributes are many and that he is a good family man.

He stated that he believed it only fair to state, however, that BROWN is inclined to equivocate in his language at times, but stated that he is certain that his decisions are made honestly, sincerely, and in good conscience.

He commented on allegations which he stated were made during Governor BROWN's political campaign and stated that some of the allegations dwelt upon BROWN's "liberal" tendencies.

He stated that he is aware that Governor BROWN at one time was a member of the local chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild and also noted that he was in very select company in his membership, noting that members of the judiciary and prominent lawyers were members at the same time.

He remarked that membership in the National Lawyers' Guild at that time, 1939 to 1941, was not at all unusual and that it was only through this organization that the young lawyers of the San Francisco Bay area were able to receive recognition at the Bar Association Conventions. As soon as it became evident that liberal elements were attempting to control the National Lawyers' Guild, he stated that Governor BROWN and countless other attorneys deserted the ranks of the National Lawyers' Guild in protest.
The following investigation was conducted by Investigative Clerk.

CREDIT AND POLICE CHECKS

On May 11, 1960, the files of the San Francisco Retail Credit Association were checked by Files of this Credit Association. A record was found concerning EDMUND GERALD BROWN reflecting that they had a favorable credit rating. There was nothing in the files of this Credit Association reflecting unfavorably upon them.

On May 12, 1960, the files of the San Francisco Police Department were checked by but nothing identifiable with EDMUND GERALD BROWN, was found.
California, advised that he has known Governor BROWN for the past 14 years as District Attorney of San Francisco County, Attorney General and Governor of the State of California. He stated that it is his personal opinion that Governor BROWN is lacking in character, ability, judgment and integrity, and that he cannot keep a secret.

As an example of Governor BROWN'S lack of ability and judgment, [redacted] cited what he considered Governor BROWN'S mishandling of the recently publicized CARYL CHESSMAN case wherein Governor BROWN granted CHESSMAN a reprieve. [Redacted] advised in this connection that he is strongly opposed to Governor BROWN'S stand in favor of abolishing capital punishment as he, [redacted] is to retain capital punishment.

Concerning Governor BROWN'S lack of character and integrity and his inability to keep a secret, [redacted] stated that in December, 1949 he attended the National Chiefs of Police Convention wherein U. S. Attorney General McCARTHY gave a talk and stated that in February, 1950 he, McCARTHY, was having a meeting in Washington, D. C. with a few selected members of the national Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs regarding organized crime. [Redacted] stated that after this speech he went to Attorney General McCARTHY and asked him why the District Attorneys were not included in this February, 1950 meeting inasmuch as the District Attorneys were the front line defense in organized crime. McCARTHY advised him that the District Attorneys had no national organization. [Redacted] told McCARTHY that he had been working on a national association of District Attorneys for over a year. [Redacted] advised that McCARTHY then requested that he, [redacted] five District Attorneys from throughout the United States to attend the meeting in February, 1950.

[Redacted] advised that he attended this meeting with [redacted] District Attorneys but that BROWN, then District Attorney for San Francisco County, was not invited. [Redacted] stated that BROWN attended this meeting even though he was not invited. According to [redacted], at the meeting he, [redacted], made a talk regarding the formation of the national association of District Attorneys and informed that he, [redacted] County Supervisors Association of California,
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had worked on this plan for over a year and contacted many of the District Attorneys throughout the United States. According to [redacted] also took the floor and further explained the plans for a national association of District Attorneys.

[redacted] stated that the next day Mr. BROWN called a press conference and announced that the national association of District Attorneys was his idea and that he, BROWN, had presented it at a meeting on the day before. [redacted] stated that this was 100% false and a deliberate lie. According to [redacted] later when he saw Mr. BROWN in California and accused BROWN of this falsification, BROWN stated "well, you didn't have a patent on it".

Concerning loyalty to the United States, [redacted] said that while he certainly does not believe Governor BROWN is disloyal, on one occasion at a District Attorneys Convention in Santa Barbara, California, date not recalled, Mr. BROWN gave a speech and criticized congressional committees and hearings. [redacted] stated that Chief WILLIAM PARKER, Los Angeles, California Police Department, gave a speech following that of Mr. BROWN. According to [redacted] Chief PARKER pointed his finger at Mr. BROWN and stated that BROWN talked like a Communist and that he was espousing the Communist Party line.

Other than the above, [redacted] said that he had no additional comment to make concerning Governor BROWN'S loyalty. He stated, however, that in view of the items which he mentioned, as set forth above, he did not feel that he could personally recommend that Governor BROWN be given access to confidential data in which the United States Government has an interest.
The following investigation was conducted by SA

AT OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

[Redacted] advised on May 11, 1960 that he has known of Governor BROWN professionally for 20 years and always knew him to be a loyal American. He stated that as Governor of the State of California, Mr. BROWN is head of the California National Guard and also as Governor of the State of California, he is entrusted with confidential information. [Redacted] advised he did not believe that any leaks would come from Governor BROWN. He further stated that he did not know Governor BROWN well enough to pass on his character or associates.

The following investigation was conducted by SA

AT MODESTO, CALIFORNIA

[Redacted], Attorney, 1115 I Street, advised on May 11, 1960 that he had known Governor EDMUND G. BROWN for approximately ten years, and since BROWN has been Governor, he has been in contact with him several times a week during the period when Assembly was in session. He advised that he considers Governor BROWN as being of good character and reputation. He advised that he considers Governor BROWN as being a loyal American and that no question has ever been raised regarding Governor BROWN which would reflect unfavorably on his character, reputation or loyalty.

The following investigation was conducted by SA

AT SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

[Redacted], Aerojet General Corporation, advised on May 12, 1960 that he has been acquainted with Governor BROWN since approximately 1947 and has had a great deal of social contact with him since that time. He stated that he regards Governor BROWN as a person of excellent character, associates and he has no reason whatsoever to doubt Governor BROWN'S loyalty to the United States. He stated he believes Governor BROWN can be placed in a high position of trust.
The following investigation was conducted by SA [redacted].

On May 12, 1960, Sacramento, California, advised that he has known Governor BROWN for over 20 years and regards him as a person of excellent character and associates. He stated he has no reason to doubt Governor BROWN'S loyalty to the United States and would highly recommend him to a position of trust.

On May 11, 1960, San Francisco furnished a 6-page mimeographed document mailed to him from the Northern California Headquarters of EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN for Attorney General, San Francisco, California, on October 16, 1950, which was captioned "For Your Information and Use". This mimeographed document was designed to refute charges that BROWN was a "leftist" because (1) in February, 1945, he described deportation proceedings against HARRY BRIDGES as a "threat to industrial peace" and joined in the recommendation that they be dropped, (2) he held membership in the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild, (3) his name was used as a member of a committee on a letterhead of the National Citizens' Political Action Committee, Northern California Division in conjunction with a testimonial dinner on April 22, 1946, and (4) because his name was used in connection with a banquet given by a "Salute to Young America".

A photostat of the above document, together with the envelope in which it was received, is attached, marked "Exhibit C".

A characterization of the National Citizens Political Action Committee is appended hereto.

Governor EDMUND G. BROWN, in a telephone conversation with SAC RICHARD D. AUERBACH on May 9, 1960, expressed a desire to furnish certain pertinent information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Accordingly, an appointment was requested and Governor BROWN was contacted on the afternoon of May 13, 1960 and furnished the following information to SA [redacted].

He stated that while campaigning for election as Attorney General of California during the fall of 1950, certain elements in California attempted to "smear" his reputation by inferring that he had "leftist" tendencies. These persons attempted to cite three or four incidents to support their contention.
GOVERNOR BROWN said that for the purpose of combating this 'smear,' a carefully documented statement of the true facts was prepared for presentation to the public.

Governor BROWN reviewed this statement prepared during September, 1950 and stated that although his recollection of some of the details was somewhat hazy, due to the passage of time, it still stands as a correct description of his position at that time. A photocopy of the part of his statement used by the Governor BROWN is submitted with this report as Exhibit 5.

On May 15th a Commission made by the Governor of 1947, that deportation proceedings not be carried out against BRIDGES, the year round prisoner at the San Francisco County Jail, was then District Attorney of San Francisco County, told that the political philosophy of BRIDGES had nothing to do with his taking public office. BRIDGES at the time had what amounted to a virtually continuous contact with western points through which he was being invited to the facilities. Many political organizations were appreciative that while the Nation's political situation would tend to a variation of the liberal-socialist philosophy being presented.

BRIDGES has had an excellent record of service in the United States and is a graduate of the University of California. He has been a member of the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Lawyers Guild. He has been in active service with the United States Senate and the United States Senate Committee on the Veterans Administration.

BRIDGES has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild. The Governor BROWN and his counsel for the National Lawyers Guild have not been his political friends.

Governor BROWN at his request, his counsel for the National Lawyers Guild have not been his political friends. However, I have no doubt that if a new administration were to have a new attitude towards his political affiliations, the Governor BROWN would come into a new conversation with Judge Rumen.
plane trip which influenced his action. He could not recall attending any meeting, however, and decided to resign from the organization after reading one of the pamphlets. He became aware that he "didn't like the people in it" and that he had no sympathy for the "line" which the organization was beginning to take. He also recalled that several prominent persons, which he believed included Judge MURPHY, also resigned on the same day.

Governor BROWN stated that the quotation from his letter in the statement referred to above clearly points out the reason for his resignation, i.e., the differences between the Guild's national policy and his own personal convictions.

He also stated that he was criticized for attending a dinner for HENRY A. WALLACE who during 1946, as Secretary of Commerce, visited San Francisco, and noted that prominent civic leaders in San Francisco, including both Republicans and Democrats, participated in the arrangements.

The fourth charge, Governor BROWN stated, related to his alleged connection with a banquet in late 1945 in San Francisco. He recalled a group of young people visiting him at his office in this connection, and that there was some indication that he was desired as a speaker. He noted that he had always been interested in young people and their activities. However, he later received information from a Judge McMAHON, who had also been approached, that there was some question as to the sponsorship of the banquet. In reviewing the statement, previously referred to, he stated that use of his name was without his authorization; that he did not appear at the banquet; and that he did not support the organization or engage in its activities.

Governor BROWN also recalled another meeting in the Los Angeles area about June, 1946, at which he made a brief appearance. This occurred during his campaign for Attorney General on a ticket headed by BOB KENNEY, who was also there along with a number of other speakers. The meeting was held at some large auditorium where prize fights were held because he recalled the ring in the auditorium, and the rally was attended by perhaps as many as 5,000 people. He could not recall the organization which sponsored the meeting but believed that the theme of the meeting had something to do with opposition to the Ku Klux Klan. Governor BROWN said on this occasion he spoke four or five minutes, and that several other candidates were present and spoke. He recognized the group, after his arrival, as having what he described as a "left wing" flavor.
He noted that he could not recall this incident as having been included in the "smear" campaign but that an individual who was not aware of the true facts might possibly place the wrong interpretation on his appearance.

Governor BROWN observed, in conclusion, that one of the great problems this country faces today is the danger of Russian Communism and that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and he, as the Governor of California, have a common purpose in meeting and facing this danger.

The following investigation was conducted by SA

CREDIT AND POLICE CHECKS

On May 13, 1960, Sacramento Retail Credit Association; Sacramento Police Department, and Sacramento County Sheriff's Office, all advised they had no record in their files concerning Governor BROWN.
NATIONAL CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

The Fifth Report of the Un-American Activities Committee to the 1949 Regular California Legislature at page 351, cited the National Citizens Political Action Committee as "typical of the completely Communist created and controlled organizations in the...political association and civic committee field." This Report indicates it was also cited in the 1948 Report of the same Committee at page 38. At page 315 of the 1949 Report of the above Committee, the following is set forth:

"The Hollywood Unit of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. Cited as a Communist front which was successor to a number of Communist fronts, including Motion Picture Democratic Committee, and Hollywood Democratic Committee. When ICCASP 'joined hands' with National Citizens Political Action Committee to 'form the new political Communist front, Progressive Citizens of America, HICCASP became the Hollywood Unit. (PCA later merged into the Independent Progressive Party, just before the 1948 presidential campaign, in the HENRY WALLACE third party, but the nucleus of HICCASP regrouped late in 1948 as the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council'."

The 1955 Report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, page 46, stated, "The Independent Progressive Party in California was quickly captured by the Communists, and by the time the Wallace for President campaign had swung into high gear was being operated lock, stock and barrel by the Communist Party of California. Time after time the committee in questioning witnesses throughout the State discovered that the leaders of the Communist Parties in various localities were identical with the leaders of the Independent Progressive Party in the same area. It is true, of course, that in the Independent Progressive Party there were many sincere liberals who, because of dissatisfaction with the two major political organizations registered as Independent Progressives and continued their affiliation until the true control of the I.P.P. became obvious. These people invariably resigned, many of them having given the benefit of their experience to various official agencies interested in the exposure of subversive activities."
The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in House Report No. 1311 on the CIO Political Action Committee dated March 29, 1944, page 149, cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a communist front.

The Committee on Un-American Activities in House Report No. 3123 on the National Lawyers' Guild dated September 21, 1950 (originally released September 17, 1950) cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents".

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in its Handbook for Americans, Senate Document No. 117, dated April 23, 1956, page 91, stated that "To defend the cases of communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations are the * * * National Lawyers' Guild. When the Communist Party itself is under fire these offer a bulwark of protection".

APPENDIX PAGE
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EDMUND GERALD BROWN
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT-APPLICANT

All Confidential Informants referred to in the report of Special Agent [redacted] dated May 16, 1960, at San Francisco, California, have furnished reliable information in the past.

This is furnished for your information and should not be disseminated to unauthorized persons or agencies.

(5)
January 10, 1946

Mr. Edmund G. Brown
460 Magellan Avenue
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

In a newspaper dispatch datelined New York, January 8, 1946, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, publicly stated that the American Youth for Democracy is the successor of the Young Communist League.

The same United States Government Official, who above all others should be in a position to speak with authority, stigmatizes American Communism as holding "....a godless, truthless philosophy of life. They are against the America our forefathers fought and died for; they are against the established freedoms of America ....There is a distinction between respecting our ally Russia and respecting those within our country who would destroy all that we believe in."

We note that you were listed as a Sponsor for the Banquet honoring the American Youth for Democracy held on Saturday, November 10, 1945, at the St. Francis Hotel.

As Veterans who fought to prevent these United States from becoming "a godless, totalitarian state" we cannot believe that you, as an American citizen, knowingly gave your consent to be used in support of the American Youth for Democracy.

Our membership comprising over seventy per cent of the Student Body of this University would like a written expression of your stand on the American Youth for Democracy.

Sincerely yours,

Omicron Epsilon
per

Americanization Committee
Dear Mr./Ms.

Alexander Ford

Pat Brown

Dewey

Thompson

Joseph Gilford

Adrienne Curet

Etc.

$5 tickets available

8:30 pm

TV 9724

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Thank you for your letter of January 16. I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background. I knew that the Young Communist League or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the American Youth for Democracy. I, therefore, called the young lady who asked me to become a sponsor for the dinner, not the organization, and asked her if there was any truth in the assertion that the American Youth for Democracy was communist in either origin or intent.

She advised me that it was not in any manner, shape, or form communist although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged. She told me that they were affiliated with many church groups. I was also advised by her that the organization encouraged young people to participate in government and that it fought racial intolerance and religious bigotry.

I would consider it a pleasure to discuss with you at length organizations such as this. You have fought and died for a terrific cause, but the real fight has now begun. Merely being against some organization is not sufficient. Active participation to hold the things you won must never cease.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

EDWARD G. BROWN
District Attorney

EGB:dh
FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND USE

The undersigned believe that you, as a responsible individual interested in truth will want to read the attached document refuting a Statewide political smear designed to portray Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, District Attorney of San Francisco and Democratic nominee for Attorney General, as a "leftist."

The document categorically destroys each of four separate allegations on the following subjects; (1) Pat Brown's letter on the Bridges deportation case; (2) membership in the Lawyers' Guild; (3) assistance in arranging a banquet in 1946 for the then Secretary of Commerce, and former Vice President of the United States, Henry A. Wallace; (4) alleged support of a "Salute to Young America" Banquet.

The allegations against Mr. Brown first emerged as a political document whose sponsors, through elementary inquiry, could have determined the baseless nature of this attempt to impugn his loyalty and integrity.

Following the original circulation of the "leftist" canard, it was reproduced last week as a "Special Report Dealing with Communism" in a scurrilous handbill distributed by "Alert", a "confidential" newsletter whose Los Angeles publisher is a campaign associate of Mr. Shattuck, and appears at public meetings with him. The handbill is being mailed to thousands of persons in envelopes bearing no return address.

MR. SHATTUCK HIMSELF IS EMBRACING THIS DEFAMATORY MATERIAL AND GIVING UTTERANCE TO IT IN HIS CAMPAIGN TALKS.

In our view—and we believe in the view of thinking citizens—the conduct and actions of Mr. Brown's opponent and his allies pose this question:

Would Mr. Shattuck, as Attorney General—the State's chief law enforcement officer—have the same reckless disregard of TRUTH in matters affecting YOUR reputation, if by so doing he could advance his own political fortunes?

Although we have no desire to play into the hands of Mr. Brown's opponent by giving further circulation to this smear, we believe that you as a leader of public opinion, should have the facts. You are privileged to use this statement, and the accompanying documentary proof of Mr. Brown's victimization, in any manner that you deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

HENRY G. BODKIN, SR., Los Angeles
HONORABLE HUGH BURNS, Fresno
(Chairman, State Senate Committee on Un-American Activities)
GEORGE CREEL, San Francisco
FREDERICK DOCKWEILER, Los Angeles
EMMETT DOHERTY, Los Angeles
HONORABLE CHESTER GANNON, Sacramento
LEON HAPPEL, Stockton
(Fast Commander, Department of California, American Legion)

HUGH McKEVITT, San Francisco
SIG NYLANDER, San Francisco
LLOYD P. OLESON, Ventura
(Past National Commander, Disabled American Veterans)
HONORABLE JOHN W. PRESTON, Los Angeles
(Former Associate Justice, California State Supreme Court)
HONORABLE PETER J. SHIELDS, Sacramento
(Dean of the Sacramento County Superior Court bench, retired)
September 29, 1950

CHARGE #1

....that District Attorney Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Democratic nominee for Attorney General, is a "leftist" because, in FEBRUARY, 1945 he described deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges as a "threat to industrial peace" and joined in a recommendation that they be dropped.

THE TRUTH

IT IS APPARENT FROM THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT OF FACT THAT DISTRICT ATTORNEY BROWN'S FEBRUARY, 1945, STATEMENT WAS ISSUED IN CONCERT WITH STATEMENTS MADE BY OTHER CIVIC, STATE AND NATIONAL LEADERS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREVENTING WATERFRONT STRIFE AT A TIME WHEN THE NATION WAS ENGAGED IN A DEATH STRUGGLE WITH THE AXIS POWERS. THE ATTEMPT, FIVE YEARS LATER, TO ISOLATE THE BROWN LETTER AND MAKE IT APPEAR THAT HE IS A "LEFTIST" FOR HAVING WRITTEN IT, IS A FALPABLY CRUDE POLITICAL SMEAR.

The political philosophy of Harry Bridges had nothing to do with Mr. Brown's action, and the chronology of events leading up to it makes this fact absolutely clear.

In FEBRUARY, 1945, our nation was at war. As leader of the Longshoremen's Union, Harry Bridges virtually controlled the operation of West Coast ports through which American men and material had to pass enroute to the theatres of war.

Early in 1944 Bridges' union wrote a voluntary "no-strike" clause into its contract. This action, in support of the war effort, lead the California State Assembly, on JUNE 13, 1944, to pass a resolution publicly praising the union for its pledge. The resolution was voted 58 to 1 and later made unanimous.

On JUNE 26, 1944 - 13 days after the Assembly resolution was passed -- the United States Circuit Court of Appeals denied Bridges a writ of habeas corpus in his fight against deportation.

This led immediately to openly expressed public apprehension that Bridges' workers would tie up the waterfront in sympathy with him.
On AUGUST 11, 1944, Rear Admiral Carlton H. Wright, Commandant of the Twelfth Naval District, wrote an official letter to Bridges in which he stated:

"As Commandant of the Twelfth Naval District I wish to take this occasion to express the appreciation of the Navy here of the work of the stevedore and longshore trades in the transporting of troops and supplies to the war area. It is gratifying to receive your assurances that the work in connection with supporting the war effort will go on."

Government officials, prominent citizens, Legislative leaders and the Press joined in expressing themselves publicly in favor of dropping deportation proceedings against the longshore leader.

Here are some of the actions taken and statements made:

On FEBRUARY 2, 1945, Royce Brier, Editorial Director of the San Francisco Chronicle, a Republican newspaper, wrote in his column:

"Attorney General Biddle is going to deport Bridges simply because he, Biddle, thinks it is a good idea.... Biddle says he has a law for this and undoubtedly he has. So much more the reason for repealing it."

On FEBRUARY 5, 1945, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted a resolution addressed to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Biddle, urging that deportation proceedings against Bridges be abandoned because "incalculable harm" to home front unity would result.

On the same date, FEBRUARY 5, 1945, District Attorney Brown wrote the letter describing the Bridges deportation proceedings as a "threat to industrial peace" and said he hoped Bridges would be permitted the "opportunity" to seek citizenship.

At about this time, members of the West Coast Congressional delegation, including United States Senator Downey, appealed to the President to intervene in Bridges' behalf.

On FEBRUARY 24, 1945, R. R. McFall, California Department Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, wrote President Roosevelt that:

"In the interests of harmony, and in order that we may continue to present a united front in this critical period of our war, I ask for a careful consideration of all the facts in this case."
On FEBRUARY 28, 1945, Governor Mon C. Wallgren of the State of Washington, wrote the President that:

"From impartial observation it appears to me that the residents of the Pacific Coast and the State of Washington favor the dismissal of the deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges."

At the same time 23 members of the Washington State Senate, and 51 members of the Washington State House of Representatives joined in a similar appeal to the President.

On MARCH 31, 1945, Republican Assemblyman Thomas A. Maloney of San Francisco, Speaker Pro Temp of the California Legislature, wrote to President Roosevelt that:

"It would be an economic mistake to deport Mr. Bridges."

On JUNE 18, 1945, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the deportation order against Bridges was invalid.

+ + + + + + +

CHARGE #2

...That Pat Brown is a "leftist" because he held membership in the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild.

THE TRUTH

Pat Brown was a member of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild. The Honorable Edward P. Murphy, Judge of the San Francisco Superior Court, was president of the chapter when Brown served as a vice president in 1945. Serving as vice-president with him was Walter Gordon, now chairman of the California State Adult Authority (an appointee of Governor Warren). Many other prominent California attorneys likewise held memberships in its State chapters, including such leaders of the legal fraternity as Philip H. Angell, of San Francisco, former President of the State Bar of California.

The Guild's national roster included the names of such men as United States Supreme Court Justice Jackson; Federal Judge Ferdinand Pecora, of New York; the Honorable William H. Hasty, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia;
the Honorable James H. Wolfe, Utah Supreme Court; and the Honorable John P. Devaney, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Minnesota.

It is interesting to note that State Senator Jack Tenney, former Chairman of the California Legislature's Un-American Activities Committee, was a charter member of the Los Angeles chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild. He sought law business for his firm, Tenney & Halva, by advertising in the National Lawyers' Guild Quarterly magazine.

Pat Brown resigned from the Guild when it became clear that the Guild's national policies conflicted with his own views. Other resignations followed. In his letter of resignation, District Attorney Brown stated his disagreement with Guild policy in these words:

"It is my belief that the greatest problem facing us today is the prevention of another war. I believe the Marshall Plan will do more than anything else in the world to solve this problem. In view of the Guild's national policy and my own convictions, I have taken the above action" (resignation).

* * * * *

CHARGE #3

...That Pat Brown is a "leftist because his name was used as a member of a committee on a letterhead of the National Citizens' Political Action Committee, Northern California Division, in conjunction with a testimonial dinner for Henry A. Wallace, given at the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, on APRIL 22, 1946.

THE TRUTH

On APRIL 22, 1946, Henry A. Wallace, former Vice-President of the United States, was United States Secretary of Commerce, and in that capacity, he visited San Francisco.

The committee in charge of the banquet represented a cross-section of the leaders of the San Francisco community. The Honorable Roger D. Lapham, Mayor of San Francisco, and a Republican leader, gave the welcoming address. Mrs. Henry
F. Grady, wife of the former American Ambassador to Greece, was chairman of the Arrangements Committee.

**CHARGE #1**

...That Pat Brown is a "leftist" because his name was used in connection with a banquet given by a "Salute to Young America Committee", a Communist-front organization.

**THE TRUTH**

This accusation is based solely upon a report published in the "People's World" under date of November 7, 1945, announcing a "Salute to Young America" banquet, and listing District Attorney Brown as a member of the banquet committee.

The use of District Attorney Brown's name was entirely without his knowledge or authorization. Mr. Brown never appeared at the banquet which he allegedly sponsored. He has never been a supporter of the organization. He has never in any way participated in its activities.
**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**
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</table>
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Field Office File No.: Los Angeles 116-67059

Title: EDMUND GERALD BROWN
CA-15757

Character: AEAA

Synopsis: Commented favorably concerning the applicant's loyalty, character and reputation and stated that to his knowledge, the applicant was never knowingly associated with individuals or organizations of questionable reputation or loyalty. Applicant reportedly spoke at a meeting sponsored by the Mobilization for Democracy in Los Angeles in June, 1946.

- RUC -

DETAILS:

MISCELLANEOUS

On May 16, 1960, California, advised that he has known the applicant for approximately the past 25 years. He stated that he was associated professionally with the applicant between and during which period the applicant was serving as . He related that BROWN continued that his contact with the applicant over the years has been on a limited social basis as well as a professional one and even though they have had their political differences in being associated with different political parties, he has always regarded the applicant as a man of the highest integrity whose morals,

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.
personal habits, reputation and loyalty are above reproach. In addition, [redacted] stated that he has never known the applicant to knowingly be associated with persons or organizations of questionable reputation and loyalty.

By report dated June 20, 1946, U. S. Army Intelligence advised that the Mobilization for Democracy on June 14, 1946 sponsored a "Stop the Klan" meeting at Olympic Auditorium, Los Angeles, California. According to this report, EDMUND BROWN, District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, was introduced at this meeting and spoke briefly. This report indicated that BROWN complimented Los Angeles on "its great meeting tonight" and said he was "going to try to have the same kind of meeting in San Francisco."

The Third Report on Un-American Activities in California, 1947, on page 369 describes the Mobilization for Democracy as one of "the key Communist fronts in California."
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LEAD
WASHINGTON FIELD OFFICE

AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

Will report results of check at CIA.
The records of the Investigations Division, Civil Service Commission, as caused to be checked on May 16, 1960, by IC did not reflect any information concerning Governor BROWN.

The files of the Passport Office, Department of State, reviewed by SE on May 16, 1960, disclose that EDMUND GERALD BROWN was issued San Francisco Series passport #30196 on October 11, 1954, for a five-week trip to Mexico, Guatemala, Uruguay, Brazil and Venezuela to attend the Pan American Congress of Public Law Administration. Attached is a photostat of his birth certificate which lists his birth date as April 21, 1905, at San Francisco, California. He listed his permanent residence as 460 Magellam Avenue, San Francisco, California. He listed his father as EDMUND JOSEPH BROWN who was born at San Francisco, California, on October 22, 1870, deceased. He listed his mother as IDA SHUCKMAN who was born at Venado, California, on January 11, 1879, residing at above permanent residence. He states he was married on October 30, 1931, to BERNICE LAYNE who was born at San Francisco, California, on November 19, 1908.
The file contained no additional pertinent information.

WF T-1 learned on January 26, 1960, that DREW PEARSON, newspaper columnist, had a luncheon appointment with the Soviet Ambassador, MIKHAIL A. MENSHIKOV, on that date. According to informant, PEARSON advised that Governor BROWN of California was in Washington, D.C., and PEARSON wondered if the Ambassador would like to change the luncheon appointment and have luncheon with PEARSON and the Governor. Informant learned that MENSHIKOV invited PEARSON and Governor BROWN to have lunch with him at the Embassy of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics at 1:00 p.m. on January 26, 1960.

Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation observed DREW PEARSON and Governor EDMUND G. BROWN enter the Soviet Embassy shortly before 1:00 p.m. on January 26, 1960. They observed Governor BROWN leave the Embassy about an hour later and observed PEARSON leaving the Embassy almost half an hour after Governor BROWN departed.
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File No. 116-132564

EDMUND GERALD BROWN
AEA - A

mentioned in the report of Special
Agent dated and captioned as above,
has furnished reliable information in the past.

This is furnished for your information and
should not be disseminated to unauthorized persons or
agencies.
EDMUND GERALD BROWN  
AEA - A  

mentioned in the report of Special 
Agent dated and captioned as above,  
has furnished reliable information in the past.

This document contains references  
to and includes the entire contents of  
the Special Agent's Report, dated  
May 18, 1960, and all subsequent  
reports of the same subject.  

All documents should be  
distributed through your agency.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, WFO (116-132564)
EDMUND GERALD BROWN - CA
ta
AEA-A

Rerep of SA dated 5/18/60.

A representative of CIA advised SA that the files of that agency contain no derogatory information concerning BROWN. This information was furnished 5/26/60.

G-G-Bureau
1-WFO
GGD:pam
(4) -

AIRTEL

Approved: 8 JUN 1960
Agent in Charge
EDMUND GERALD BROWN  
also known as Pat*Brown  
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

of California advised on May 23, 1960, that he has known Governor Brown since 1945 when he, [REDACTED], was California State [REDACTED] and Brown was the State Attorney General. He stated there had been differences in political beliefs, however, he felt that Governor Brown was entirely loyal and competent to handle Atomic Energy information.

EMH:jpr  
(6)

CC TO: State  
REQ. REC'D-15-63  
AUG 26 1963  
ANS.  
BY: KMR-CA

NOT RECORDED  
5 JUN 2 1960

MAIL ROOM ☐  TELETYPE UNIT ☐
May 25, 1960

MR. MOHR:

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka
"PAT" BROWN
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT - APPLICANT

Pursuant to the request of the Investigative Division, I talked with the Office of (R. - Calif.) 5-23-60. Previous attempts had been made to get in touch with Brown, but in view of travel status he was not available.

advised 5-23-60 that he had known Governor Brown since 1945 when he, and Brown was the State Attorney General. He stated there had been differences in political beliefs, however, felt that Governor Brown was entirely loyal and competent to handle Atomic Energy information.

has been contacted on three different occasions, the last contact being 5-23-60, relative to determining if desired to make any comments regarding Governor Brown. There has been no reply from to date, consequently, it is anticipated he does not desire to make any comments for the report.

ACTION:

It is suggested this memorandum be forwarded to the Investigative Division for appropriate consideration.

RESPECTFULLY,

C. D. DE LOACH

1 - Mr. Rosen
CDD: sak (3) REC - 1

5 JUN 2 1960

51 JUN 9 1960
EDMUND GERALD BROWN
Also known as "Fat" Brown
ATOMIC ENERGY ACT-APPLICANT

On May 23, 1960, furnished the following comments in connection with this matter:

He has known Governor Brown for about the past 15 years, beginning when he, [redacted] and Brown were a District Attorney there. Later, Brown was Attorney General while [redacted]. While he and Brown were affiliated with different political parties during the above periods, Brown was always most cooperative with him and was considered a good law enforcement officer. There has never been any question in his mind about Brown's honesty and he considers Brown to be loyal to the United States, with no inclination toward communism. There is nothing he could say which would be adverse to Brown insofar as his character, loyalty or associations are concerned.

NOTE: Above interview with [redacted] conducted by SA [redacted], Liaison Section. In accordance with approved procedure for handling interviews in this case, [redacted] was informed of reason for investigation; namely, that it has been requested by Atomic Energy Commission in order to provide basis for clearance determination in view of Brown's need for access to classified Atomic Energy data as Chairman of Board of Regents, University of California.
May 27, 1960

Personal

Mr. C. D. DeLoach
Assistant Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. DeLoach:

With reference to your inquiry about Governor Edmund G. Brown, who is subject to security clearance because of his membership on the Board of Regents of the University of California:

I have no hesitancy at all in giving my unqualified approval to such a clearance.

Sincerely yours,
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Rosen
FROM: Mr. Callahan
SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka Pat Brown, CA 15757

Investigation requested by John A. McCone, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) ordered 5/6/60, completed 5/26/60.

Interviews were conducted with persons associated with Brown in civic, social, legal, official and political fields, but no neighborhood investigation was conducted. All persons interviewed were advised investigation being conducted at specific request of AEC. Attached investigative reports reflect Brown, when District Attorney, San Francisco, in 1945, opposed deportation of Harry Bridges, notorious west coast labor leader; Brown former member and vice president San Francisco chapter National Lawyers Guild (NLG), cited as communist front; in 1945 Brown reportedly sponsored a dinner honoring the American Youth for Democracy (AYD), designated by Attorney General under EO 10450. Brown and Drew Pearson, newspaper columnist, visited Soviet Embassy 1/26/60, to have lunch with Soviet Ambassador Menshikov.

Numerous prominent Democrats and Republicans interviewed, including U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel (R), Congressman John F. Shelly (D), former U.S. Senator William F. Knowland (R), former Governor Goodwin J. Knight (R), all of California, as well as Chief Justice Warren, U.S. Supreme Court. All furnished favorable comments concerning Brown except Brown characterized by those who furnished favorable information as loyal American whose private life and integrity unquestioned. However, some persons close to Brown state he is impulsive and ambiguous in both speech and actions and as a result gets in "hot water" on occasions.

Believes Brown is lacking in character, ability, judgment, integrity and cannot keep a secret. Criticized Brown's handling of recently publicized Caryl Chessman case and also accused Brown of stealing of forming National Association of District Attorneys.

Enclosures
1 - Mr. DeLoach
2 - Liaison Section

EMH:kkn:jpr (8)
Memorandum to Mr. Rosen  
Re: EDMUND GERALD BROWN

Brown, who was advised investigation was being conducted at the request of AEC was interviewed at his request. Brown stated he was aware of allegations of leftist tendencies against him. Said his opposition to deportation of Harry Bridges dictated by military and civic expediency since he feared deportation of Bridges would result in tie-up of California waterfront. Claimed his membership in NLG prompted by legal associates but that he left NLG after becoming aware of the nature of the organization. Brown concluded by stating that one of the greatest problems this country faces today is the danger of Russian communism and that the FBI and he, as Governor of California, have a common purpose in meeting and facing this danger.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the investigative reports be delivered to AEC by a representative of the Liaison Section.

Delivered to  
The Assistant to the
Assistant 6/1/63  
Oakley 7/16/63
Chairman JOHN MCCONE, Atomic Energy Commission, telephoned through the White House operator for the Director. He was advised of the Director's absence and asked if anyone else could be of service to him. He declined to speak to anyone else and asked that the Director return his call through the White House operator. He did not indicate what he wishes to discuss with the Director, but said that it was "quite important."

He was told that the Director would be advised upon his return to the office.

Mr. Mohr knows of no reason for Mr. McCone's call. Mr. Parsons is checking and if he finds any reason for the call, the Director will be immediately advised.

MSR

ADDENDUM: 12:38PM MSR

Mr. Parsons has advised that Mr. McCone may be calling in regard to their request for a Bureau representative on the team surveying French Atomic Energy Security measures. This request was turned down last week. Copies of memoranda regarding this matter are being obtained and will be furnished the Director.
Transmit the following in

(Type in plain text or code)

Via AIRTEL

(Priority or Method of Mailing)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (116-442768)

FROM: SAC, WFO (116-132564) (RUC)

EDMUND GERALD BROWN,
aka Pat Brown - CA - 13737
A2A - A

Re WFO report dated 5/13/60 captioned as above by SA 67C

Rerep stated that HCUA records were unavailable for review at that time.

HCUA records are being reviewed and on 8/23/62, IC reviewed the records of the HCUA and determined that there are numerous references to the applicant while the applicant was acas an official of the State of California, however, these references are not deemed sufficiently derogatory or pertinent to report. UACB, WFO not reporting information contained in HCUA files.

Bureau
WFO

JJO:erm
(4)

AIRTEL

Approved: Special Agent in Charge
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SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD (PAT) BROWN

FILE: 62-HQ-76249
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.
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR
BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Record of Telephone Call or Visitor

July 19

Time 6:55PM

Name DISTRICT ATTORNEY-BROWN
OF SAN FRANCISCO, tele-

thru operator from Chicago

Referred to

Details:

When advised Mr. Hoover was not in
the office Mr. Brown consented to

7:05PM advised that Mr. Brown stated he
was in Chicago attending the Democratic Conven-
tion, that he had never met the Director, and
would like to do so. He further indicated that
if it were possible for him to meet Mr. Hoover
he would make a special trip to Washington, ar-

ving Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr. Cunningham indicated that he was not familiar
with the Director's Commitments, but invited Mr.
Brown to visit the Bureau even if Mr. Hoover
would be out of the City next week, and unable
to meet him. Mr. Brown stated the latter might
be arranged.

It is noted that Mr. Brown was elected District
Attorney of San Francisco in the Fall of 1943.

Mr. Brown may be reached at the Palmer House.

jmh
To: COMMUNICATIONS SECTION.

Transmit the following message to:

MR. EDWARD BROWN
C/O PALAVER HOUSE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

I WAS PLEASED TO RECEIVE WORD OF YOUR CALL LAST EVENING. UNFORTUNATELY PRIOR COMMITMENTS REQUIRE MY PRESENCE OUTSIDE OF WASHINGTON DURING THE COMING WEEK. SHOULD YOU COME TO WASHINGTON, I HOPE YOU WILL CALL AT THIS BUREAU AND DISCUSS MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

[Signature]

COPIES DESTROYED

151 NOV 12 1964

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
681 5TH STREET
WASH. D.C. 20537

JUL 20 1944
Office Memorandum  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. D. M. Ladd  DATE: July 20, 1944

FROM : [Redacted]  call 7 p.m. 7-13-44

SUBJECT:  

Mr. Edmund Brown was referred to my office when he called the Director's Office Wednesday evening.

Mr. Brown stated that he was calling from Chicago, Illinois where he was attending the Democratic National Convention. He advised he is State District Attorney for San Francisco, California and as such, is the "chief law enforcement officer" for that area. He said that he had never met the Director and that in view of the fact that he is as close to Washington as Chicago, he felt that he would like to take advantage of this and come to Washington to meet him.

Mr. Brown went on to state he had no other business in Washington and that his sole purpose in coming would be to see the Director and to discuss Internal Security matters with him. He felt that such an interview or conference would be productive, particularly because of the strategic importance of the San Francisco area. I advised Mr. Brown that I did not know offhand whether the Director's commitments would permit him to be in Washington in the near future and inquired when he felt he would come to Washington. He said he intended to come on either Monday or Tuesday. I told Mr. Brown that we would be only too happy to show him our facilities here and in the event the Director wasn't in Washington, that one of his assistants would be perfectly able to discuss Internal Security Matters with him. He indicated he might come to Washington even though he is not able to see the Director.

Upon Mr. Brown's request, I advised him I would determine whether or not the Director would be available Monday or Tuesday and would wire him in care of the Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois.

ADUNGENDUM

Agent [Redacted] of San Francisco, who is in In-Service School, advises that he understands our relationships with Mr. Brown are very cordial. He personally has met him and thinks rather highly of him. Mr. Brown gives a talk at a police school in San Francisco and once appeared on the same occasion as Agent [Redacted]
Office Memorandum  •  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LBN: HBM  TO:  WP. TOLSON  DATE:  July 24, 1944
FROM:  L. B. NICHOLS
SUBJECT:

On July 19 Edmund G. Brown, Prosecuting Attorney in San Francisco, called the Director. The call was transferred to [REDACTED] who informed him that he was not familiar with the Director's commitments but invited Brown to visit the Bureau providing he was in the city this week. Brown wanted a definite appointment. Consequently, [REDACTED] told him it was highly improbable that the Director would be out of the city the early part of the week but that he would be glad to see him.

In line with the Director's inquiries to check with SAC Pieper on Brown, there is attached hereto a summary from the San Francisco office. Pieper subsequently advised me that he knows Brown personally and that Brown seems to be a capable individual and seems to be doing the right thing. He works very closely with Chief of Police Dillea of San Francisco. There has been some undercover talk that the police commission would like to have gambling in San Francisco. Brown and Dillea take the stand that as long as the statutes prohibit gambling they will enforce the statutes.

There is no specific reason, according to Pieper and Van Pelt, as to why Brown would want to see the Director.

Attachment
TAIL ATTENTION: ASST. DIRECTOR NICHOLS. RE EDMUND GERALD BROWN.

INFORMATION CONCERNING SUBJECT WAS FIRST KNOWN TO THIS OFFICE EARLY IN NINETEEN FORTY TWO WHEN HE EVINCED AN INTEREST IN APPOINTMENT AS SPECIAL AGENT OF THIS BUREAU. HE WAS INTERVIEWED ON MAY EIGHTEEN FORTY TWO, AT WHICH TIME HE DESIRED TO WITHDRAW APPLICATION FOR THAT REASON THAT HE HAD A WIFE AND THREE CHILDREN, HAD BEEN OFFERED OTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO AID THE WAR EFFORT WHICH WOULD MORE CLOSELY CONFORM TO HIS EXPERIENCES AS A TRIAL LAWYER, PAY MORE MONEY, AND ALLOW HIM TO STAY AT HOME WITH HIS FAMILY. HE IS THE RECENTLY ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, HAVING DEFEATED MATTHEW BRADY IN THE LAST ELECTION. HE HAS BEEN ACTIVE IN POLITICS FOR SOME TIME.

REPORTEDLY FORMERLY FINANCIALLY SUPPORTED BY FORMERLY BAIL BOND KING AND POLITICAL POWER WHO WAS EXPOSED BY THE ATHERTON GRAFT INVESTIGATION. REPORTEDLY MATTHEW BRADY, ALTHOUGH VERY CLOSE TO FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, PREVENTED FROM GETTING A RENEWAL ON HIS BAIL BOND LICENSE AFTER THE ATHERTON INVESTIGATION, AND THEREFORE, OPPOSED BROWN. PROMINENT CRIMINAL ATTORNEY IN SAN FRANCISCO, ALSO REPORTED TO HAVE SUPPORTED BROWN ALTHOUGH IT IS PROBABLY HE WOULD HAVE SUPPORTED ANY CANDIDATE OPPOSING BRADY. INFORMANTS CLOSE TO BROWN STATE THAT COPIES DESTROYED
WHEN HE OFFERED SUPPORT, HE CONFERRED WITH CLOSE POLITICAL FRIENDS WHO ADVISED HIM TO ACCEPT IF THERE WERE QUOTE NO STRINGS ATTACHED, UNQUOTE. BROWN SUBSEQUENTLY ACCEPTED SUPPORT ON THAT BASIS. SOURCES CLOSE TO BROWN STATE THAT BECAUSE OF HIS POLITICAL AMBITIONS, HE WOULD BE CAREFUL TO AVOID COMPLICATIONS WITH SUCH A MAN AS AND THAT BROWN IS SEEKING TRAINED INVESTIGATORS FOR HIS STAFF; AND THAT SOME PERSONS BELIEVE HE HAS AMBITIONS OF BECOMING ANOTHER DEWEY. ONI FURNISHED INFORMATION MAY NINETEEN FORTY-FOUR CONCERNING SECURITY MATTER DASH C, SAN FRANCISCO FILE ONE HUNDRED DASH FIVE NINE NAUGHT TWO, TO THE EFFECT THAT THIS INDIVIDUAL, A WELL KNOWN COMMUNIST, HAD OBTAINED IN SEEKING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT, LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION FROM INDIVIDUALS WHO, ACCORDING TO ONI, ARE QUOTE NOT THOUGHT TO BE COGNIZANT OF SUBJECTS COMMUNIST PARTY RECORD, UNQUOTE. ONE OF SUCH LETTERS WAS FROM PAT BROWN WHO IS POSSIBLY IDENTICAL WITH SUBJECT. SUBJECT IS A FORMER CLASSMATE IN LAW SCHOOL WITH OF THE FIRM OF IN SAN FRANCISCO. ARE BOTH MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE REVENUE OF THEIR OFFICE IS ALMOST ENTIRELY FROM THE COMMUNISTS AND RELATED PERSONS. OF THIS FIRM HAS
INCLUDED SUBJECT ON A LIST OF WHAT HE BELIEVES TO BE LIBERALLY LAWYERS. ARE ANXIOUS TO GET BROWN TO JOIN THE LAWYERS
GUILD. BROWN IS IN FREQUENT CONTACT WITH AND
HAD NUMEROUS CONFERENCES WITH THESE PERSONS DURING HIS CAMPAIGN FOR
THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY. BROWN FEELS CONSIDERABLY INDEBTED
TO FOR THE REASON HE IS CONVINCED WAS
INSTRUMENTAL IN HIS ELECTION. SUPPORT TO BROWN
RESULTING IN WHAT BROWN BELIEVES TO BE AN EXTRA EIGHT THOUSAND VOTES,
RESULTING IN HIS VICTORY. REPORTED IN

OCTOBER NINETEEN FORTY THREE THAT BROWN IN THE OPINION OF THE CAMPAIGN
MANAGER FOR OLETA YATES, WAS A SUPPORTER OF OLETA YATES IN HER CAMPAIGN
FOR ELECTION TO THE OFFICE OF CITY SUPERVISOR. OLETA YATES IS SAN
FRANCISCO SECRETARY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY. BROWN IS MENTIONED
FREQUENTLY IN COMMUNIST CIRCLES AS THE PERSON WHO MIGHT BE WILLING
TO APPEAR AT VARIOUS PROGRAMS SPONSORED BY COMMUNIST PARTY FRONTS. HE
HAS CONTRIBUTED TO THE JOINT ANTI-FASCIST RELATIONS COMMITTEE, OR TO
ONE OF THE COMMITTEES FROM WHICH THE J.A.F.R.C. WAS FORMED. NO
INDICATION ON FILE REGARDING ANY FURTHER RELATIONSHIP WITH SUCH PERSONS
OR GROUPS. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES HAVE REFLECTED BROWN BECOMING VERY
INTERESTED IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND IN RACIAL DISCRIMINATIONS HAS DESIGNATED ONE ASSISTANT, [REDACTED], TO MAKE INQUIRY INTO MATTERS INVOLVING RACIAL DISCRIMINATIONS, HANDLING OF RIOTS, ETC., WITH A VIEW TOWARD PREPARING FOR SUCH POST-WAR DIFFICULTIES. SINCE HE IS COMPARATIVELY NEW IN OFFICE AND BECAUSE THESE HAVE BEEN BUT RELATIVELY FEW MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST THUS FAR, HIS RELATIONSHIP WITH THIS OFFICE HAS NOT BEEN A VERY CLOSE ONE BUT I WOULD NOT HESITATE TO APPROACH HIM REGARDING ORDINARY, ROUTINE MATTERS.

PIEPER
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August 2, 1944.

Honorable J. Edgar Hoover,
Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

It was with great regret that I found it impossible to visit your organization in Washington. I trust, however, I will be able to do in the very near future. I know that your office has devoted a great deal of time to municipal police organization and I am sure you made a great contribution to law enforcement.

For the first six months that I have been District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco I have felt the need of constant conferences between the District Attorneys of the various metropolitan cities. I do not know who could take the lead in such conferences, but if your office could do it I would be very happy to help on the West Coast. I do not know whether it would be advisable in war time but as soon as it is ended I think that a conference of District Attorneys throughout the United States should be held in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney
To: The Honorable Roger D. Lapham, Mayor of San Francisco

The creation of a Crime Prevention Department in this office in January, 1944, was an innovation.

Some criticisms were offered that such activity was not within the scope of the duties of a District Attorney; that he is a law enforcement officer and should confine himself to the enforcement of the laws and the prosecution of crime. I submit, however, that a District Attorney's office must concern itself with incipient crime, and that activity by a District Attorney in the field of crime prevention is mandatory.

This office and this Department therefore particularly interested itself in obtaining complete knowledge of all phases of this City's juvenile crime prevention program and in actively supporting this program with every facility of the office. This report is designed to acquaint you with this program and these activities carried on by various agencies and groups in the community. It is our purpose to actively assist in coordinating this work to the fullest extent possible.

This Department also investigated and studied the background and character of first offenders, especially those immediately beyond the juvenile stage, and assisted in their rehabilitation.

**JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION:** An ever-rising tide of juvenile delinquency throughout America is today threatening to engulf the home, the school, the welfare agencies, and the nation.

The situation not only is serious, it is critical, and merits the attention of everyone concerned with the future of America.

Our investigation disclosed that the juvenile crime prevention program in San Francisco is an active and vigorous one. Great industry, ingenuity and effort are being poured into it. Ten official departments or commissions and forty-five private agencies or organizations are directly engaged in fighting juvenile delinquency.

Statistics at best are difficult to obtain or to evaluate—meaning little or nothing if standing alone—but I feel it is safe to say that this concentrated activity accounts for our juvenile delinquency rate being only one percent here in this City. Out of 185,600 children under eighteen years of age in San Francisco, approximately 1,800 cases each year, (official and unofficial) are attended to by the Juvenile Court. This includes not only major crimes but also minor violations (not traffic) and "unofficial" cases.

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND JUVENILES:** This office cannot deal officially with juvenile delinquents. Except in rare instances, minors under eighteen who have committed crimes are not prosecuted by the District Attorney. Their cases, by law must be handled by the Juvenile Probation Department through the Juvenile Court. Furthermore, the District Attorney's office has not the facilities to direct corrective programs over a long period of years, a situation which properly limits the field within which it must function.

This department of the District Attorney, the Juvenile Court, does not exactly, emphasize crime prevention. Deputies address youth groups, 66,14846, clubs and girls' clubs. In our talks, the exciting, unglamorous side of crime is portrayed, the "crime doesn't pay" idea is pictured with stories of actual cases. The damaging, injurious effects of not "playing the game of life" during minority, is stressed.

EDMUND G. BROWN, District Attorney
It is a primary principle of his office to seek a minor's community of those adults charged with contributing to a minor's delinquency. This mandate is never forgotten. Such cases are vigorously prosecuted with all the due process and the mind of the child is not further presenting such cases so that the court is not further imperiled. To end, the proceedings and trials are held at the Juvenile Court without publicity and with minimum testimony on the part of the child involved.

**JUVENILE COURT RECORDS:** The records on Juvenile Court cases prepared by George Brose, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, have been examined carefully.

During the first six months of 1944, there were approximately 700 official cases; 470 of these were delinquency cases; 230 neglect or dependency cases; 320 of these were of Catholic parents; 340 of Protestant parents; six of Jewish parents; thirty-four miscellaneous; 600 were white; 100 were negro; 450 cases came from broken homes of one type or another; 250 from homes not broken.

Three hundred and twenty of the 470 delinquents were boys, 140 girls; 400 in age bracket 14-17; 440 were first-time offenders, 20 were second-timers, 10 were third-timers; 100 of these went to full-time school; 90 neither went to school nor worked. In one-third of the delinquent acts, the child acted alone; in the rest of the cases, the child acted with one or more companions.

One hundred and fifty of the cases involved no parental control; 70 involved unfit homes; 50 "refusal to obey"; 50 habitual truancy; 75 "danger of immorality" (70 girls); 80 auto thefts; 70 burglary; 10 traffic; 15 mischief; 25 other law violations by boys.

In the delinquency group 400 of the 470 were San Francisco residents. More than half of these cases came from the Ellis-Folks and Mission Districts. In about 85% of the cases, the family income was adequate.

In disposing of these cases half of the children were sent home and others were placed in homes of relatives or foster homes, under Juvenile Probation Officer supervision. Twelve boys were sent to the Log Cabin Ranch, 5 to the Preston School of Industry, 3 girls to the Vanturn School for Girls, 2 boys and 2 girls were sent to the California Youth Authority.

There were about 500 "unofficial" cases handled by the Juvenile Probation Department, involving petty thefts, burglary, curfew violations, truancy and malicious mischief. There were 300 traffic court hearings; 10 of these concerned females. Four hundred of the 600 were 17 years of age; 130 were 16 years; 400 were first offenders, 200 were second timers; 400 were charged with speeding, 150 thefts, 200 were repeaters; 200 were charged with property damage, 25 involved license violations; 20 cases involved property damage; 25 involved personal injuries; 200 were driving their own automobiles, 200 their parents' automobiles, 100 their employers' automobiles, 100 some other person's car.

**PROSECUTION OF PARENTS:** The comment sometimes is heard "There is no such thing as juvenile delinquency, it is parental delinquency." In our first year's work we did encounter a number of instances of provable parental delinquency. The School Department and the Health Department have been struggling with these and similar problems for many years.

The Attendance Bureau of the School Department and the Juvenile Probation Department reported to us several aggravated truancy situations where the truancy was occurring with the consent and active cooperation of the child's parents. The attitude of these parents toward the workers was uncooperative, contemptuous and insulting. These parents were cited to the District Attorney's office at the Juvenile Court building. They were advised that the law compels them to send their children to school and they were then instructed that they must comply with this law. They were advised that warrants would be issued if the children were again reported as truants, and there was evidence that the parents were at fault.

In several cases, drastic action was taken and the parents were charged with contributing to the delinquency of their own children.
This was all that was necessary, and parental delinquency in this regard was definitely curbed.

The Health Department reported a number of chronic pediculosis (lice) cases. The cases were traced to infested homes and it was found that the condition was due to flagrant and deliberate parental neglect. Repeated instructions to these parents did no good; the homes remained filthy and the children returned to school infested with lice. It is necessary to send these children home from school. Neither the Health nor School Department can do the "de-lousing" job. The result was these children became truants, remained away from school for long periods.

It is safe to assume that had it been possible to cleanse these children and keep them deloused, they would not have become truants—and truancy we know is often the first step towards more serious delinquency.

The District Attorney's office with the cooperation of the Bureau of Child Hygiene of the Department of Health arrested the parents and charged them with contributing to the delinquency of their children. Much preliminary work was done with these parents before this drastic action was taken. The Medicinal solutions for curing the condition and the cleaning up of the home were actually furnished. The directions for doing the job were supplied printed in five languages.

It was found that where the arrests were made and the work of these parents was interrupted and their income interfered with, the unhealthy condition was soon eradicated.

Adults who aid, abet or encourage minors to violate the curfew ordinance are also prosecuted, of course.

TRANSIENT YOUTH PROBLEM: The problem of the transient youth is one which vorges on the tragic. Mocking into San Francisco literally in mobs and droves, boys and girls alike are faced with the problem of finding shelter in an already overcrowded city. The attractions which draw them to the city are chiefly the desire to enter the Merchant Marine or to find jobs in the ship-building or other war industries. A survey disclosed that they live in cheap "flop houses" or "inhabit" all-night movies, or go home with friendly truck drivers or other chance pick-up acquaintances.

Little or no effort has been directed at aiding this group. The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have an "understanding" by which they endeavor to accommodate younger transients before older men and women are taken care of. But, of course, the facilities of these two organizations are already stretched to the limit.

The San Francisco Center of the California League of Woman Voters has been conducting a survey to ascertain just what conditions exist, and hopes to complete it shortly. The Center intends to use the survey as the basis for a plan which will cure or at least alleviate existing evils.

The Center has agreed to send me the statistics they are gathering, and I hope to use them as the basis of a supplement to this report in a short time.

CHILDREN IN THEATRES: In many cases involving sex offenses against children, it was observed that the contact between the offending adult and the child had been made in a theatre. In our investigation of truancy cases, we found that almost invariably the truant had spent all or part of the time in a theatre where he should have been in school. Conferences were held with the California Theatre Association, Inc., which represents all of the theatres in San Francisco. The Association reported that its members would make every effort to be vigilant, and ushers were specifically instructed to make periodic inspections of the theatre. In connection with keeping children out of theatres during school hours, the Association asserted that invariably when a youngster was challenged, he replied that he was not supposed to be in school at that particular time or that he attends a morning session only, or an afternoon session only, etc., etc. They stated that admission was refused if there was reason to believe that the child should be in school. The Association
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further agreed to go further and assist the authorities in the prevention of delinquency by refusing admission to unaccompanied children after 7:00 P.M. and before 2:00 P.M.

The association gave wide publicity to this self-imposed restriction and to the Curfew Ordinance. They urged parents and children to comply with it. A "Curfew Trailer" was provided. This trailer carried the message of Chief of Police, Charles W. Dulce, regarding the new curfew law. The cost of the production and distribution of this trailer, approximately $5,000.00, was handled by the Association.

The Association reported that its members complain bitterly of the practice which has become quite prevalent during the past two years, of parents "parking" children in theatres. The children are instructed to see the show twice, that they will be called for five or six hours later. These arrangements have been discovered when the small children become restless after seeing the show and start running up and down the aisles.

It was suggested that in order to have the theatre owners and their employees constantly aware of the cooperative practices which we wish them to follow, a set of rules and policies be prepared and posted in theatres so that all employees might become acquainted with them.

The California Theatre Association is entitled to great credit for its splendid attitude which was freely and voluntarily imposed at great financial expense to its members.

BARS, TAVERNS, LIQUOR STORES: Inspection tours of these places were made at frequent intervals. For the most part the taverns were fairly well-lighted. There was substantial evidence of good faith efforts being made to avoid selling liquor to minors. In a number of places, however, we found that minors, especially those seventeen years of age and up, still were able to obtain alcohol in drinks. Liquor store operators particularly often failed to ascertain the age of youthful customers and would accept fictitious letters from parents in some cases.

A good many prosecutions were had involving bartenders and liquor dealers selling to minors. Convictions were obtained in the majority of these cases. However, where it was difficult to determine the age of the minor, the jury would sometimes acquit the offender, even though the law places upon the liquor seller the burden of making sure that the purchaser is over twenty-one years of age. In cases where convictions were obtained, the records were forwarded to the State Board of Extradition with a recommendation that the conviction be revoked.

The San Francisco Bar and Tavern Owners' Association, under the direction of its President, Mr. Edward Dunn, has affected a self-policing organization which has received the compliment of the veteran disease control authorities, the United States Public Health Service and the Medical Joint Army-Air Force Control Board. The District Attorney's office has found that Association of great assistance in disciplining its own members. This form of organization control is more effective than penal punishment in some particular cases.

PUBLIC DANCE HALLS: These places are very well supervised. Minors under 18 are not admitted. However, when a minor under 18 is discovered at one of these places, the Public Dance Hall Committee supervisors not only make sure that the minor is not allowed at the public dance, but they take an interest in the minor and assist in creating a substitute for the public dance. The home of the minor is visited and the parent or guardian is consulted, and work is done to bring into the minor's activity a healthy substitute for the desire to attend the public dance.

There is little evidence of intoxication at these dances. This is probably due to the fact that liquor cannot be sold at a public dance.

da-1
SKATING RINKS: In the time when roller skating rinks were popular in San Francisco, children between the ages of 12 and 21 are assembling at night. Some rinks accommodate as many as 600 skaters each evening, half boys and half girls. Over 75 per cent of the boys are young servicemen, mostly sailors. Our inspection showed practically no chaperoning or adult supervision, but despite this fact, there was little evidence of bad conduct in these rinks. The children keenly enjoy this vigorous activity. The servicemen are typical, clean-cut, energetic, American youths.

The rinks close at about 10:45 p.m. Some of the girls of tender age have considerable distances to travel to get home. This is not good, because, obviously, they are subject to hazards while traveling unchaperoned late at night. Parents are responsible for this condition and enforcement of the chaperoning statute will be invoked if this condition is not corrected.

Intelligent adult supervision and guidance should be brought into activity which hundreds of children find attractive.

THE CHURCHES AND JUVENILE DELIQUENCY: Considerable criticism is heard about the charges of America failing to take a more active part in the fight against crime and juvenile delinquency. Whether the charge as a whole is justified is a moot question. Certainly, some churches have shown the utmost zeal in this direction; with others ranging through lukewarm to cool or cold in their efforts.

The churches of this land have always been looked upon as a potential tower of strength in the guidance of the citizens and particularly in the guidance of the youth of the country.

Ninety-five per cent of the delinquents profess church membership, but only about five per cent have attended Sunday school or received religious training. The lack of religious and moral training is undoubtedly a factor in the troubled lives of these children.

The churches are aware of this situation. They are being encouraged to broaden the scope of church activity in the neighborhoods so all children will be drawn into the church halls and will receive essential religious guidance. In this connection, it is recommended that the "release time" law should be tried in San Francisco. This recommendation is made despite the sincere objections of many who feel that it would break down the fundamental principle of separation of Church and State.

BROKEN HOMES: The relationship between broken homes and juvenile delinquency is definite and startling. In the 700 odd official cases before the Juvenile Court, during the first six months of 1944, 450 of these children came from broken homes of one sort or another; 250 of homes not broken. In other words, two out of every three children in trouble had a background of a broken home.

Insufficient attention is being given by the citizens of our community to the proved fact that the six morals of our people, the carefree and easy divorce and the breakdown in ethical training are the major causes contributing to the delinquency of children.

The skyrocketing divorce rate is breath-taking. In Los Angeles, there were 32,000 marriages performed in 1943, and 28,000 divorces granted. Involved in these 28,000 divorce cases were 15,000 boy and girl victims under 14 years of age. From this group of 15,000 children, who already have two strikes against them, will come most of the future juvenile delinquents.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, San Francisco issued 13,033 marriage licenses; while court records for the same period show: 2,648 final decrees, 3,836 interlocutory decrees; 1,148 annulments, and 17 separate maintenance; a total of 7,539.

We echo the words of competent, energetic, Harold A. Slane, member of the California Youth Authority from Los Angeles: "These staggering divorce statistics foreshadow the disappearance of the old-fashioned American home. It was upon this idea of American home and family life that our great democracy was built. Destroy...
it and it presses the disintegration of our American way of life."

Sloan poses the question: "Who is to be responsible for these 15,000 children, who is going to raise them, and that they get the fundamental training they need so much? Is the State to do it?"

In the same vein, Father Eugene J. Shea, of the Coordinating Council of San Francisco says: "It is practically impossible for a child to develop normally in an abnormal home, and the home in which the parents are divorced or separated is abnormal."

Domestic relation problems and tangles pour into our Domestic Relations Department day after day. Great effort and diligence are put forth to heal the breaches, to keep parents together and to save those homes.

The problem of rebuilding and strengthening the moral fibre of our people and of discouraging divorce is one to which we must give the greatest and most profound thought if we are to keep safe our children, our community and our nation.

It is recommended that the conciliation court be given a real trial, and endeavor on to state that by the time the case reaches the court it is too late.

THE PUBLIC PRESS: Some very fine magazine articles, feature stories and editorials have appeared in the daily papers on juvenile delinquency. This publicity tends to highlight this ever-present and important community problem; tends to focus attention upon it. Articles have appeared directing attention to conditions which stimulate juvenile delinquency; others have challenged parents, schools, churches and the community, pointed out failures in their obligations to children. This work by the press is effective, commendable, fruitful.

Some newspapers, however, undo all the good that comes from such efforts by an ever-increasing tendency to exaggerate the importance of certain public trials. One turns from splendid articles and editorials to find bazaared on the front pages of the papers sensational stories and reports concerning every kind of sex crime, obscene conduct and immoral acts. Great prominence is given to rape, adultery, seductions, sex improprieties, immoral and illicit relations. All the sordid details are printed, with verbatim testimony of court witnesses describing these offensive situations quoted. Prominent personalities are often involved, and children of twelve years of age and up read this unhealthy, innocent, corruptive literature daily. How much damage results to the young people it would be hard to demonstrate, but circulating such pornographic material certainly does an immense amount of harm.

BOOKLET ON LAWS RELATING TO MINORS: On a number of occasions people have asked if we could prepare some sort of a summary of all laws relating to minors. It is thought that if such a summary in booklet form were available, it would be widely distributed and found valuable.

School study and discussion groups could use the booklet for discourses, debates, dramatic plays, etc., designed to acquaint minors with the laws applicable to them. Suits could be designed on the idea that "ignorance of the law is no excuse."

This department has collected and arranged the material for such a booklet. It is now being printed and soon will be in circulation. It is, I believe, a unique development in the war on juvenile delinquency.

POLICE JUVENILE BUREAU: The Police Department has set up its new Juvenile Bureau in the Old North End Police Station on Greenwich Street near Scott Street. Here is central all police facilities and personnel having to do with juveniles. Modern, scientific police methods of handling "pre-delinquent" youngsters and juvenile crime cases are being used.
The splendid Big Brother and Big Sister idea, which has accomplished such wonderful results, and which the Police Department has fostered for so many years, has headquarters in the Bureau.

I, as District Attorney, and other members of my staff, meet with police officers in small groups at the Police Academy. Various phases of juvenile crime are discussed. We believe that the police department is one of the key agencies in discovering and bringing to the attention of the proper authorities the first outcroppings of delinquency.

The Police Department is constantly on the watch for places which are hazardous to children. Within the last two months several indecent shows have been raised, arrests made, convictions obtained. Adults handling pornographic pictures have been arrested, prosecuted and convicted.

SAN FRANCISCO COORDINATING COUNCIL: This Council was set up a few years ago for the purpose of "furthering the cooperation and coordination among the public departments and between the public departments and social agencies in a more effective program for the youth of San Francisco". During 1944, the Coordinating Council ordinance was amended and the structure of the Council changed. The District Attorney became a member of the Council, which now has a membership of ten and an executive secretary. The official members of the Council are the Chief of Police, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Superintendent of Schools, Superintendent of Recreation, and the District Attorney. Five lay members of the Council are appointed by yourself, as you know.

The Board of Education conducts a parental school, suggested by the Coordinating Council. Parents are enrolled in the school and attend eight weekly lectures. This work is well carried on and the instruction is extremely valuable. The District Attorney's office handles one of these lecture periods, instructs the group on the various phases of the "legal responsibility of parenthood".

Under the San Francisco Coordinating Council there are nine district Coordinating Councils situated in the nine districts of the city.

Meetings of these District Coordinating Councils are attended by a representative of the District Attorney's office. They have proved extremely interesting. The enthusiasm and zeal of the members of the District Committee is inspiring. Meetings are well attended-the average attendance being 16 people. In addition to official members present, there frequently seemed to be a number of "people in the neighborhood" who were participating in the work of the District Council. These committees are familiar with their districts and are intimately acquainted with the problems and needs of the area. This type of work at the neighborhood level is of extensive value and should be encouraged and expanded.

Members of these district councils are discouraged and frustrated, however, over the failure of the Coordinating Council to give assistance in executing the carefully developed plans for district improvements which they have repeatedly recommended.

In a special report by the 1944 Grand Jury, the ineffectiveness of the Coordinating Council under the legal limitations surrounding its present setup is commented upon. The report approves this office's suggestion that all work and activity of every kind relating to children and youth in our city should be under the supervision of a Director of Child Welfare, said director to have capacity and authority similar to the Director of Public Health. Now legislation is probably not necessary, because the executive secretary of the Council can no doubt do this work. A new secretary has been employed, and time should demonstrate the validity of this suggestion. We are convinced that the council is doing a necessary work and aiding the city-wide child welfare program.
SEEMERS CLUB OF SAN QUENTIN PRISON: In 1943 an organization was formed in San Quentin Prison by a group of men and named the "Seekers Club". The purpose of the club is to "promote self-betterment of men in prison; to render mutual help through open discussion. The group claims to be "seeking the truth" about themselves. Sometimes they are quite brutal with each other in pointing out their own defects and weaknesses. Truth and honesty is demanded; a man must admit his wrongdoing in prison, paying his debt to society, in order to become a member. Self-pity is shunned and the ultimate aim of the group is to help a fellowmen straighten out his slant on life so that when he gets out he will have a better chance of getting on with his neighbors, of living correctly in society.

One of the founders writes, "We admit that our program will not make honest men out of each and every member, but we firmly believe that a certain percentage of them will never again cross swords with the law. In the final analysis they have discovered themselves to be their own worst enemies."

My office was invited to send a representative to attend the Saturday afternoon meetings of the club. Several appointments and myself have attended on various occasions. There are about 200 members; between 100 and the weekly meetings. The invitation was issued to my office so that we might become acquainted with the club's plan for reducing juvenile delinquency.

The Seekers Club has suggested that every juvenile offender be unofficially sentenced to one day in San Quentin. He should be taken on a complete tour through the prison, shown the grim realities of prison life, the grab, tigers; depressing routine; he would see the sets where the man live, would see death row and the gas chamber. Specially selected members of the Seekers Club would go on the tour, would attempt to quietly implant in the young mind the dismal horrors, the hopelessness of life of crime; the sacrifice of freedom would be emphasized. Selected men who have served fifteen and twenty years behind bars would address the youth along the same vein.

I have discussed this matter with several psychologists, and although the plan has merit, it also has potentialities for harm, in their opinion. They agree that the effect of such a visit would vary greatly with the individual juvenile, with some juveniles it would be just the right thing. To others the shock to their nervous system, through such a morbid scene, would be harmful.

In the second part of their program the club makes the further suggestion that every single parent involved in a divorce ac-

The meetings of this club were interesting, instructive. Each meeting is presided over by a different member. A plan of char-
acter analysis by chart has been developed.

I am impressed by the sincerity of these men, believe they are working hard to accomplish the aims and purposes of the club, and are consequently reclaiming some who have been sent to the penitentiary.

GANG ACTIVITY: One gang in San Francisco has been causing trouble during the past four years. Their criminal records and his-

Only vigilant and unceasing police surveillance keep the pre-

We attempted to learn why these persons couldn't be rehab-

They want to be big-time criminals. Their design of living is predicated upon rob-
bing, burglarizing, assisting. They think they’re all high-speed drivers, auto thieves. They can get an automobile open, started and moving by using a 'jump rope', faster than you or I can do it with a key. The girls are precocious, vile, vicious and abusive."

A special and intensive effort was made to help some of these people; to get them on the right track; to get them into clean work and activity. This effort these gangsters called "giving us baby-talk". By assistants were deceived and abused.

This gang has two recognized leaders. One was released from San Quentin in 1944; the other entered that institution during the same year. In all, twelve of the gang were sent to San Quentin during 1944. Federal authorities took over a number of them as draft evaders; others have been inducted into the Armed Forces during the last two years.

But the gang gets new recruits; it remains an organized and operating group; it has not been rooted out and exterminated in spite of the best efforts of the authorities.

We contacted the Joe-Rats Club in San Quentin, explained the problem, told them here was a definite challenge for their club to work on. The members of the gang who were in the prison were invited to attend Joe-Rat-Club meetings. The gang leader and several others joined the club, the gang leader was chairman of one of the usual Saturday meetings.

The gang members still at large are under suspicion in connection with the recent large number of side-swacks.

LATINO-AMERICAN DAYGS: Several Latin-American groups have formed into gangs. One is known as "The Jenny Jive Club", another as "The Actor". The Jenny Jive Club has about 70 members aged from 12 to 19 years.

Members of these gangs are American born Mexicans, Philippinos, Negroes, a few whites. The group segregates themselves; seems to want it that way. Members carry a "chip on their shoulder", look constantly for trouble, get together and attempt to raid or "crash" other 'teen-age parties and dances; they constantly cause disturbances at these places whether admitted or kept out; they have brutally assaulted other youngsters; they are problems in schools, many are below average intelligence, many are non-readers. They claim that they are not wanted, that they are discriminated against.

Strenuous, vigorous, well-managed and intelligent work has been done with these groups to integrate their activity into the San Francisco community program. Our best youth leaders have directed these efforts. To date there has been no success. The plan has been to work segregation, to get these children to single, work, play and study with the other children of the neighborhoods. It hasn't worked.

These groups live and congregate in the industrial district around 8th and Howard streets, and in the Mission District, vicinity of 21st and Howard Streets. They are definitely known and many have juvenile court records.

Extensive investigation of this critical community problem was made. The best we have in San Francisco is laboring in this field today.

This is a serious and tremendous problem. It must be met and a solution must be found. There is, and there can be, no compromise until the problem is settled.

Perhaps segregation is the answer. Perhaps giving these groups recreational centers of their own is the thing to do.

San Francisco authorities are experimenting. They hope to find the answer!

One other angle reflecting the complexity of this matter came
to light recently. In some of the groups Negro membership has run
now the Mexican youths have decided (in club rule) that no more
Negroes shall be admitted; privately these children have added that
they hope the present Negro members will crop out.

There is not now, nor can there ever be room in America for
race prejudice, for intolerance, based on a difference of race, of
creed, or of color. Every decent person in this and in every

We have a plan for enlisting the aid of the various consuls
residing in San Francisco to aid in our fight on juvenile delinquency.
Under the suggested plan the consuls will aid in breaking down the
"group barriers" wherever they exist among their own nationals.

These consul to whom the matter has thus far been mentioned
unanimously gave the plan their whole-hearted approval, and promised
strong support.

I believe a great deal can be accomplished by attacking this
problem from such an angle.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, I present these recommendations, to which I
have been led by a careful consideration of the data presented in the
foregoing report:

(1) Every effort possible must be made to cut down the divorce
rate. People must be made to realize that the marriage contract is
sacred and that others than themselves are interested in its mainten-
ance. In theory, the latter is a party to every divorce action. This
theory should be made a fact. In this connection, the court of
conciliation might be utilized. In every case where a divorce
action is filed in the Superior Court and there are children of the
marriage, a full and complete report should be made to the Court
before the decree is granted showing the actual and real cause for the
divorce. This investigation should be made by an intelligent person
appointed by the Court. (Judge I. Harris has ordered such an investiga-
tion in many cases appearing before him but it is the exception
rather than the rule at present in San Francisco.)

(2) Men and women who contribute to the delinquency of minors
must continue to be promptly and vigorously prosecuted. Places of
public refreshments and amusement should be rigidly supervised
and where violations of law involving offenses against minors are
discovered, rigid penalties should be imposed,

(3) Recreational facilities of the City should be continued
and, whenever possible, expanded. Such facilities should be planned
to permit home training of children and not take them away from home
at night.

Other cities have found swimming pools to be one of the best
activities with which to combat juvenile delinquency. Swimming is
a good clean sport which nearly every boy and girl enjoys. No paraph-
eralia is needed, and it can be engaged in at any convenient time,
with or without companions.

San Francisco is woefully lacking in such facilities. True,
so have Clovis pool, but its location unfortunately is too remote
from the districts most in need of facilities.

It would be better to have a number of smaller pools scattered
throughout the city, than to have only a few large pools.

It will be, of course, difficult to secure the necessary
materials at the present time; but the construction of
such pools should be in at the earliest possible date.

(4) The School Department with the assistance of other public
agencies must devote more time and money to the reduction of truancy.
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Truancy is the first evidence of delinquency. Publicity of the facts of truancy, not the individual case, should be given to the general public. The people of San Francisco have no idea at the present time of the extent of truancy.

(5) Physicians know that anything which adversely affects the health of a child makes for juvenile delinquency and crime.

Decayed tooth, stomach ulcers, nervous disorders, and their like, all tend to develop juvenile delinquency.

Every child should have the benefit of frequent examinations and treatment by skilled physicians. If the parents cannot, or do not, see that the child receives such medical treatment as it requires, it then becomes the duty of the State to see that the child is given treatment.

Every child is entitled to a sufficient and proper diet. Here too it is the duty of the parents to furnish what is needed, and if they fail, the duty devolves upon the State.

Los Angeles now has plans for the erection as soon as possible in the post-war period, of a new $300,000 downtown health center for that city's school children. The proposed center will provide special diagnostic services for children with chest and heart diseases, endocrine disorders, postural, orthopedic, behavioral and mental problems. It also will afford x-ray examination and emergency health care by school officials, and dentists and specialists volunteering their services. Needy children will be treated under P.T.A. sponsorship. The present Yale Street Clinic (principal unit of 23 P.T.A. sponsored clinics in the city) is said to be treating about 22,000 pupils annually.

(6) The character of most children is formed chiefly by conditions existing in the home. Every child is entitled to a good home, to loving care, to proper home training and guidance. For that reason, whatever makes for good home makes for a decline in delinquency by minors and a lower crime rate. Overcrowding, unsanitary quarters, low-income parents (resulting in "doorkey" children) irregular hours, and similar results of the impact of war industries upon San Francisco, all bring child delinquency and crime. They all must be fought by every means within the city's power. You cannot have people sleeping in the Terminal Building; the Ferry Building, and other public buildings for lack of a home, and expect those people to raise normal, healthy children.

In one home in the Sunset District there are fifteen people living in five rooms. Impossible! Not at all! The group consists of a war worker, his wife and their three children; his sister-in-law, her husband (both working) and their four children; two adult sisters of the war worker (both of whom work); and two elderly relatives of members of the group. The living room and the dining room of this home have both been converted into sleeping quarters. Cooking is all done on one stove in the living room, with each group having its fixed hours of kitchen use. Cats for some of the children have been placed in the basement.

These people are upper middle class, of a high degree of intelligence, and have a splendid income. They are willing and anxious to secure larger and better quarters for all of them, but thus far have been unable to find any suitable place for rent.

I believe that a renewed, continuous and vigorous campaign should be begun at once to secure more housing for San Francisco and this entire vicinity. With more people flocking here each day, the situation will become increasingly intolerable.

As to the present emergency shortage, more steps must be taken immediately to give shelter to all individuals unable to secure shelter.

Across the City Hall are the wartime emergency barracks erected for the Armed Forces and others directly connected with the
For effort, such as merchant seamen.

In four nights of the week (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday), these quarters are usually only ten percent occupied. On the other three nights (Friday, Saturday and Sunday), they are usually filled to capacity.

Any vacant space in these quarters on any night should be made available to the Red Cross.

I am sure that these quarters were erected on a priority which provided they be used only for the Armed Services or closely allied branches of the Government, but certainly every effort should be made to secure an ending of this instruction. If the problem is properly presented to the Federal authorities, I believe this space can be made available.

If this space cannot be secured, and no other suitable space is obtainable, then I suggest the following:

I have been informed that the Red Cross keeps thousands of cots stored in an Pingram for an emergency. Tell, the emergency is here.

I urge that the Red Cross be asked to allow the use of these cots by those persons who cannot secure shelter from the elements.

I suggest that the city throw open each night (any at eleven o'clock or so) some suitable building, such as the Civic Auditorium, for the use of the homeless. Each person can be then fed a substantial meal. They can rest in a few minutes, and then lie down and rest until dawn.

Upon their leaving in the morning, the men fold the cots and blankets, and will then use them in the room for use the next night.

One or two weeks should be all that would be required to patrol the building, for protection against fire, theft, etc.

If the city is unable to pay for such an and for other incidental expenses of the plan night until, I have a dozen organizations that will undertake it.

If the Civic Auditorium should prove too small to accommodate the homeless, I suggest that the ball of such buildings as the City Hall and the Public Library be used also. This is an emergency and can only be met with temporary measures.

Every residence of any means of a house is capable of being utilized for a shelter, and should be utilized for this purpose for the efficiency of the San Francisco Police Department.

(7) There is a very close connection between the health of a child and the family. A untitl. in being taken by the School Board is the best in the interest of the health Department but not enough, as soon as medically an expert opinion should be instituted that would investigate the health of each and every child in the schools.

(8) The religious needs of the City should implement their purpose and make the church a vital, living force in San Francisco family life. A definite church juvenile program should be instituted.

(9) The "Release This Man" for religious instruction should be tried. It could be so that one could help not only the child but many parents who would be attracted to the church by the child.

(10) It has been suggested that a new juvenile institution be located in the East for intermediate offenders. It is my feeling that institutions such as Preston are ineffective. The larger counties should take care of their own; until it is determined that an institution is absolutely needed, and not until, shall that institution be authorized for a state institution. Prominent citizens, such as the presidents of the Chamber of Commerce,
Labor Unions and Service Clubs could be encouraged to have delinquent boys or girls report to them as unofficial probation officers. Let each of these public-spirited citizens take the responsibility for but one boy or girl who has gotten into trouble.

(11) After the "war," Vienna, Austria, held first place in Europe for legislation affecting juvenile delinquents.

I have secured a copy of the laws of that city on this subject, and am studying them with the intention of recomposing the adoption laws of such of the laws as I believe would aid us in our fight on juvenile delinquency and crime.

(12) A great need exists for a printed means of communication which would act as a clearing house for ideas and developments throughout the nation in the field of juvenile delinquency.

Many cities and states are trying, with varying degrees of success, new and radical means and methods for combating juvenile delinquency and crime.

Buffalo, N.Y., for example, has a foster home plan which gives indications of offering a solution for at least one phase of the problem juvenile delinquents present.

A sheriff in Texas has another.

Firemen in some New England cities, towns and villages are fitting up club rooms for boys and girls in fire stations, in a sincere effort to combat juvenile delinquency.

A means should be devised for getting such developments into the hands of all the people interested in wiping out juvenile delinquency.

(13) An eminent psychiatrist points out that four things are essential to the development of a rich and stable character and personality in children. The four are:

1. Purposeful work
2. Creative play
3. Something to love
4. Something to believe in. (Religion)

Every effort should be made to secure these four things for every boy and girl in San Francisco.

(14) There is a real shortage in San Francisco of experienced probation officers and trained personnel for dealing with delinquent youth—a shortage which is resulting in the rapidity and damnation of some of the finest boys and girls in America.

True, there is a war! True there are many reasons for the shortage! True the blame can be laid in very places!

But equally true, delinquency among juveniles is rising at an alarming rate throughout the nation. It won't wait! It won't stop! It will continue to rise and grow unless it is fought on every front—constantly, vigorously and unrelentingly.

Tomorrow the penitentiaries of this state will be filled with the boys and girls of today, unless the community acts NOW to save them.

I am certain that if the average intelligent man and woman of this city would devote just a little time to the so-called delinquent child—would take just a little interest in guiding the footsteps of that child in the right path—a large part of the crime problem of today and tomorrow would be solved.

I believe we, the people, can lick juvenile delinquency and crime. I believe that in this first year of operation our Crime
Prevention Department has well proved its value.

I believe that it is cheaper and easier for society to prevent a youth from becoming a criminal, than it is to reform that youth after he has become a criminal.

I intend to continue and enlarge the Crime Prevention Department, and I invite the earnest support and aid of every official, every man or woman, every youth in San Francisco, in preventing crime.

Respectfully submitted,

EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, California, 550 Montgomery Street.
August 15, 1944

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Honorable Lecanda G. Brown
District Attorney
550 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 11, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

I have your letter of August 2, 1944, and I regret very much that I was out of the city when you visited Washington recently. I hope that the next occasion when you come East I will have the pleasure of seeing you.

I noted with interest that conferences among District attorneys are desirable and I am very glad indeed to have your views. In the police field we have had a great deal of success through the holding of the FBI Law Enforcement Conferences of which there are between 350 and 450 held each four months throughout the United States. These conferences are called regularly by the Special Agents in Charge of the FBI Field Divisions so that we may coordinate the activities of the local, county, and state law enforcement organizations who work with us in carrying out our internal security functions.

It was good of you to write to me and I appreciate your thoughtfulness.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

San Francisco, August 13, 1944
March 10, 1945

Mr. Edmund G. Brown  
District Attorney  
550 Montgomery Street  
San Francisco 11, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

I appreciate very much indeed your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of the 1944 report of the Crime Prevention Department. I hope that you will continue to make such interesting information available, and I would like to have a copy of the book you are preparing on laws relating to minors when it is completed.

If we of the FBI can be of service at any time, by all means let us know.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

cc - San Francisco
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Confidential and Personal

It has been my observations during the past fourteen months, as District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, that we are prosecuting a great many men in the Army and Navy and also many returned veterans. A great portion of these have seen action, or have been aboard ships for a long period of time. Some of these cases are psychiatric, some are not. I believe it will get worse, before it gets better, particularly as the war goes on or is concluded.

It occurred to me that a thorough examination should be made into individual cases of Army, Navy, and returned veterans personnel. This examination should consist of a psychiatric examination, examination of records prior to entry into the Army or Navy, and record during service in the armed forces. I would set up a board consisting of a psychiatrist, representative of the Army, Navy, and representative of the felony trial court, as well as a representative of my office. We could examine into the record and facts of each case and determine whether a person should be prosecuted or dismissed or given hospital treatment under supervision.

The situation we find in San Francisco is probably true in other parts of the country. I would thank you to let me have your views on this subject because it is my intention to take some action. I trust that I have made myself clear but if you desire any clarification of my views I would be glad to discuss it with you.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney
March 19, 1945

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
District Attorney
City and County of San Francisco
550 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 11, California

My dear Mr. Brown:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 12, 1945, wherein you advise that because of the large number of service personnel who are prosecuted, that you believe it advisable these individuals be afforded a thorough examination to inquire into the record and the facts of each case prior to the time a decision is made as to prosecution.

I wish to advise that inasmuch as the matter to which your letter relates is one of policy, I have taken the liberty of referring your letter to the Attorney General.

I want you to know that I sincerely appreciate the interest which prompted you to communicate with me.

Sincerely yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director
Office Memorandum

TO: The Attorney General

FROM: John Edgar Hoover - Director, F.B.I.

DATE: March 19, 1945

SUBJECT:

There are attached herewith copies of a letter received by this Bureau from Honorable Edmund G. Brown, District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, California, wherein he requests an expression concerning a proposal made by him that service personnel who are involved in criminal activities be given a thorough examination prior to the time prosecution is authorized against them.

Inasmuch as this relates to a matter of policy, the same is referred for any observations and comments you may desire to make and Mr. Brown is being advised of the reference of his letter to you.

Enclosure

62-76 2y.9.8
March 23, 1945

Honorable Robert P. Patterson

War Department

Washington, D. C.

Dear Bob:

I am enclosing you a copy of a letter to Edgar Hoover from the District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, which Mr. Hoover has referred to me since it involves a matter of policy.

I should be very glad to have your reaction on Mr. Brown's suggestion that he set up a board, on which would be included representatives of the Army and Navy and a psychiatrist, to examine individual cases that are subject to prosecution. You may wish to answer Mr. Brown yourself.

Sincerely yours,

Francis Biddle

Encl.
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. HOOVER

I return you your memorandum of March 19, to which is attached a copy of Mr. Brown's letter of March 12, and a copy of Secretary Patterson's letter to me in reply thereto.

You might wish to write Mr. Brown indicating that you have talked to the War Department and stating their views.

Francis Biddle
Attorney General
Honorable Francis Biddle,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Francis:

This is in reply to your letter of 23 March with a copy of letter to Mr. Hoover from Edmund C. Brown, District Attorney of San Francisco.

Mr. Brown suggests setting up a board which would include representatives of the Army and Navy, to examine into the cases of service men and veterans who are brought before criminal courts.

I do not favor any proposal which would indicate that there is a special problem created by criminal acts committed by members of the armed forces or veterans. I do not believe that they violate the criminal law any more than any other comparable group. Any plan that would give indication to the contrary, in my opinion, should be discouraged.

Sincerely yours,

Robert P. Patterson
Under Secretary of War.
April 13, 1945

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
District Attorney
San Francisco County
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

With reference to your communication of March 12, 1945, I took the liberty of transmitting this information to the Attorney General, who in turn has communicated with the Under Secretary of War.

I am now in receipt of a memorandum which was prepared by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, in which he has advised the Attorney General that he did not favor any proposal which would indicate that there is a special problem created by criminal acts committed by members of the armed forces or veterans. The Under Secretary of War indicated he did not believe members of the armed services or veterans violate the criminal law any more than any other comparable group and any plan which would give indication to the contrary in his opinion should be discouraged.

I thought you would be interested in knowing of the opinion which has been rendered by the Under Secretary of War with reference to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

J. Edgar Hoover
Director

[Signature]
October 24, 1945

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

I have been reading the Uniform Crime Reports, Volume 16. From a careful reading of this report it would indicate that San Francisco has more crime than any other city of comparable size in the United States.

I would thank you to advise me whether my conclusion is correct and if so whether your statisticians and criminologists are able to give any reason for it. I assure you that I would keep any reply that you would make extremely confidential, but I am interested in finding out why we have more violations than any other city.

If my office is not functioning, I think it is about time that it did. Any help or any thoughts will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney
November 2, 1945

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
District Attorney
City and County of San Francisco
550 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 11, California

My dear Mr. Brown:

I have your letter of October 24, 1945, concerning the amount of crime in San Francisco as reflected by data appearing in the Uniform Crime Reports Bulletin.

A comparison of the crime rates for San Francisco with the national average for cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants discloses that the San Francisco figures are above average for all offense classes. However, when the San Francisco figures are compared with the average for cities with over 100,000 inhabitants in the Pacific states, it is observed that the San Francisco rates are below average for burglary and larceny, although they are above average for the remaining offense classes. In other words the average figures for the Pacific states are higher than the corresponding averages for the entire nation.

As you know, the amount of crime committed in a community is influenced by many factors, some of which are listed on page 21 of the enclosed Uniform Crime Reports Bulletin. In order to ascertain more definitely the factors contributing most heavily to high crime rates in a specific community, it would be necessary to survey the functioning of all branches of the machinery charged with enforcing and administering the laws, as well as to survey the community with a view to determining the adequacy of crime prevention programs. As indicated in the Uniform Crime Reports Bulletin, throughout the United States approximately one-half of the crimes against property are committed by persons under 21 years of age.

It is suggested that you may wish to refer to reports of surveys of criminal justice conducted in other cities, copies of which are undoubtedly available in your local libraries. I am enclosing a copy of "How to Use the Uniform Crime Reports" which may be of assistance to you in connection with your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director
Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

In a recent issue of "Newspaper Man", an editorial said:

"There is a bright side to almost everything, and without being Pollyanna, we can take a certain satisfaction in the announcement of J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that there are 5,000,000 criminals on the American scene gearing themselves for action."

Will you be so kind as to advise me if you made such a statement, and if so, what the occasion was? If you should have a copy of the speech, or talk in which this reference was made, I should be very glad indeed, to have it.

I am now preparing my report for the two years, 1944 and 1945, and would like to use this quotation if you are correctly quoted.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

District Attorney

[Date: February 6, 1946]
February 15, 1946

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
District Attorney
City and County of San Francisco
550 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 11, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

Your letter of February 6, 1946, has been received and I wish to advise I did not make the statement you mentioned. From time to time I have stated that the files of the FBI's Identification Division contain the fingerprints of six million different persons arrested to answer for a criminal charge. I am enclosing copies of two recent addresses which will provide further information on this subject.

I have heard a number of reports concerning your work with young people in San Francisco, and I hope that from time to time as the occasion presents itself you will keep me informed of your accomplishments. In the event I can be of service at any time please do not hesitate to communicate with me.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Enclosure

Address delivered at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.
Remarks before the Annual Board Meeting, Catholic Youth Organization.

CC-San Francisco

EDM:02/15/46
February 20, 1946

Honorable J. Edgar Hoover
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

I will be in Washington during the week commencing March 25, 1946. I would appreciate an opportunity of discussing some of the law enforcement problems that we have on the west coast. Would you please advise me whether it would be convenient for you to see me during that week. May I also take this opportunity to thank you for the courtesies that were extended by your office to Harding J. McGuire, the Assistant District Attorney in charge of homicides during his recent visit to Washington.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter that I addressed to Tom Clark, United States Attorney. I would appreciate it very much if you could have someone in your department read this letter and advise me whether anything can be done.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney
Honorable Tom Clark  
United States Attorney General  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Clark:

I will be in Washington during the last week in March in connection with some business of this office. At that time I am very desirous of discussing with you the case of People v. Alfred L. Cline. This man has murdered eight women. He has refused to make any statement of any kind, nature or description. His modus operandi was to meet a woman, marry her, obtain her signature, forge documents, and then transport her from state to state and finally poison her in a hotel room, cremate her body and then obtain her property. The essential weakness of all eight cases is the inability to determine the cause of death.

Four of the murders took place prior to 1932. The Los Angeles District Attorney's office at that time concluded that they did not have sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution, principally because of the facts above set forth. He was, however, convicted of administering poison to an old man who did not die. As soon as he got out he commenced his activities all over again and this time murdered four old women. The man was arrested in San Francisco, but no murders were committed in San Francisco.

I have taken the burden of attempting to determine which city has the best case against Mr. Cline. I have now concluded that Portland, Oregon, the scene of the last death, has by far the best case. My deputy advises me that this District Attorney is reluctant to expend
a great sum of money in the prosecution of this case because of the inherent weaknesses hereinabove set forth. I intend trying him for forgery in San Francisco and have a good case against him, but a conviction in those cases will only keep him in the penitentiary for a relatively short period of time. I believe the case is one that calls for the coordinated efforts of your office and the Department of Justice to the end that this man be not permitted to kill any other individuals. In addition to that, failure upon the part of this office or the other offices to convict this man might result in a series of crimes of a similar nature because a great many evil and designing men are, I am sure, watching the outcome of this case.

I realize that this does not fall within the statutory jurisdiction of your office, and probably does not fall within that of the Department of Justice, but a central coordinating agency is necessary to sift all that we have obtained and then use the great powers vested in your office to aid or assist the local community.

I trust that I made myself clear and would like to have your advice on this extremely important matter.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney
Attached is a summary memorandum regarding our relationship with Edmund G. Brown, District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, who, according to a letter to the Director, dated February 20, 1946, has indicated a desire to see the Director some time during the week commencing March 25, 1946, to discuss law enforcement problems on the West Coast.
March 5, 1946

MEMORANDUM

RE: EDMUND (PAT) GERALD BROWN
DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

BACKGROUND

Edmund Gerald Brown was born April 21, 1905, at San Francisco, California, attended elementary and high school there, and was graduated from the San Francisco Law School with an L.L.B. degree in 1927. He was admitted to the bar in San Francisco in October, 1927, and thereafter apparently became engaged in the practice of law in the firm of Edmund G. Brown and Harold C. Brown (a brother) located in the Russ Building, San Francisco.

He is a member of the Elks Knights of Pythias, San Francisco Bar Association and the California State Bar.

He was married to Bertrice Layne who was born in San Francisco [redacted] had three children. His parents were born in this country. His brother-in-law [redacted] was employed, according to Brown's statement, [redacted] at San Francisco. Brown in 1942 resided at 680 Nagellan Avenue, San Francisco, California.

Brown was first known to the FBI when on December 16, 1941, he requested an application for appointment as a Special Agent. In his letter he stated he had practiced law in San Francisco in his own office for the past 15 years and that in
In 1939 he had been defeated as candidate for District Attorney of San Francisco, although receiving 940,000 votes. He said, "It is my desire to serve in some capacity during the period of the emergency." On April 4, 1942, Brown submitted his application as Special Agent, from which the above background material was obtained. On May 28, 1942, Brown was interviewed by an Agent of the San Francisco office at which time he stated that since filing his application, he had been offered other opportunities to aid in the war effort which would be more in accordance with his experience as a trial lawyer and asked that his application be withdrawn. (67-288686)

It has been reported to the Bureau that Brown's father was a bookmaker operating in and around the San Francisco area. (62-75147-47)

**POLITICAL BACKGROUND**

On January 8, 1944, Brown took office as District Attorney for the city and county of San Francisco, replacing Matthew Brady, who had held the post for some 30 years. Brown has been active in politics in San Francisco for a considerable length of time and it was reported to the Bureau that he had been formerly financially supported by formerly a bail-bond king in political power, who was exposed by the Atherton graft investigation in 1937. Reportedly, Matthew Brady, a former District Attorney, although very close to for a number of years prevented from getting a renewal of his bail-bond license after the Atherton
investigation and, therefore, opposed Brady bitterly. A prominent criminal attorney in San Francisco named also is reported to have supported Brown, although according to information received by the Bureau, it is probable he would have supported any candidate opposing Brady. Informants close to Brown stated that when he was offered support, Brown conferred with close political friends who advised him to accept it provided there were "no strings attached." Brown subsequently accepted this support on that basis. Sources close to Brown stated that because of his political ambitions he would be careful to avoid complications with such a man as and that Brown is seeking trained investigator for his staff. It is believed in certain quarters that Brown aspires to become another "Thomas Dewey."

It is reliably reported that Brown appears to be "playing both sides" at the present time. He is reported to be honest but is looking toward the future in a political way, being anxious not to make enemies on any side. One of his present investigators is an experienced man whereas two are political appointees. Brown has appointed as his assistant former Assistant United States Attorney Thomas Lynch of San Francisco, who was regarded as being a very capable and honest individual. Lynch is extremely friendly and cooperative with the San Francisco Field Division. (62-75147-47; section 3)

COMMUNIST PARTY SUPPORT OF BROWN

The files do not reflect that Brown openly aligned himself either before or after election to office with the
Communist Party of America. There is, however, evidence to support Brown's espousal of not only the dropping of the Harry Bridges' deportation proceedings but also the candidacy for city office of one avowed Communist candidate.

The Communist Party's sole candidate in the November, 1943, San Francisco Nonpartisan elections was Oleta O'Connor Yates, a full-time functionary in the San Francisco Communist Party, who entered the race for supervisor. She polled 39,416 votes and placed tenth in a group of 17 candidates, six of whom were elected. It was estimated she received 18 per cent of the votes cast and ran much stronger than any other Communist candidate in previous years.

The Communist Party in San Francisco exhibited considerable interest in the mayoralty and district attorney (Brown) campaigns. The Party, as well as the CIO organisation in San Francisco, had switched their support from McPhee, a Republican, to George Reilly, a Democrat, for mayor, because, according to reliable information, "they did not want to strengthen the Republican machine for 1944 because they should keep Roosevelt after the war so that they can strike all they want to as he will not interfere if they have an argument in the right way." Roger Dearborn Lapham was elected mayor despite the CIO and the Communist backing of George Reilly. Lapham is regarded as "an out-and-out Fascist" by the Communists.

Brown, the successful candidate who defeated Matthew Brady for district attorney was backed by the San Francisco
CIO organizations. well known Communist Party instrumental in securing
the CIO's support for Brown. According to an informant, the
Communist Party was very much pleased with the election of
Brown. Other informants reported left-wing elements in the
San Francisco Chapter of the Lawyers' Guild were in 1944 making
efforts to get a new district attorney into that organisation.

The names of Edmund Gerald Brown (100-2-22 4146 65 6200-54;
100-15? 94) are contained in an anonymous confidential communication dated
March 1, 1939, received by the Bureau which alleged actively
assisted Communists in the San Francisco area in their legal
troubles. (61-7559-3634)

CMI furnished information to the Bureau on May 19,
1944, concerning one who is the subject
in a San Francisco office Security Matter - C case, that this
individual, a well known Communist,
are "not thought to be cognizant of
subject's Communist Party record." One of such letters was
from "Pat" Brown, who is possibly identical with the district
attorney herein referred to. (62-76249-4)

Brown is a former law-school classmate of
Communist Party of the firm of
in San Francisco. are both
members of the Communist Party and revenue of their office is
almost entirely derived from Communists and related persons.
It is [redacted] who are most interested in seeing Brown become a member of the Lawyers' Guild. Brown frequently contacts [redacted] and had numerous conferences with these persons during his campaign for the office of district attorney. Brown feels particularly indebted to [redacted] because he is convinced Brown's support, was instrumental in his election, resulting in an additional 8,000 votes and victory for Brown over Nat Brady. According to reliable information, Brown is frequently mentioned in Communist circles as one person who might be willing to appear at various programs sponsored by Communist Party fronts. He has contributed to the Joint Anti-Fascist Relations Committee or to one of the committees from which the Joint Anti-Fascist Relations Committee was formed. There is no indication in the files regarding any further relationship with such persons or affiliated groups. (62-762494)

A confidential informant, after the election of Brown in 1943, advised that because [redacted] the former could very well "profit" through Brown's election. Immediately before the election, [redacted], above referred to, was engaged in making speeches on behalf of [redacted], the Communist's candidate for the Board of Supervisors. It is interesting to know that Harry Bridges, a West Coast labor leader, when in San Francisco in 1943 [redacted]. (100-3757-32 & 40)
On February 6, 1945, the San Francisco Board of
Supervisors passed a resolution opposing the deportation of
Harry Bridges. The resolution requested that President Roose-
velt and Attorney General Biddle halt these proceedings. Mayor
Roger Lapham on February 13, 1945, vetoed this resolution
giving as his reason the fact that the case was in the hands
of the Supreme Court and the city and county of San Francisco
would be overstepping its bounds in interfering with govern-
ment action. On the same day, February 13, in an article
appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle, District Attorney
Brown came out against the deportation of Bridges, completely
breaking with Mayor Lapham in this regard.

CONTACTS AND ACTIVITIES OF BRIDGE

The California Labor School is a Communist-dominated
enterprise in San Francisco and is purportedly operated for the
education of trade-union people in the bay area. According to
confidential information, Bridge is an old-time Commun
ist and was under inves-
tigation in San Francisco in connection with
San Francisco. Bridge was characterized
by other functionaries of the Communist Party in the San
Francisco area as "one of the most valuable men"

A highly confidential source advised that in
December, 1944, an unknown man had been contacting prominent people in San Francisco and informing them that the California Labor School was dominated by Communists. This highly confidential source advised that called on District Attorney Edmund Brown and after a long chat was allegedly assured that Brown would give the school and a "clean bill of sale to anybody in town." (100-38325; 61, 64 & 75)

District Attorney Brown was reported by a confidential source to be a [redacted] People's World of San Francisco. She is a frequent contact, of course, of well known San Francisco Communist Party functionaries. (100-237266-6)

A reliable source in San Francisco advised that Benjamin Ballinger Dreyfus, with aliases, who is the subject of an Internal Security - C case in San Francisco, contacted one [redacted] a known Communist political association member, in November, 1944, at the National Lawyers' Guild and requested [redacted] to get publicity and aid for District Attorney Edmund Brown in connection with Brown's investigation of Mothers, Wives and Sisters of USA. This organization is [redacted] a San Francisco attorney, who was believed to be particularly antiadministration. (100-52643-2)

The People's World above referred to as a Communist front in San Francisco, on August 11, 1944, stated that plans
were under way for the formation of an organization to strengthen group and interracial relations to thus build unity among all sections of San Francisco's population. The organization was tentatively titled "San Francisco Council for Unity" and one of its first meetings was conducted at the Booker T. Washington Community Center in San Francisco.

Among the various speakers on racial matters, labor problems and unity among all groups was District Attorney Edmund Brown, (100-135-48-45)

Since election to office, Brown has apparently concerned himself to a considerable extent with racial discriminations and has designated one of his assistants, who is regarded as capable in the juvenile delinquency field, to not only make inquiries into adolescent problems but also into matters involving racial discriminations and handling of riots with a view toward preparing for such postwar difficulties. (62-76249-4)

Brown's interest in juvenile delinquency after her appointment as

proved to be quite cooperative and has indicated her willingness to Bureau Agents to make available all material which may be of interest to the FBI in its study of the juvenile delinquency program. She has received juvenile delinquency material from the Bureau at various times. On May 29, 1945, SAC Pieper forwarded to the Bureau pamphlets entitled "Youth, Don't Be a Chump," which explains the law as it applies to minors. It
was stated the pamphlet appears to be a new approach to the subject and is rather well written. The pamphlet, consisting of 22 pages, contains a foreword by Mr. Brown in which he invites every boy and girl to come in to see him whenever confronted by any problem. Pages thereafter, illustrated by line drawings and emphasizing "remember you can't break the rules and win" and pointing out the futility of breaking the law, contained also a photograph of Brown meeting members of the San Francisco Boys' Club. (62-26225-5-616)

Information contained in the crime survey covering the period ending October, 1944, 10 months after Brown took office as District Attorney, indicated that interest in juvenile delinquency in the San Francisco area had dropped off considerably. As reflected by newspaper publicity, it was believed such lack of interest was caused by a slight but steady decrease in juvenile delinquency cases during the months immediately preceding October, 1944. Another contributing factor to the possible decrease was the formation of a crime-prevention squad in the San Francisco juvenile and probation office, an innovation by District Attorney Brown. (62-75147-47-21)

The crime survey for a comparable period in 1945 under the heading Juvenile Crime indicates that a juvenile bureau was recently opened in San Francisco in the police department and was reported to be doing a magnificent job.

No new juvenile gangs were operating in San Francisco and crime among the juveniles was about the same as when last reported. (62-75147-47-32)
BROWN'S INTEREST IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

On July 19, 1944, Brown telephonically contacted the Bureau while he was in Chicago attending a Democratic convention and advised that he would like to see the Director concerning internal security matters in the San Francisco area. Some of the information herein mentioned was obtained from SAC Pieper at San Francisco prior to the time Mr. Brown planned to see the Director in Washington, who, because of prior commitments, could not at that time visit with him.

SAC Pieper stated, "Since he (Brown) is comparatively new in office and because there have been but relatively few matters of mutual interest thus far, his relationship with this office has not been a very close one, but I would not hesitate to approach him regarding ordinary routine matters." It was reported at the same time that Brown works closely with Chief of Police Dulles of San Francisco. (62-76249-4)

On August 2, 1944, in a letter to the Director Brown indicated that he felt a need for conferences between district attorneys of the various metropolitan cities and suggested the Director take the lead in arranging such conferences to be conducted in Washington. On August 15, 1944, this letter was acknowledged by the Director, who said he regretted not being in the city when Brown visited Washington recently and "I hope that the next occasion when you come east, I will have the pleasure of seeing you." The Director also advised Brown that FBI Law Enforcement Conferences were
conducted by various field divisions in an effort to coordinate the activities of local, county and state law enforcement organizations. (62-676249-5)

Brown sent to the Bureau in early 1945 a copy of a 13-page "Report of the Crime Prevention Department," for 1944 in San Francisco. This department, established by Brown in January, 1944, according to Brown's statement, was an innovation in San Francisco. Receipt of this material was acknowledged by the Director on March 10, 1945, with the request that the Director would appreciate receiving a copy of laws relating to minors when completed. (62-76249-6)

On March 12, 1945, Brown in a letter to the Director suggested that a psychiatric board be set up to handle cases of servicemen and veterans who come before the criminal courts. His letter was ultimately referred to Robert P. Patterson, then Undersecretary of War, who did not favor the proposal inasmuch as he felt that this group of men was no more culpable than any other group, and Mr. Brown was so advised by the Director by letter dated April 13, 1945. (62-76249-8)

On October 24, 1945, Brown by letter advised the Director he had read the Uniform Crime Reports, Volume 16, and concluded that San Francisco "has more crime than any other city of comparable size in the United States." He asked whether his conclusion was correct and requested information as to the reason for such a crime showing. An acknowledgment dated November 2, 1945, was sent to Brown explaining the
comparison did disclose San Francisco's figures as above average for all offenses in cities with more than 100,000 population. It was explained that the averages for Pacific Coast area cities are higher than corresponding averages for the entire nation. Brown was told that many factors contribute to high crime rates in a given community and that only a survey of all functioning machinery charged with enforcement and administration of the laws would provide the solution to the problem. A copy of "How to Use the Uniform Crime Reports" was sent to Brown. (62-76249-9)

The crime surveys conducted by the San Francisco Field Division in 1945 indicate that while Brown definitely appears to be playing both sides of the fence at the present time, he is reported to be honest and looking toward the future. whose activities were exposed under the Atherton investigation, still operates a bail-bond office but is eligible to do bail work only in connection with the Federal courts inasmuch as no state license is required to so operate. There appeared to be no organized gangs operating in the San Francisco area. There is no evidence of political tie-ups with organized crime nor police tie-ups with organized crime, despite the fact that allegations are continually made that police have received payoff money for the periodical opening of gambling joints and houses of prostitution. There
is, however, a fear in these underworld circles of the police efficiency. Since the raising of the ban on horse racing, various bookies are again springing up in San Francisco but the police are making numerous raids and attempting to keep these places closed. There are no large gambling establishments operating in San Francisco. (62-75147-47-32)

All San Francisco bookies were closed shortly after "Pat" Brown took office and the bookies still do not know exactly which way Brown is going to turn, although as indicated above several have been opening, only to be closed by the police. Brown, in the latter part of 1944, prosecuted bookies under an old California statute which carried a felony penalty for that violation. The utilization of this law was more or less forced upon Brown, but according to an informant in the San Francisco office he has attempted to make deals with the local judges so that the defendants would not actually be prosecuted under the felony statute. Some judges have gone along with Brown whereas others have sentenced them on felony charges and others have thrown the cases out of court. (62-75147-47-21; pg.38)
IN REPLY, PLEASE REFER TO FILE NO. __________

Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice

Suite 1729 - 111 Sutter Street
San Francisco, California
March 20, 1946

CONFIDENTIAL

Director, FBI

Res: EDMUND G. BROWN, aka Pat Brown
District Attorney
San Francisco

Dear Sir:

Quoted herewith are a letter from the Omicron Epsilon Fraternity of the University of San Francisco dated January 10, 1946, to BROWN requesting an explanation as to why he permitted his name to be listed as a sponsor for a banquet honoring the American Youth for Democracy held at the St. Francis Hotel here November 10, 1945, and his reply:

"January 10, 1946

Mr. Edmund G. Brown
160 Magellan Avenue
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

"In a newspaper dispatch datelined New York, January 8, 1946, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, publicly stated that the American Youth for Democracy is the successor of the Young Communist League.

"The same United States Government Official, who above all others should be in a position to speak with authority, stigmatizes American Communism as holding '....a godless, truthless philosophy of life. They are against the America our forefathers fought and died for; they are against the established freedoms of America....There is a distinction between respecting our ally Russia and respecting those within our country who would destroy all that we believe in.'

"We note that you were listed as a Sponsor for the Banquet honoring the American Youth for Democracy held on Saturday, November 10, 1945, at the St. Francis Hotel.

Copies Destroyed
15 NOV 12 1944
Re: EDHUND G. BROWN, District Attorney, San Francisco

"As Veterans who fought to prevent these United States from becoming 'a godless, totalitarian state' we cannot believe that you, as an American citizen, knowingly gave your consent to be used in support of the American Youth for Democracy.

"Our membership comprising over seventy per cent of the Student Body of this University would like a written expression of your stand on the American Youth for Democracy.

"Sincerely yours,

Omicron Epsilon
per Americanization Committee"

* * *

"February 1, 1946

Americanization Committee
Omicron Epsilon
University of San Francisco
San Francisco 7, California

Dear

"Thank you for your letter of January 16. I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background. I knew that the Young Communist League or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the American Youth for Democracy. I, therefore, called the young lady who asked me to become a sponsor for the dinner, not the organization, and asked her if there was any truth in the assertion that the American Youth for Democracy was communistic in either origin or intent.

"She advised me that it was not in any manner, shape, or form communistic although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged. She told me that they were affiliated with many church groups. I was also advised by her that the organization encouraged young people to participate in government and that it fought racial intolerance and religious bigotry."
Re: EDMUND G. BROWN, District Attorney, San Francisco

"I would consider it a pleasure to discuss with you at length organizations such as this. You have fought and died for a terrific cause, but the real fight has now begun. Merely being against some organization is not sufficient. Active participation to hold the things you won must never cease.

"Very truly yours,
Signed
EDMUND G. BROWN
District Attorney"

"EGB:dh"

Very truly yours,

C.W. STEIN

C. W. STEIN WP
Special Agent-in-Charge

CWS:SSH
TO: MR. D. M. LADD
FROM: J. C. STRICKLAND
DATE: March 20, 1946
5:20 PM

SUBJECT: EDWIN G. BROWN

SAC Van Pelt, San Francisco, called and furnished the contents of two letters which came to their attention in connection with Brown and which Mr. Van Pelt thought would be of interest.

The first is a letter addressed to Brown, dated January 10, 1946, from the Americanization Committee of the Omicron Epsilon Fraternity at the University of San Francisco. It points out that in a newspaper dispatch from New York on January 8, the Director publicly stated that the American Youth for Democracy is the successor of the Young Communist League and that it is noted Brown has been listed as a sponsor for a banquet honoring the American Youth for Democracy held on Saturday, November 10, 1945, at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco. The letter goes on to say that "As veterans who fought to prevent these United States from becoming a Godless totalitarian state, we cannot believe that you as an American citizen knowingly gave your consent to the aid and support of the American Youth for Democracy. Our membership comprising over 70 per cent of the student body at this university would like a written expression of your stand on the American Youth for Democracy."

On February 1, 1946, Brown replied to thanking him for his letter and stating:

"I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I have first investigated its background. I knew that the Young Communist League or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the American Youth for Democracy. I, therefore, called the young lady who asked me to become a sponsor for the dinner, not the organization, and asked her if there was any truth in the assertion that the American Youth for Democracy was Communist in either origin or intent. She advised me that it was not in any manner, shape or form Communist, although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged. She told me that they were affiliated with many church groups. I also advised her that the organization encouraged young people to participate in Government and that it fought racial intolerance and religious bigotry.

"I would consider it a pleasure to discuss with you at length organizations such as this. You have fought and died for a terrific cause but the real fight has now begun. Merely being against some organization is not sufficient. Active participation to hold the things you won must never cease."

Mr. Van Pelt stated he was sending this information to the Bureau.
March 5, 1946

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
District Attorney
City and County of San Francisco
550 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 11, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

I have your letter of February 20, 1946, together with the enclosure, advising me regarding your contemplated visit to Washington. While I do not expect to be in the city at that time, I would be glad to have you call at our headquarters where arrangements have been made for you to see one of my assistants.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mr. Brown

[Address]

[Signature]

[Address]
I called the Secretary of Congressman Havenner on March 13 relative to her previous call to the Director's Office seeking an appointment for District Attorney Edmund G. Brown of San Francisco with the Director. I told the Secretary that the Director would not be here at the time mentioned and had asked that I advise her. I indicated I would be very glad to see Mr. Brown. She stated she would advise Mr. Havenner and if any arrangements were to be made she would again contact me.

In view of the information contained in the teletype from San Francisco concerning Brown and the Director's desire for him to see Mr. Ladd, if the Secretary calls me in connection with an appointment I shall make arrangements for Brown to see Mr. Ladd.
EDMUND GERALD BROWN, AKA PAT BROWN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, SAN FRANCISCO. MISCELLANEOUS, INFORMATION CONCERNING. PLEASE REFER ORIGINAL TELETYPING SAN FRANCISCO TO DIRECTOR JULY TWENTY, NINETEEN FORTY FOUR, MARKED ATTENTION ASSISTANT DIRECTOR NICHOLS. IN ADDITION TO INFORMATION SET OUT THEREIN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS OF THIS OFFICE ADVISE BROWN NOW VICE-PRESIDENT NATIONAL LAWYERS' GUILD, SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER. SEVEN MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THIS ORGANIZATION KNOWN TO BE AFFILIATED WITH COMMUNIST PARTY. SEVERAL OTHER INFORMANTS THIS OFFICE STATE BROWN IS "HAND PICKED" CANDIDATE FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ROBERT KENNY, PRESENT ATTORNEY GENERAL. [REDACTED] FBI NA GRADUATE, SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT, ADVISED IN CONFIDENCE THAT BROWN IS PUBLICITY SEEKER, HAS INJURED CASES BECAUSE OF PREMATURE PUBLICITY IN CASES. SAN FRANCISCO INFORMANT [REDACTED] REPORTS [REDACTED] COMMUNIST AND MEMBER OF FIRM OF [REDACTED] AND [REDACTED] COMMUNIST PARTY ATTORNEYS, ACTIVELY CAMPAIGN FOR BROWN IN HIS CANDIDACY FOR SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY IN THE FALL ELECTIONS OF NINETEEN FORTY THREE. MEMORANDA SUPPORTING INFORMATION SET OUT IN THIS TELETYPING BEING FORWARD TO BUREAU AIR MAIL SPECIAL DELIVERY THIS DATE. BROWN HAS PUBLICLY STATED IN THE PRESS THAT HE IS GOING TO CONFER WITH
GOVERNOR DEWEY, MAYOR O'DWYER OF NYC ON RACKET BUSTING. RECENTLY IN CONNECTION CASE HE STATED HE WOULD CONFER WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL TOM CLARK AND J. EDGAR HOOVER OF THE FBI.

REFER TO MY LETTER MARCH ELEVEN, NINETEEN FORTY SIX ENTITLED SUSPECT, MURDER. SUGGEST BUREAU HANDLE BROWN WITH CAUTION BECAUSE IT APPEARS HE IS MORE INTERESTED IN OBTAINING PERSONAL PUBLICITY THAN SERVING THE ENDS OF JUSTICE.

STEIN

1. What is the case?
2. Send memo to A.G. warning him re Before.
3. I will not see him. If he wants to talk to someone in Bureau, I would like Ladd to handle.
The secretary said that Mr. Edmund G. Brown, District Attorney for the city and county of San Francisco was to be in town in March and would like an appointment with Mr. Hoover in the afternoon of Tuesday, March 26th or anytime Wednesday, March 27th. She was told that Mr. Hoover would be given the message and that someone would contact the office of Congressman Havener.

Files are being checked.
The Attorney General

John Edgar Hoover = Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

March 15, 1946

I thought you would like to know that the above-captioned individual, who is the local prosecuting attorney in San Francisco, has indicated an intention of calling at your office within the next week or ten days with the alleged purpose of conferring with you regarding the case.

According to the information in the possession of this Bureau, was arrested by the San Francisco Police Department in December, 1945, on suspicion of forgery. In addition, he was later charged as a fugitive from justice as a result of a murder charge against him in Dallas Texas. He was indicted by a San Francisco County Grand Jury on January 18, 1946, for forgery and grand larceny. His trial on these charges is still pending. was suspected of being responsible for seven or eight deaths since 1931 and is particularly suspected of the poison deaths of elderly women he had married since his discharge from Folsom Prison, California, on February 7, 1943, after serving a nine-year term for grand larceny and administering stupefying drugs. It is indicated that had the bodies of these women cremated in Jacksonville, Florida; Dallas, Texas; and Portland, Oregon, following which he considered himself heir to their estates. The San Francisco Police Department believes that pretended that his various wives were alive after he had caused their deaths through the slow administration of poison and when death certificates were subsequently issued, he would report their identities under the names of previous wives. The San Francisco Police Department is also holding four warrants for Florida authorities against

In January, 1946, in San Francisco, contacted the Bureau for possible Laboratory assistance in connection with this case. At that time, was traveling to the various cities where was alleged to have had his deceased wives cremated.

With regard to Edmund Gerald Brown, information has been received by this Bureau that he was elected District Attorney in San Francisco County in the Fall of 1943 and that during his campaign, he was actively supported by certain Communist elements. We have been confidentially advised that he is now Vice President of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild, the Executive Board of which includes seven members who are alleged to be affiliated with the Communist Party. It has also been alleged that Brown is more interested in obtaining personal publicity than in serving the ends of justice.
Office Memorandum – UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : THE DIRECTOR
FROM : D. M. LADD

DATE: March 27, 1946

SUBJECT: RE: EDMUND GERALD BROWN,
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
San Francisco County
California

I interviewed Mr. Brown on March 27th by reference from your office. He stated that he had just talked to [redacted] in the Department with reference to the murder case involving [redacted]. He stated he thought he might have interested the Department of Justice in this case in that he thought he might have a mail fraud violation for the Post Office Department by reason of the fact that [redacted] had through the mail collected insurance on several of his alleged victims. He stated that it did not appear there was any violation in which the FBI could assist him inasmuch as none of the facts indicated a Federal violation over which this Bureau had jurisdiction, and I agreed with him.

He then discussed the uniform crime reports which he receives from the Bureau and states that these reports show San Francisco to be one of the most crime-ridden cities in the country. He wanted to know if the FBI could make a survey of San Francisco to determine the cause of this. I advised him that this would be outside the jurisdiction of the FBI and that, therefore, no assistance could be given to him by the Bureau. He then stated he would try to have the State Department of Justice make such a survey of his city.

He made no mention of police training — he did express, however, a desire to see some of the facilities of the Bureau in order that he might know more about the FBI and accordingly I arranged with Mr. Nichol for a brief tour for Mr. and Mrs. Brown. Special Agent [redacted] conducted this tour which began at about 4:15 P. M.

I don't know the purpose of Brown's call inasmuch as it appeared to be solely a social visit, although he probably will capitalize politically in any subsequent campaign which he might wage for the office of Attorney General for the state of California on the fact he has conferred with the FBI on "crime problems."
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO
SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka Pat Brown

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING

Reference is made to the teletype sent to the Bureau under date of March 13, 1946 concerning the above-named subject.

I am attaching hereto one copy each of the memoranda, from which the information set out in this teletype was taken.
San Francisco, California
March 13, 1946

MEMO, SAC

RE: EDUARD GERARD "PAT" BROWN,
San Francisco County District Attorney

A review of the Communist Party indices in this office reflects the following information on the above.

A confidential informant, on April 9, 1943, reported that (Communist and member of the law firm of Communist Party attorneys) had drawn up a list of lawyers who have expressed liberal opinions at some time, each to be called or written a letter by the Lawyers Guild getting their support in opposition to the legislation the Lawyers Guild is opposing. The name of EDUARD BROWN was on that list.

As well as (Communist and other member of the above law firm), actively campaigned for BROWN in his candidacy for San Francisco County District Attorney in the Fall elections of 1943. BROWN, during the campaign, frequently met and consulted with and at one time stated that BROWN was a former classmate of his in law school and that he, was instrumental in endorsing BROWN's candidacy. On November 3, 1943, after the election, again reported that and in discussing the results of the election, indicated that they were elated over BROWN's election and that put him over the top. further advised that alter the election, BROWN contacted and said, "Thanks a million for all your fine work in my behalf, If it hadn't been for those extra 7,500 to 8,000 I would never have made it."

Confidential Informant on November 9, 1943, reported that an individual believed to be (Communist), then an official of the San Francisco Chapter of the Lawyers Guild, requested to work on a subcommittee of the guild which was to work out a program for the District Attorney's Office in connection with the war activities, and which was working undoubtedly toward getting EDUARD BROWN, the District Attorney, into the Lawyers Guild. at that time suggested that his partner, would be a better man to work on such a committee because he was close to BROWN and had been instrumental in getting a bloc of votes for BROWN in the election.
Confidential Informant [obscured] on December 10, 1943, reported that [obscured] contacted EDMUND BROWN and advised him that the Lawyers Guild was planning to give a luncheon for him, whereupon they discussed the Lawyers Guild and BROWN stated that "in my heart I agree with you people but I sometimes differ with your methods."

Again on December 20, 1943, according to the above source, [obscured] notified BROWN that the Guild was arranging a luncheon at the Sir Francis Drake Hotel, to be in the nature of a welcome dinner for BROWN. At that time BROWN and [obscured] discussed the changes to be made in the District Attorney's Office.

Confidential Informant [obscured] on August 11, 1944, reported that [obscured] was a personal friend of District Attorney EDMUND BROWN as they used to be fellow Democrats. [obscured] is a known Communist and was active in the affairs of the Communist-dominated California Labor School.

Confidential Informant [obscured] in September of 1944, reported that the California Labor School was endeavoring to get BROWN to contribute money to the school. [obscured], at that time [obscured] of the school, contacted BROWN and he declined to contribute because of his current expenses, whereupon [obscured] asked him whether he could say that he, BROWN, approved and endorsed the school. BROWN said this would be O. K.

In December of 1944, several individuals in San Francisco were charging the California Labor School with being a Communist Party front, whereupon, according to Confidential Informant [obscured] (Communist), [obscured] contacted District Attorney BROWN regarding an answer to these charges. According to [obscured] after his contact with BROWN, BROWN stated, "Anybody in town could be referred to him and he would give me and the school a complete bill of sale."

The San Francisco Field Division is in possession of a letterhead entitled, "Salute to Young America Committee," which was a committee, according to the letterhead, to sponsor the American Youth for Democracy's Second Anniversary Dinner in San Francisco. This letterhead lists EDMUND G. BROWN as a member of the Committee in formation. According to Confidential Informant [obscured], who furnished this letterhead, BROWN was being considered by the Communist Party as a speaker for this committee.

Confidential Informant [obscured] in January of 1945, furnished a list of names prepared at State Communist Party headquarters. This list was captioned, "Names for 'People's World Advisory Committee.'" BROWN's
name was included in this list along with other prominent public, union, and clergy officials, all known by this office as sympathetic to left-wing groups. The People's World is the West Coast Communist Party organ. No definite information has been received since to indicate that [REDACTED] was a member of any such committee.
The following information was obtained from the San Francisco Police Department and was given to the writer in strict confidence. The experience of the Police Department with BROWN is that he is playing everything for its publicity value. In support of this he said a recent case they had which gained some prominence was broken by BROWN during the time the police were conducting a very extensive investigation. He stated this caused the Police Department a great deal of embarrassment in view of the fact they were still looking for three of the fugitives in the case, and the publicity has not helped the department at all. He stated that the investigation was conducted by the Police Department, but that the publicity made it look like it was a case handled through BROWN's office.

The San Francisco files are very voluminous and indicated that he has committed four or five murders and has had the bodies of each of his wives cremated and has buried them under the names of wives previously killed by him. There is no indication that any of these murders have ever taken place in San Francisco or the bodies were disposed of here, and that one of these things should be present in order to enter in on the case in San Francisco. He also stated that BROWN speaks of psychological murder, but the law in California does not seem to support this.

his department had a good forgery case against him and that he is being held on this forgery charge. A number of people have felt that BROWN was a convert to the Catholic religion, but that he believes the truth of the matter is that he was a non-working Catholic and that he has recently been very active in the Catholic Church because he felt it would help him politically. He said that his father-in-law, Captain A.M. LUNE of the Police Department was

people in this area feel that BROWN is "hand picked" by KENNY to run for his job, but that he feels that Lieutenant Governor Houser, who has filed on the Republican ticket to run for Attorney General will defeat him in the coming election.

his name be kept very confidential, as it would ruin him in his present job if it were to come out that he had made any statement about BROWN. A further review of the files in this office indicates a reference to BROWN in 100-17879-1222-33, Comrap file, that a clipping from the San Francisco "Chronicle" of January 9, 1944, page 5, concerning a speech made by BROWN was found in the possession of GREGORI M. KHEIFETS.
San Francisco, California

March 13, 1946

San Francisco file 61-363, the National Lawyers' Guild, reflects that among the newly elected officers the name of EDMUND G. BROWN is listed as Vice-President.

It will be noted that in addition to this the CP and the CPA indices of the San Francisco Field Division reflect the names of are affiliated with the Communist Party.

JDS/jh
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : SAC, San Francisco
FROM : [Redacted] 67C

DATE: March 13, 1946

SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka Pat Brown
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING

The following information was obtained by the writer pursuant to your request.

The current Martindale Hubbell Law Directory discloses that BROWN was born 1905, graduate from the San Francisco Law School (not to be confused with the University of San Francisco School of Law) in 1925.

The following information was furnished to the writer by [Redacted] a close personal friend of the writer and it is therefore requested that his name be maintained in absolute confidence. He served as [Redacted] and at the present time is associated with [Redacted]. BROWN is also retained by San Francisco, Counsel for the California State Federation of Labor (AFL). He is also retained by this organization concerning some matters.

BROWN became active in politics in the CINCINNATUS, a group of young men who came to the front in San Francisco several years ago and were particularly active about 1938. BROWN is reportedly very friendly with [Redacted] and the American Communist Association and a leader in the CIO, whose communist affiliations are on record in this office. He is also reportedly quite friendly with [Redacted], Local 6, IUW, a member of the Communist Party. It is informant's understanding that BROWN was personally designated by [Redacted] to be candidate for the position which run for governor of the State. He is also reported to be quite friendly with BENJAMIN DREYFUS, member of the Communist Party and the mainspring on the NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD Chapter at San Francisco. In this connection, it is noted that BROWN recently aligned himself with other known communist members of the LAWYERS GUILD in San Francisco, to have the GUILD retract its condemnation of a few months back of the speech made at San Francisco by GERARD L. K. SMITH. Several of the communist sympathizers in the local chapter of the LAWYERS GUILD have opposed this repudiation of the GUILD's earlier stand claiming that SMITH was a Fascist, whose views must be suppressed. It is also worthy of note, here, that information has been received from other sources; namely, [Redacted] that [Redacted] and DREYFUS are close friends. [Redacted] is also extremely active in the affairs of the NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD.

BROWN was a delegate to the democratic convention in Chicago in 1944 and prior to the convention was opposed to the candidacy of HENRY A. WALLACE for vice-presidency. However, he changed his mind and then reportedly refused to abandon WALLACE, when the others did not, when pressure was put upon him.

BROWN is a convert to the Roman Catholic faith and is a constant practicing catholic, who is reportedly active in the study clubs of his local parish. He is a member of the ST. THOMAS MORE society of San Francisco, a group of lawyers, principally catholic, who espouse the principles of a SAINT-
San Francisco

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka
Pat Brown

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING

CHANCELLOR. Prior to being elected District Attorney at San Francisco, BROWN engaged in a fairly successful practice, a good deal of which was personal injury work.

The following information was obtained by the writer. A close personal friend, who is also the legal firm BROBECK, PHELGER & HARRISON, 11 Sutter St., San Francisco. It is requested that identity be kept absolutely confidential because of writer's friend.

BROWN apparently beset with political ambitions and BROWN has received a start with CINCINNATUS, political organization which was founded about 1928.

He is reportedly a political friend of local democratic who is also the democratic committee and is a political friend ofSubject is said to be a good practical catholic and an extremely sincere person who is not too bright, a very pleasing personality, but little political "savvy". A rumor is current in San Francisco that BROWN once represented the BOOKIES, against whom he has directed, more or less, a campaign in recent months to suppress their activities. Informant carefully pointed out, however, that this is a rumor, the basis of which he does not know.

BROWN's wife is the daughter of former police Captain ARTHUR D. LANE, who was known in the police department as a "straight guy" (informant's father was a police lieutenant in San Francisco for many years). LANE was removed from his post as captain of the central district because of his raid on houses of prostitution and gambling joints.

BROWNS have four children.

Flood Building, also a close personal friend of the writer and whose identity must be maintained in confidence, advised as follows:

It should be noted that has been quite active in democratic politics in the lower scale for several years. Subject and subject who is also a practicing attorney in San Francisco, became extremely interested in a CINCINNATUS organization in San Francisco politics in its beginning, which was reportedly founded about 18 years ago. BROWN is reputedly, not too capable an attorney but sincere and unquestionably has high political ambitions.

advised that the Veteran's Group at the University of San Francisco, had recently sent out a letter to various sponsors of a dinner given by the AYD at the Colonial Room of the St. Francis Hotel, several months ago, asking them the basis of their support of this dinner, in view of the Director's denunciations of a few months ago, of the AYD, in which he pointed out its connection with the YCL. Informant has maintained a file of the responses re-
San Francisco

EDMUND GERALD BROWN, aka
Pat Brown
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING
received by the veteran's unit and is endeavoring to locate any reply received from Brown, which was not available at the time of conversation with him.


Located Brown's reply to the above mentioned letter which was sent out by NOVICRON EPSILON, the U.S.F. veterans group. The reply dated 2/1/46 stated that Brown had "called the young lady who had invited" him to attend the that she assured him it was in no "way

REL: mjp shape of force ammunition."
The following information was furnished to Special Agent... and the writer by... on March 1, 1946. In the event this information is used, greatest care should be exercised to prevent any information which may reveal the identity of the informant, and it is noted that the information is within the exclusive possession of the informant.

The San Francisco Chapter of the NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD is presently split over the question of whether the Guild should retract its condemnation of a speech given by GERALD L. K. SMITH at San Francisco last November.

EDWIN BROWN, San Francisco District Attorney, desire the Guild to retract the condemnation of SMITH's speech and to furnish all newspapers in this area with a copy of the statement of retraction.

The informant stated that the Communist faction of the Guild does not want such a retraction to be made, and that the dispute had been started in the Executive Committee sometime ago. The dispute revolves around the issue of Free Speech, and the Communist side, that is, the group opposed to BROWN and the others mentioned above, has opposed the condemnation of SMITH and voted in favor of the retraction on the basis that the condemnation could be used against the Communist Party at some subsequent date.

The ballots were mailed out to the members, who have returned them, and the names of the voters have been clipped from the ballots.

In connection with the Guild informant further advised that DREYFUS, who has been a mainspring of the organization at San Francisco, deplored the fact that he made an appointment on March 2nd in order to endeavor to have him change his mind. DREYFUS also asked to change his mind. DREYFUS and other members of the Guild who are Communist Party members and Communist sympathizers fear that the Nuremberg trials will whitewash the Nazis and they do not want to have any of their men associated with it.
May 25, 1949

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
District Attorney
San Francisco 11, California

My dear Mr. Brown:

I received your letter of May 19, 1949. In response to your request it is a pleasure to adjust our records so that future issues of the Uniform Crime Reports will be forwarded to you. I am enclosing copies of the two reports for 1948 at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Enclosure
UCR's 19-1, 19-2.

VN: rlc 1.8
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover  
Director, Federal Bureau  
of Investigation  
Washington, D.C.  
 
Dear Mr. Hoover:  

During the year 1948 and up to the present time, we have not received a copy of the crime reports of the F.B.I.  

We would be very pleased if we could be added to the mailing list to receive these reports regularly.  

Very truly yours,  

EDMUND G. BROWN  
District Attorney  

May 19, 1949
Date: December 4, 1950  Time: 10:50

F. Shelly's Office (D-California)
Phone No. Capitol 555

REMARKS

was calling to arrange an appointment for Mr. Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General elect, of California with Mr. Hoover. She stated that Mr. Brown would be in town Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week and would like very much to talk with Mr. Hoover.

was assured that Mr. Hoover would be advised and she would be called relative to whether Mr. Hoover would be able to see Mr. Brown.

Files are being checked.
OFFICE MEN  

TO:    MR. TOLSON
FROM:  MR. H. H. CLEGG

SUBJECT: REQUEST OF ATTORNEY GENERAL-ELECT EDMUND G. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA FOR APPOINTMENT WITH THE DIRECTOR

Upon receipt of the attached notice of the call from Congressman John F. Shelley's office that Brown desired an appointment with the Director, I called the Congressman's office, made known the Director's unavailability and the fact that I would be glad to see him.

This morning I received a call advising that Mr. Brown had made so many appointments throughout the city and his time here was so brief that he would be unable to make an appointment for this purpose.

Attachment

EX-128  REC: DEC 15 1950

It is well I must from a shipping he has named Wm. O'Connor S. A. lawyer as an 3d R. G. of Cal. O'Connor has been a bitter foe of the T. B. L.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
Office of the Attorney General  
STATE BUILDING, SAN FRANCISCO  
April 2, 1951

Hon. J. Edgar Hoover  
Director, Federal Bureau  
of Investigation  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

During the past few months, California has experienced a series of atrocious murders. Some of these have been emotional crimes growing out of domestic difficulties; others involve sex, robbery, etc.

In looking at your statistics, I note that in some cities in some states there are very few murders of any kind, nature or description. In others, the homicide rate is completely out of proportion to the population.

Have you ever tried to interpret these figures to determine what environmental factors might affect the homicide rate in any of its facets? If your organization has made such a study, would you please let me have the figures.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

EGB: A3
April 14, 1951

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Attorney General
State of California
630 State Building
San Francisco 2, California

Mr. Attorney General:

I have received your letter of April 2, 1951, and read with considerable interest the observations you set forth.

We have, of course, noted differences in crime statistics furnished to us by law enforcement agencies throughout the nation. I wish to advise, however, that we have not conducted any study along the lines suggested in your communication. As you will note on page 27 of the annual bulletin for 1950, Uniform Crime Reports, a copy of which you have received, it is pointed out that caution should be exercised in comparing crime data for individual cities because the differences in the figures may be due to a variety of factors. A list of some of the factors which affect crime is set forth on the same page.

I regret that I cannot be of further assistance in this instance.

Sincerely yours,

E. Edgar Hoover

cc - San Francisco, with copy of incoming.
cc - Los Angeles, with copy of incoming.
cc - San Diego, with copy of incoming.
PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL - AIR MAIL

Director, FBI

Re: HAROLD G. ROBINSON
Former Special Agent

Dear Sir:

Forwarded herewith are two newspaper clippings from the "San Francisco Chronicle" and the "San Francisco News" dated January 3, 1951 concerning the intended appointment of former SA ROBINSON to the position of Chief Investigator for the Office of the Attorney General of the State of California, when Attorney General-elect EDWARD G. (PAT) BROWN, until recently District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco, takes office later this month.

By way of background, the Bureau is aware that up to six months ago, ROBINSON had served as investigator, and subsequently as Chief Investigator, of the California Commission on Organized Crime. That Commission was disbanded on June 30, 1950. Shortly thereafter, ROBINSON was appointed as Chief Investigator for the U.S. Senate Special Rackets Investigating Committee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat from Tennessee. The Bureau is undoubtedly aware of the activities of that committee, which to some extent has been blamed for the loss of several Democrat held seats in both the House and Senate during the last election, because of exposes of certain graft and corruption existing in a number of cities throughout the United States, which in some instances controlled by the political party in power.

While having lunch with the San Francisco Police Commission and a Special Service Contact of this office, last week, he advised me that Attorney General-elect BROWN, who was the only Democrat in the state of California to win a major office in the State during the last election has indicated a desire to take leadership of the Democrat Party in California, and in pursuing this desire, recently went to Washington where he is known to have had an appointment with President TRUMAN.

BROWN was advised me confidentially that while at the White House, President was very disgusted with the manner in which has allowed his Committee to operate, which has assisted the Republicans materially in defeating the Democrat incumbents, and that he also feels that, who formerly worked for the Truman Committee, when the President was in the Senate, has "betrayed" his close personal friendship with the President by aiding and assisting in these exposes.

HMK:emb
Enclosures - 2

RECORDED - 131 | 62-76249-23

EX. 63
Director, FBI, from SAC, San Francisco

January 5, 1951

Re: HAROLD G. ROBINSON, Former Special Agent

BROWN that under no circumstances should BROWN appoint

In his office in California, in view of this betrayal to the President and
the Democratic Party.

As indicated in the enclosed clippings, BROWN has indicated that
he has already committed himself to ROBINSON, and is going through with his
appointment. It is apparent that BROWN is attempting to set up a non-partis
san Attorney General's Office. During the past election BROWN refused to
the forces of HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS for Senator and JAMES ROOSEVELT for Go
ernor on the Democratic ticket as a package deal, feeling that his own ex-
perience and popularity throughout the State as District Attorney of the Ci
and County of San Francisco for the past several years and his leadership a
President of the California State District Attorneys' Association would be
sufficient to assure his election. As it turned out, his prophecy was cor:
inasmuch as DOUGLAS and ROOSEVELT were both soundly defeated by their Repub-
lican opponents. BROWN's designation of ROBINSON, who was appointed by Gov-
ernor WARREN as Chief Investigator of the California Commission on Organize
Crime, as well as of Assistant Attorney General ARTHUR H. SHERRY, former
Assistant Counsel of the State Crime Commission and a close personal friend
and supporter of Governor WARREN, and Assistant Attorney General BURT LEAVE
an active Republican Party worker, to his staff would tend to indicate that
he is endeavoring to build up a political machine similar to that of Gover
WARREN.

BROWN has announced to close friends, according to that
should Governor WARREN run for President in 1952, he will run for Governor
himself in 1954, probably against Lieutenant Governor GOODWIN KNIGHT, Re-
publican, who is considered somewhat weak.

The above information is being forwarded as of possible interest
to the Bureau.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Harry M. Kimball
HARRY M. KIMBALL, SAC
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: San Francisco

FROM: Director, FBI

DATE: 8/13/54

SUBJECT: ATTORNEY GENERAL EDMOND G. BROWN — STATE OF CALIFORNIA

You will recall that in the Escondido, California, Daily Times Advocate of July 28, 1954, Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of California was quoted as stating that the California crime statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI. Apparently, he based his observations on the fact that the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in California, under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General's Office, has full-time representatives whose primary duty is to call upon local agencies that promote accuracy in the reports prepared. The Attorney General was quoted as additionally stating "I doubt that the FBI, with its many other responsibilities, can give equal attention to promoting uniformity." The Bureau, of course, realizes that Brown's criticism must be primarily based on the fact that he was being severely criticized by California newspapers relative to the crime reporting program in the State of California. The Bureau, however, feels that Brown's statements should not be unchallenged. You should call upon Attorney General Brown, explain to him that his statements have come to the Bureau's attention and that you will present to him certain additional information which may serve to support his statement.

You should point out to the Attorney General that in view of the statement attributed to him appearing in the press, the FBI is giving serious thought to discontinuing the publishing of crime statistics for the State of California in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin and that while we are not desirous of airing controversies it will be, of course, necessary to make it clear to anyone interested that the action is taken in view of the statement made by the Attorney General.

You should not develop any argument with Attorney General Brown relative to the accuracy of the figures. It should be pointed out on the other hand, that the FBI has handled the crime reporting program ever since its inception in 1930 at the request of the IAJP and that the program is still handled in cooperation with that
310, San Francisco

8/19/54

organization. It should be understood by the Attorney General, of course, that we feel it only fitting and proper that his attitude be made known to members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police at the 1954 Convention in New Orleans on September 26th, etc.

Following your contact with the State Attorney General, you should immediately advise the Bureau of the results of your discussion along the above lines.
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: MR. TOLSON
FROM: L. B. NICHOLS

DATE: Aug. 27, 1954

SUBJECT: ATTORNEY GENERAL EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

On my memorandum of August 18, 1954, concerning the statements of Attorney General Brown of the State of California that the California criminal statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI, the Director indicated that he would like to see the letters prepared on August 19, 1954, to the SAC at San Francisco and Mr. Leroy E. Wike, Executive Secretary of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, which have not been sent.

These letters are attached.

LBN: FML
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SENT DIRECTOR 8-27-54
TO: Mr. Tolson
DATE: 9/13/54
FROM: L. B. Nichols
ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWIN G. BROWN
SUBJECT: STATE OF CALIFORNIA

You will recall that a California newspaper dated July 22, 1954, quoted the captioned State Attorney General as stating that California criminal statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI. The Director noted on my memorandum dated August 10, 1954, as follows: "I think we should stop printing all California crime statistics since AG of California states FBI statistics are not accurate and let it be known why we are doing it."

I am in complete accord with the Director's concern relative to the unwarranted statements on the part of Attorney General Brown. Undoubtedly, Brown, of his own initiative, was doing quite a bit of bragging in order to add luster to his own position, and to defend himself against recent newspaper criticism of the State Bureau of Criminal Statistics annual reports. As you recall this same newspaper article criticizing the Attorney General's report commended the FBI Uniform Crime Reports bulletin by way of comparison. We, of course, have received no indication that Brown's statement are backed up by the police in the State of California who have for a long time submitted excellent crime statistical reports to us.

Although the Director's suggestion is most logical and backed up by flagrant abuse of the truth on the part of Attorney General Brown, I respectfully would like for the following points to be considered before we eliminate the printing of California crime statistics:

1) The FBI for many years has been engaged in the reporting of crime statistics at the specific request of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). This organization is heartily in accord with the way we have been carrying on this program and has commended us on numerous occasions regarding the program. It is felt that severing relations with California authorities, insofar as the crime statistical program is concerned, would be a violation of trust imposed in us by the IACP. The same fact holds true with reference to police officers in the State of California. These men have never, to our knowledge, criticized our crime statistical reporting program and to cut them off as a result of a statement made by a politician who is in office for only a temporary period of time, would be in effect severing friendly relations with officers who look to the FBI for leadership not only in this field but in many other fields of law enforcement relations.
Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. E. Nichols  
RE: ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWARD G. BROWN  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(2) To sever relations with California Police with respect to crime reporting would do much to disrupt the compilation of statistics on a nationwide basis. Our estimates would largely be ineffective and vulnerable to any attack by professional statisticians such as the American Statistical Association. If we withheld the printing of the California statistics, the contribution of reports by the local authorities there, being meaningless, would unquestionably soon drop off to nothing and the withdrawal of such a large and important segment of the crime reporting program would be extremely detrimental to the over-all program. The "crime clock" for example, which presents the number of crimes per hour, per day, et cetera, has been used very effectively and has been received very well by the public, would be so defective as to raise serious question as to whether we could continue its compilation.

(3) As you know, the current Chief of Police of Los Angeles, William Parker, is somewhat unfriendly towards the FBI. He would undoubtedly seize any opportunity to "blow up" anything severing our relations between the FBI and California State authorities from a crime reporting standpoint. Parker would capitalize on such publicity by making it entirely unfavorable to the FBI. I do not feel he should be given this opportunity.

(4) The Bureau's long-established policy in withholding the publication of any figures in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin has been that the withholding be on the basis of incompleteness definitely established and only after the reporting agencies were warned substantially in advance and given a reasonable time for improvement. The IACP's Committee on Uniform Crime Records generally understands this. It may be that to do otherwise at this point would be unfair and bring about adverse criticism.

(5) It is respectfully pointed out that if we withheld printing of California's crime figures, we would have to redo all the tabulations which have just been completed and are included in the material for the current issue of the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin presently being reviewed for approval. The bulletin is almost ready to go to the Government Printing Office and such a withholding of printing of the California figures would not only seriously detract from the quality of the published data but also substantially delay the printing of the bulletin.

I do feel that Brown's statement should not go unchallenged. Subject to the Director's approval there is attached a letter instructing SAC Sheian of San Francisco to call upon Attorney General Brown.
Memorandum to Mr. Tolson from L. A. Nichols

ATTORNEY GENERAL ERNEST M. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

And advise him that we were surprised to see his charge of incompleteness in the paper inasmuch as we had never heard from him as to any deficiencies in the crime reporting program. Shelan is instructed to explain to the Attorney General that we are giving serious consideration to discontinuing the publication of any crime figures for the State of California in view of the unwarranted attack and that while we are not desirous of airing any controversies, if such action is taken it will be necessary for us to make it clear to everyone concerned the reasons behind it. We will be advised that we are at this time giving him the opportunity of presenting a bill of particulars. We will be additionally advised that we feel it is only fair that his attitude be made known to members of the IACP at the 1954 Convention in New Orleans, Louisiana, on September 26th, next.

It is additionally felt that we should go on record with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the parent organization of the program and the organization that has requested us to coordinate this program on a nationwide basis for police, by telling that organization of Attorney General Brown's unwarranted attack and of the fact that to our knowledge he has never offered any suggestions or advised us in any manner of dissatisfaction with the program in the State of California.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is respectfully suggested that the above facts be considered in connection with this matter, and that final decision as to future handling of California crime statistics be delayed until after our conference with Attorney General Brown.

2. That the attached letters to SAC, San Francisco, and Mr. Leroy E. Hill, Executive Secretary of the IACP, be forwarded as suggested above. A copy of the letter to Mr. Leroy E. Hill is being directed to Mr. Bruce Smith, Director, Institute of Public Administration, 334 Park Avenue, New York 10, New York.

Dir. Advises

No furth. Action on matter.
Now Resolve.
August 19, 1954

Mr. Leroy E. Wike
Executive Secretary
International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.
Mills Building
Pennsylvania Avenue at 17th Street, Northwest
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wike:

I wish to bring to your attention and through you to the attention of other officials of the International Association of Chiefs of Police the recent unauthorized attack against the FBI crime reporting program on the part of Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of the State of California. In the Escondido, California, Daily Times Advocate of July 28, 1954, Attorney General Brown of California was quoted as stating "California crime statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI." He was additionally quoted as saying "I doubt that the FBI with its many other responsibilities can give equal attention to promoting uniformity." With respect to the latter statement, he was referring specifically to the coordination of criminal statistics on the part of the FBI.

I thought you would like to know that this was our first knowledge of the Attorney General of the State of California felt there were any deficiencies in the crime reporting program of the FBI and the International Association of Chiefs of Police within the State of California. The Attorney General's office there has never contacted us to point out any specific area wherein the crime reports published by the FBI for the State of California fell short of the accuracy achieved by the State Bureau of Criminal Statistics at Sacramento, California. For the purpose of promoting the best interest of law enforcement relations, it is felt that Attorney General Brown should have at least given the FBI and the International Association of Chiefs of Police the courtesy of advising of
any such inaccurate reporting, if he had proof, prior to the issuance of a press release bringing out such matters.

I have instructed a representative of this Bureau to call upon Attorney General Brown in order to give him an opportunity to produce a bill of particulars to back up his attack. He will additionally be advised that in view of the statements attributed to him, the FBI is giving serious consideration to discontinuing the publishing of crime statistics for the State of California in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin, and that while we are not desirous of airing controversies, it will be, of course, necessary to make it clear to anyone interested that this action is taken in view of the statements made by him. We will, of course, advise you of the results of such contact; however, I did want to let you know of the above information.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to Mr. Bruce Smith, Director, Institute of Public Administration, 684 Park Avenue, New York 21, New York.

Sincerely yours,
ATTORNEY GENERAL EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

You will recall that in the Escondido, California, Daily Times Advocate of July 28, 1954, Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of California was quoted as stating that the California crime statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI. Apparently, he based his observations on the fact that the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in California, under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General's Office, has full-time representatives whose primary duty is to call upon local agencies that promote accuracy in the reports prepared. The Attorney General was quoted as additionally stating "I doubt that the FBI, with its many other responsibilities, can give equal attention to promoting uniformity." The Bureau, of course, realizes that Brown's unwarranted attack must be primarily based on the fact that he was being severely criticized by California newspapers relative to the crime reporting program in the State of California. The Bureau, however, feels that Brown's statements should not go unchallenged. You should call upon Attorney General Brown, explain to him that his statements have come to the Bureau's attention and that he is being given an opportunity to present a bill of particulars.

You should point out to the Attorney General that in view of the statement attributed to him appearing in the press, the FBI is giving serious thought to discontinuing the publishing of crime statistics for the State of California in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin and that while we are not desirous of airing controversies it will be, of course, necessary to make it clear to anyone interested that the action is taken in view of the statement made by the Attorney General.

You should not develop any argument with Attorney General Brown relative to the accuracy of the figures. It should be pointed out on the other hand, that the FBI has handled the crime reporting program ever since its inception in 1930 at the request of the IACP and that the program is still handled in cooperation with that
organization. It should be understood by the Attorney General, of course, that we feel it only fitting and proper that his attitude be made known to members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police at the 1954 Convention in New Orleans on September 26th, next.

Following your contact with the State Attorney General, you should immediately advise the Bureau of the results of your discussion along the above lines.
Mr. Leroy E. Wike  
Executive Secretary  
International Association of Chiefs  
of Police, Inc.  
Mills Building  
Pennsylvania Avenue at 17th Street, Northwest  
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wike:

I wish to bring to your attention and through you to  
the attention of other officials of the International Association of  
Chiefs of Police the recent criticism of the FBI crime reporting  
program on the part of Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of the  
State of California. In the Escondido, California, Daily Times  
Advocate of July 28, 1954, Attorney General Brown of California  
was quoted as stating "California crime statistics are far more  
accurate than those of the FBI." He was additionally quoted as  
saying "I doubt that the FBI with its many other responsibilities  
can give equal attention to promoting uniformity." With respect  
to the latter statement, he was referring specifically to the coordi  
ation of criminal statistics on the part of the FBI.

I thought you would like to know that this was our  
first knowledge that the Attorney General of the State of California  
felt there were any deficiencies in the crime reporting program of  
the FBI and the International Association of Chiefs of Police within  
the State of California. The Attorney General's office has  
ever contacted us to point out any specific area wherein the crime  
reports published by the FBI for the State of California fell short of  
the accuracy achieved by the State Bureau of Criminal Statistics at  
Sacramento, California. For the purpose of promoting the best

cc - Mr. Bruce Smith, Director, Institute of Public Administration,  
684 Park Avenue, New York 21, New York (cc)

cc - SAC, San Francisco

cc - Mr. Leonard

cc - Mr. Jones

September 7, 1954
Mr. Leroy E. Wike

September 7, 1954

interest of law enforcement relations, it is felt that Attorney General Brown should have at least given the FBI and the International Association of Chiefs of Police the courtesy of advising of any such inaccurate reporting, if he had proof, prior to the issuance of a press release bringing out such matters.

I have instructed a representative of this Bureau to call upon Attorney General Brown in order to give him an opportunity to produce a bill of particulars to support his criticism. We will, of course, advise you of the results of such contact; however, I did want to let you know of the above information.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to Mr. Bruce Smith, Director, Institute of Public Administration, 684 Park Avenue, New York 21, New York.

Sincerely yours,
TO : MR. TOLSON

FROM : L. B. NICHOLS

ATTORNEY GENERAL EDMOND G. BROWN

SUBJECT: STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: 8/10/54

In the Yreka Daily Times Advocate of July 28, 1954, Attorney General Brown of California is quoted as stating that the California crime statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI. Apparently, he bases his observation on the fact that the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in California under the Attorney General's office has full-time representatives whose primary duty is to call upon local agencies to promote accuracy in the reports prepared and he doubts that the FBI with its many other responsibilities can give equal attention to promoting uniformity.

It is obvious that a State agency with full-time field men can promote greater accuracy. Whether the additional accuracy thus attained is worth the expense is open to considerable question. At the Bureau we apply every available check to reports received. Much uniformity is promoted with the use of an extensive correspondence program. Reports that apparently are not correctly prepared are not used in our summary tabulations. Furthermore, we state frankly in each issue of the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin that the FBI does not vouch for the accuracy of the data sent in by individual police agencies.

The California State Bureau field men in justification of the salary paid them undoubtedly find some adjustments to reports previously submitted. That can always be done. Since California crime reporting is generally of a high quality, I doubt very seriously if the findings justify the Attorney General's deductions that the data collected by his department is "far more accurate" than that of the FBI.

Over a period of years we have exchanged correspondence with the professional staff of the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in the State of California. Ronald H. Beattie is Chief and has always been friendly. At one time he was in charge of the Administrative Office of the U.S. District Courts in Washington, D.C. and in that capacity made available to us all of their records pertaining to convictions reported by U.S. Attorneys which we were able to check individually against our records.

The Attorney General in California is apparently doing a little bragging and I suggest that nothing may be gained by taking issue with him on this subject.
SAC, San Francisco  
Director, FBI  
ATTORNEY GENERAL EDMUND G. BROWN  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

September 7, 1954

You will recall that in the Escondido, California, Daily Times Advocate of July 28, 1954, Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of California was quoted as stating that the California crime statistics are far more accurate than those of the FBI. Apparently, he based his observations on the fact that the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in California, under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General's Office, has full-time representatives whose primary duty is to call upon local agencies that promote accuracy in the reports prepared. The Attorney General was quoted as additionally stating "I doubt that the FBI, with its many other responsibilities, can give equal attention to promoting uniformity." The Bureau, of course, realises that Brown's criticism must be primarily based on the fact that he was being severely criticized by California newspapers relative to the crime reporting program in the State of California. The Bureau, however, feels that Brown's statements should not go unchallenged. You should call upon Attorney General Brown, explain to him that his statements have come to the Bureau's attention and that we welcome any specifics which he may have to support his statement.

You should not develop any argument with Attorney General Brown relative to the accuracy of the figures. It should be pointed out on the other hand, that the FBI has handled the crime reporting program ever since its inception in 1930 at the request of the IACP and that the program is still handled in cooperation with that organization.

Following your contact with the State Attorney General, you should immediately advise the Bureau of the results of your discussion along the above lines.

cc - Mr. Harbo  
cc - Mr. Leonard  
cc - (Mr.) Jones  
CDD: jec
September 9, 1954

Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Director Hoover:

I greatly appreciate your courtesy in advising us of the recent criticism of the FBI crime reporting program on the part of Attorney General Edmund C. Brown of the State of California.

Because of the cooperative efforts of the International Association of Chiefs of Police with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in inaugurating the system of Uniform Crime Reporting, the IAACP maintains a continuing interest in the value and effectiveness of the system. To my knowledge, no reports or complaints of inaccuracies in the Uniform Crime Reporting system have ever before reached this office.

I have taken the liberty of informing President Carl F. Hanson of this matter, and it may be that he will wish to discuss it with the Executive Committee at our forthcoming conference at New Orleans. We will be in anticipation of your advice on the results of the contact of the Bureau representative with Attorney General Brown.

Sincerely yours,

Leroy E. Wike
Executive Secretary

cc: President Carl F. Hanson
TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, San Francisco
SUBJECT: EDMUND G. BROWN
         California Attorney General

On September 4, while at Los Angeles, I was introduced to Chief PARKER of the Los Angeles Police Department, after he made a heated talk before the convention of the California Officers in opposition to a talk which had been presented at the convention by the Attorney General of California, EDMUND BROWN on September 3rd.

BROWN had told the convention that on the basis of a decision in the Irvin Case decided by Chief Justice WARRE, the CA, he was issuing an opinion to the District Attorney of Los Angeles that it was illegal for police officers to install microphone devices for the purpose of trespass and that criminal action against such officers would be determined or resolved by the District Attorneys. PARKER maintains such is not the law in California and that it is a test case pending in which PARKER is a party. PARKER was most critical of BROWN for having released this statement now since it can be used at least as an argument against BROWN in the pending case.

During the course of the conversation that I had with PARKER, he advised that EDMUND BROWN, the California Attorney General, had on one occasion advised him that if BROWN is nominated and elected to the Presidency, that BROWN expected to be appointed Attorney General. PARKER did not indicate what occasion of BROWN making this statement to him. It was his face, at least, indicate that BROWN would be ambitious for the Attorney General of the United States in the event the Democratic Party elect a president.

Chief PARKER further stated that he had persuaded a legislator to introduce a bill into the State Legislature for the legalization of the use of wire tapping under the same prerequisites as used in the State of New York. PARKER said that he had occasion to discuss this proposed legislation with Attorney General EDMUND G. BROWN and that BROWN advised that he was unalterably opposed to any such legislature since it would be in violation of civil rights.
At your instructions I called upon Attorney General BROWN on September 14 and explained to him that his letter to the Editor of the Escondido DAILY TIMES-ADVOCATE had come to the Bureau's attention and that we welcomed any specifics he might have to support his statement.

The Attorney General advised that he had spoken to you about this personally some time ago. He stated that the editorial in the Escondido DAILY TIMES-ADVOCATE made him quite angry and that he asked his men to draft an answer.

He indicated to me that he did not know before I called it to his attention that his letter to the Editor had been published. Attorney General BROWN wanted me to tell you that he certainly did not intend to cast any reflections upon the accuracy of the FBI Crime Reports and knew of no instances of any inaccuracies and stated that if he had it to do over again he would not state that the California crime statistics were more accurate than those of the FBI. He stated that the word "accuracy" was poorly chosen and he regrets it.

In reference to the sentence in the next to the last paragraph, in which the Attorney General stated that he doubted that the FBI Agents could give equal attention to securing essential uniformity of local reporting as his office was giving, the Attorney General was surprised to learn that National Academy men, for instance, are given training in the matter of uniform crime reporting and that Agents of the FBI are also given some training in this matter and that on their regular calls to police departments, Agents from time to time have assisted law enforcement agencies in the understanding and better reporting of uniform crime figures, and that there is an analysis made of these figures and where discrepancies appear there is an effort made to determine the reason for the discrepancy. The Attorney General of California was not aware of the fact that the figures from some cities, such as New York City, for some years were not published in the Uniform Crime Reports because they were obviously not complete.
Letter to Director
Re: Attorney General EDMUND J. BROWN
State of California

Attorney General BROWN has a very high personal regard for the Director and the FBI. He stated that he had no animus in his own mind in making the statement he made, and that it was a poorly phrased statement made on an occasion in which he had been provoked. He gave evidence of being genuinely sorry that the statement had been made.

Attorney General BROWN, from everything I have heard and from my own personal observation, is not a very deep individual. He is a politician with somewhat average or limited ability and experience. Because of his lack of good judgment I would not trust him too far, or count him as a backer who could be depended upon. However, I do not think he will intentionally attempt to do anything that would be critical of the FBI.

9-15-54
September 24, 1954

Mr. Leroy E. Wike
Executive Secretary
International Association of Chiefs
of Police, Inc.
Mills Building
Pennsylvania Avenue at 17th Street, Northwest
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wike:

I would like to refer to my letter of
September 7, 1954, and your reply of September 9, 1954,
concerning public criticism of the uniform crime reporting
program by Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of California.
You indicated you would like to be advised of the results
of our contact with Attorney General Brown.

Our Special Agent in Charge at San Francisco
called on Attorney General Brown on September 14, 1954, and
discussed this matter frankly with him. The Attorney General
explained that he did not intend for his letter to the press
to be published and regretted his choice of words in referring
to the uniform crime reporting program.

He was considerably surprised to learn of the
training afforded the National Academy graduates in uniform
crime reporting and the fact that agents of the FBI are
available to assist in this program as needed. Apparently,
he was not too well informed on the manner in which the
uniform crime reporting program is conducted by the FBI in
cooperation with the International Association of Chiefs of
Police.

As far as we are concerned, this particular incident
is closed and I thought you should be advised of the facts.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to Mr. Bruce
Smith, Director, Institute of Public Administration, 684 Park
Avenue, New York 21, New York.

Sincerely yours,

cc - Mr. Bruce Smith, Director, Institute of Public Administration,
684 Park Avenue, New York 21, New York.
In view of the nature of the contact with Attorney General Brown of California, set forth in the attached letter from the SAC, I suggest we take no further action with reference to discontinuing publishing crime statistics from California.

L. B. Nichols
Room 5640, Ext. 691
DO-6

OFFICE OF DIRECTOR
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Dear Mr. Hoover:

You will recall our conversation relative to infiltration of Democratic clubs here in California.

Pat Brown (Att'y. Gen.) tells me he has set up a system to get F.B.I. records of suspected infiltrators. These he will pass along to Mr. Jones. He will try to prevent infiltration. But has "been cleared?"

Sincerely

/s/ Sam Yorty

COPY: hmb (l)
June 15, 1955

Honorable Samuel W. Yorty
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Congressman:

I am in receipt of your letter postmarked June 6, 1955, in Los Angeles, California.

As you are undoubtedly aware, information contained in the files of this Bureau is maintained as confidential and for official use only in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Attorney General of the United States. In view of this fact, the Bureau is precluded from making any arrangement similar to that mentioned in your letter, and no such agreement has been made.

Thank you for your interest and courtesy in communicating with me in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

San Francisco (with copy of incoming)

SAC, SAN FRANCISCO:

Congressman Samuel W. Yorty has corresponded with the Bureau on several occasions in the past and has been afforded cordial acknowledgments. (94-43740)

Edmond D. Brown is apparently the individual to whom Yorty refers as Pat Brown. Edmond D. Brown is Attorney General of California. Buffies reflect considerable correspondence from Brown, the bulk of which has been concerned with crime statistics. Following a contact with Brown on September 14, 1954, SAC Whelan, San Francisco, noted that "Brown does not appear to be a very "deep" individual."

P.W.D. -spb 11-6-55 (See page 2)
and is a politician with somewhat average or limited ability and experience. (62-76249)

But files reflect one [censored] who is apparently identical with the subject of Yorty's communication, was the subject of a Security Matter - C investigation in 1946. The investigation reflected that [censored] "moving in Communist circles" and was disapproved twice for [censored] because of pro-Communist leanings and associates. The files further reflects that [censored] later became [censored] of this organization. He is not on the Security Index. (77-14660)
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Los Angeles
SUBJECT: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Attention: Training and Inspection Division

Re SAC Letter 55-40 (C)

UACB, Attorney General EDMUND G. BROWN of the State of California will not be contacted by the SAC at Los Angeles, in accordance with instructions contained in referenced SAC Letter, inasmuch as the San Francisco Division maintains liaison with the Attorney General at Sacramento.

I am personally acquainted with Attorney General Brown and have talked with him on numerous occasions at conferences held within the Los Angeles territory. He has at no time registered a complaint with me against the Bureau.

JFM:KH

cc SAC, San Francisco (personal attention)
SAC, San Diego (personal attention)

RECORDED - 54 62-76249-3
14 JUL 25 1955
November 2, 1955

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE
NAME CHECK REQUESTS

Reference is made to your name check requests concerning the individuals listed below, requesting only copies of reports of any security-type investigations conducted by this Bureau. In response you are advised that no such investigations of these persons have been conducted by the FBI.

Fisher Flouring Mills Company
3235 16th Avenue, S. W.
Seattle, Washington

Richfield Oil Corporation
555 South Flower Street
Los Angeles 17, California

Albert W. Putnam
Born: September 22, 1877
Spuyten Duyvil, New York

Hon. Edmund O. Brown
Born: April 21, 1905
San Francisco, California

Providence, Rhode Island

Can Manufacturers, Inc., Washington, D. C.

The foregoing information is furnished to you as the result of your requests for FBI file checks and is not to be construed as a clearance or a nonclearance of the individuals involved. This information is furnished for your use and should not be disseminated outside of your agency.

Teison
Bierman
Nichols
Baker
Hart
Kohne
Parsons
Kopec

CIG and one to ONI
Rec Rec'd October 24, 1955
W. J. Fritt/Cap

10-28-55
11-1-55

11-7-55
11-12-55
11-17-55
NOTE:

The above-mentioned name check requests were received through Liaison, from Commander Rutledge of ONI who advised that the above individuals were being considered as invitees to a conference to be held by the Department of Navy in January, 1956, at which classified data will be discussed. Commander Rutledge indicated that these individuals who will attend will require at least a "secret" clearance. It is to be noted that the individuals so listed are not aware of their suggested invitations and complete background data cannot be obtained at this time. At ONI's request indices were searched for results of security-type investigations only concerning the subject.
Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Attorney General
State of California
600 State Building
San Francisco 2, California

My dear Mr. Attorney General:

Your letter of July 5, 1956, has been received, and I deeply appreciate the interest prompting you to communicate with me in this regard and to bring your observations on this subject to my attention.

While I assure you of my great interest in this problem, I must advise that since this is a matter of a legislative nature, a policy of long standing precludes my commenting upon it. You will, I am sure, understand my position in this regard.

I am happy to enclose, however, a copy of Report Number 2576, United States House of Representatives, concerning amendment of Title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of state statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities. You will note on pages four and five a copy of a letter dated May 25, 1956, from the Deputy Attorney General to Honorable Emanuel Celler setting out the views of the Department of Justice on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

July 14, 1956
Honorable Edmund G. Brown

July 16, 1956

NOTE: Bufiles reflect considerable past correspondence with Brown. Following a talk with Brown on 9/14/54, SAC, San Francisco, noted that Brown does not appear to be a very "deep individual." Relations have been generally cordial with him, but in June, 1954, he was somewhat critical of the compilation methods of the UCR. He was subsequently set straight on this topic.
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover
Bureau of Federal Investigation
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Hoover:

Several of the Attorneys General from various states have opposed a provision giving to the forty-eight states the right to prosecute subversives. I was one of those who opposed it. I did so as the chief law enforcement officer of the State of California, well knowing the personnel and capabilities of those employed in the largest state department of justice in our country.

Based upon thirteen years experience as a prosecuting official, it was my feeling that we are not equipped to do this job. I feel that it is one that requires an intimate knowledge of Communism and the ways in which they operate in other countries, plus access to confidential information which necessarily cannot be given to too many people even though they may hold high positions in the various states.

I have been informed however that you favor a so-called partnership between the states and the federal government in this field.

I assure you that I recognize the menace of subversive activities and I desire to do all in my power to aid and assist you as well as other security agencies of our government.

I would therefore like to ask you whether or not you do favor bills now pending in Congress which would.
permit the forty-eight states to investigate and
prosecute subversion of various kinds. If you do
I would like to have your suggestions as to what we
in California should do to implement any law that may
be adopted.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Reference is made to Los Angeles GII Report dated 6/29/56, a copy of which was provided to S.P. Office.

Under the sub-heading "Political and Police Ties with Organized Crime" in report, considerable information was detailed regarding the current investigation under the direction of California State Attorney General BROWN, as conducted by Assistant District Attorney, and staff. has, since the issuance of that report, established close liaison on a confidential basis with apprized of the progress of investigation of law enforcement in Los Angeles County. Our source has determined that whereas the probe initially was intended to be painstaking, was ordered to just gloss it over. Subsequently he received new orders from the Attorney General, these coinciding with the illness of Los Angeles District Attorney S. ERNEST ROLL, who is not expected to live more than sixty to ninety days and who is the only candidate to succeed himself in the November, 1956 elections.

As matters now stand, a very thorough investigation, and he has related to our source that conditions here are much worse than he ever expected to find them. The above referenced report is a fair guide of the conditions which although source reports that that at least in some respects things are even more serious than this outline would indicate.

6/30/56, took some additional information to if it proves true, will emphasize again the suspicions that there is a terrible breach
Director, FBI

8/31/56

Re: SPECIAL CRIME STUDY COMMISSION
ON ORGANIZED CRIME; EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN

INFORMATION CONCERNING - GIIF

of justice in this County. The information he took relates the Beverly Hills, California furrier who in July was convicted of conspiracy to commit a fake fur robbery and of filing a false insurance claim. The trial was in Santa Monica before Superior Court Judge ORLANDO H. RHODES. Details of the case are not especially important to this communication, except that the information as told to our source by our source incensed who told that he feels so strongly about the local law enforcement and legal situation that he intends to immediately recommend to Attorney General BROWN the re-creation of a Crime Study Commission to concentrate its energies in Southern California, or if such a Commission is not forthcoming to at least suggest that the current study be enlarged and extended so that proper justice can be done to it. It is expected that there will be more information from our source in this matter; in the meantime the San Francisco Office is being alerted so that Office can discreetly seek any pertinent information from sources in San Francisco and Sacramento.
At the time the report was prepared, [redacted] indicated his intention of providing a confidential report of findings regarding the status of law enforcement in Los Angeles County, which [redacted] had stated was even in worse condition than he had been led to expect. As indicated in [redacted], the implication drawn by our source from [redacted] remarks was that the Office of the Los Angeles County District Attorney had in some respects become almost completely derelict in its obligations to the people.

During the month of September, according to our source on 10/17/56, [redacted] seemed to be diligently working. However, [redacted] to Alameda County, where he is campaigning for public office, and in recent weeks source has been unable to discern much investigative activity by [redacted].

Source said he still hopes to obtain some resume of information from [redacted] but the prospects do not appear as bright as they did last August.

Meantime, [redacted] has learned from sources of his that Attorney General BROWN is personally handling investigation in Los Angeles County of the beating of a Retail Clerks Union representative, which apparently
was the aftermath of an affair in San Diego. The San Diego matter has been reported to the Bureau both by this Office and by San Diego under the caption, "MAX OSSLO, et al, CRIMINAL RACKETTS ACTIVITIES - GIIF." OSSLO, together with certain members of the Teamsters Union and of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, was convicted in San Diego on charges including conspiracy to assault a Retail Clerks Union representative in October, 1955, when OSSLO's Butchers Union and the Retail Clerks found themselves in controversy over jurisdiction.

Francisco, should have been prosecuted along with OSSLO and the others, since it appeared fairly evident that OSSLO furnished the goons who performed the beating in San Diego. not prosecuted, and source states that this came about through California Governor GOODWIN J. KNIGHT's obligation to repay a political debt to . Source has heard that Governor KNIGHT arranged with San Diego County District Attorney DON KELLER to delete from the prosecutive proceedings in return for which KELLER was to receive an appellate judgeship. News of this leaked out, and, while was successful in avoiding prosecution, KNIGHT was forced to cover up by appointing someone else to the judgeship. Source said this leaves KNIGHT under distinct obligation to San Diego County District Attorney KELLER.

BROWN's attention to the Los Angeles County assault case has been related to our source as necessary because of the delicate political implications which are so potentially highly embarrassing to KNIGHT's administration, as a result of his dealings with and KELLER.

While the above information is admittedly sketchy, it is source's intention to attempt developing details and possibly some degree of proof. Meanwhile, this Office will appreciate receipt of any further details from either San Diego or San Francisco in the event information along this line is brought to their attention.
An investigation has been under way in Los Angeles, California, which purported to be an investigation of law enforcement, under the direction of California State Attorney General Edmund J. "Pat" Brown, and his staff are reported to be actually conducting the investigation. A controversy between District Attorney Silas Ernest Roll and Los Angeles Chief of Police William "Bill" Parker has been fermenting for nearly 3 years. It was indicated that a local grand jury might be called to determine if either Roll or Parker is guilty of any misconduct in office. Both Roll and Parker were reportedly to have promised to cooperate. It was indicated the main source of trouble was lack of cooperation and harmony between Roll and Parker.
SAC, LOS ANGELES (94-250)

SPECIAL CRIME STUDY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZED CRIME; ,
EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN

INFORMATION CONCERNING - GIIF

Reurmemorandum dated 10/19/56.

All offices should remain alert to this situation
and any pertinent information which comes to your attention
should be promptly reported to the Bureau.

HOOVER

cc: San Diego
San Francisco

HJM: af
(6)
This matter deals with an investigation which has been going on for some time in Los Angeles, California of local law enforcement under the direction of California State Attorney General Edmund G. "Pat" Brown. The former Alameda County Assistant District Attorney and his staff are reportedly conducting this investigation. It was indicated the main source of trouble was lack of cooperation and harmony between District Attorney Silas Ernest Roll and Los Angeles Chief of Police William H. Parker.
Page(s) withheld entirely at this location in the file. One or more of the following statements, where indicated, explain this deletion.

☐ Deletions were made pursuant to the exemptions indicated below with no segregable material available for release to you.

Section 552

☐ (b)(1) ☐ (b)(7)(A) ☐ (d)(5)

☐ (b)(2) ☐ (b)(7)(B) ☐ (j)(2)

☐ (b)(3) ☐ (b)(7)(C) ☐ (k)(1)

In accord with the National Security Act of 1947

☐ (b)(7)(D) ☐ (k)(2)

☐ (b)(7)(E) ☐ (k)(3)

☐ (b)(7)(F) ☐ (k)(4)

☐ (b)(4) ☐ (b)(8) ☐ (k)(5)

☐ (b)(3) ☐ (b)(9) ☐ (k)(6)

☐ (b)(6) ☐ (b)(10) ☐ (k)(7)

☐ Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to the subject of your request or the subject of your request 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).

Page(s) withheld inasmuch as a final release determination has not been made. You will be advised as to the disposition at a later date.

Pages were not considered for release as they are duplicative of

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

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

62-76249-35
Date: January 30, 1957

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

Attention: Colonel Sheffield Edwards
Director of Security

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: EDMUND G. BROWN

The names of Edmund Gerald Brown and were contained in an anonymous confidential communication dated March 1, 1939, received by this Bureau, which alleged that they had actively assisted communists in the San Francisco, California, area in their legal troubles. No further details are available on this matter. (62-76249-11, page 5)

A confidential informant has advised this Bureau that members of and attorneys for the Communist Party, San Francisco, actively
Director
Central Intelligence Agency

campaigned for Brown in his candidacy for San Francisco District Attorney in the fall elections of 1943. The informant further advised that after the election Brown contacted and said, "Thanks a million for all your fine work on my behalf,"

On December 10, 1943, an informant advised this Bureau that mentioned above, contacted Brown and advised him that the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) was planning to give a luncheon for him. Brown and then discussed the Guild and Brown stated that "In my heart I agree with you people but I sometimes differ with your methods." The National Lawyers Guild has been cited as a communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (Tesur, 62-76249-19)

An informant advised this Bureau on August 11, 1944, that Brown was a close personal friend of San Francisco, a known communist who was active in the affairs of the California Labor School. The California Labor School has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to 50 10450. (Tesur, 62-76249-19)

An informant has advised this Bureau that in November, 1944, one of a known communist, was requested to obtain publicity and aid for District Attorney Edmund Brown in connection with Brown's investigation of the "Mothers, Wives and Sisters of USA," allegedly an "anti-administration" organization in San Francisco. (62-76249-11, page 8)

A highly confidential source has advised this Bureau that in December, 1944, an unknown man had been contacting prominent people in San Francisco and informing them that the California Labor School was dominated by communists. This source further advised that and "an old-time communist," called on District Attorney Edmund Brown and after a long chat was allegedly assured that Brown would give the school and a "clean bill of sale to anybody in town." (Tesur 62-76249-11, page 8)

In January, 1945, an informant made available a list of names prepared at the California State Communist Party headquarters at San Francisco. The list was captioned "Names for 'People's World Advisory Committee.'" Brown's name was included in this list along with other public, union and clergy officials. The "People's World," also known as the "Daily People's World," is a west coast communist newspaper. (SF 1433, 62-76249-19)
The February 13, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle," a San Francisco newspaper, reported that Brown, then District Attorney, opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges, a west coast labor leader accused of membership in the Communist Party. (62-76249-11, page 7; 39-915-2560)

An article appearing in the August 9, 1949, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle" announced that Brown had been elected vice president of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild. (100-7321-879)

In September, 1944, an informant reported that Brown contacted the California Labor School, contacted Brown and asked for a contribution. Brown replied that he was unable to contribute at that time but would allow the school to state that he, Brown, approved and endorsed the school. (Tesur, 62-76249-19)

This Bureau is in possession of a letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee," which was a committee, according to the letterhead, to sponsor a second anniversary dinner of the American Youth for Democracy (AYD) at San Francisco. This letterhead lists Brown as a member of the Committee in Formation. The informant who made the letterhead available to this Bureau stated that Brown was being considered by the Communist Party in San Francisco as a speaker for this committee. (No further details available.) (SF 1433, 62-76249-19)

In March, 1946, this Bureau was furnished a copy of a letter dated January 10, 1946, written by a veterans group at the University of San Francisco, which criticized Brown for permitting his name to be listed as a sponsor of a banquet on November 10, 1945, at the St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, in honor of the AYD. In reply, Brown by letter dated February 1, 1946, stated that he knew that the Young Communist League (YCL) or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the AYD. He then called an official of the AYD to determine if it was communist in either origin or intent. According to Brown, the official advised him that the AYD "was not in any manner, shape or form communist although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged." Brown added, "I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background."

The AYD and the YCL have been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to EO 10450. (62-76249-13)

CONFIDENTIAL
Director
Central Intelligence Agency

An informant has furnished information to this Bureau indicating that, as described above, during a political discussion at a meeting of the State Board of the Communist Party of California (of which he is a member) held on March 23, 1946, at San Francisco, stated that Brown, then a candidate for the office of State Attorney General, had called upon him and wanted him to help write a couple of speeches (no further details available). (Tesur, 100-38425-91)

According to an informant, a meeting of the Whitney Club, Communist Political Association, Alameda County, California, was held on May 2, 1946, at Oakland, California. According to the informant, the members were instructed to vote for Brown for State Attorney General. (SP 1453, 100-359085-1)

The Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, U. S. Army, has advised this Bureau that on June 14, 1946, the Mobilization for Democracy sponsored a public meeting at the Olympic Auditorium in Los Angeles, California, at which Brown spoke. The Mobilization for Democracy has been cited as one of the "key communist fronts in California," by the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Report 1947. (100-343748-9)

In October, 1946, an informant advised this Bureau that the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (HICASP) was devoting its main efforts toward the November, 1946, elections and was going to intensively support a number of candidates, including Edmund G. Brown, who was running for State Attorney General. The HICASP is an affiliate of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, which is cited as a communist front by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. (100-138754-136)

According to a highly confidential source, the name of Edmund G. Brown, 460 Magellan Avenue, San Francisco, appeared in the indices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, San Francisco, as of March 17, 1948. According to the informant, this file is labeled "Donors," and purports to reflect the names of individuals who have contributed to the organization or who can be influenced to contribute money. (100-7061-1753)

An informant advised this Bureau on February 24, 1954, that at a special executive board meeting of the East Bay Civil Rights Congress (CBC), held the previous day at Oakland, California, it was stated that a delegation of individuals (unidentified) had contacted Brown regarding the
Director
Central Intelligence Agency

[Redacted]

Concerning which the CRC was extremely grace. (Wells is a Negro life-term at San Quentin Penitentiary sentenced to die in March, 1954, for assaulting a prison guard.) Brown reportedly asked the delegation if the implications in the Wells case were political. He was informed that they were; that the delegation controlled votes in various local unions in Oakland and San Francisco and that these votes might be helpful to him if he wanted to be governor some day. Brown reportedly agreed to meet for further discussion of the Wells case (no further details available). The CRC has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to EO 10450. (100-3-72-100/)

Associated Press dispatches dated January 21, 1955, at San Francisco, California, reported that Brown was requesting the California State Legislature to establish a new bureau to keep track of California's racketeers and hoodlums. He also was quoted as saying there is need for legislation requiring the State Attorney General to make periodic county crime surveys to determine what kind of a job the smaller law enforcement agencies are doing. It is noted that the legislation proposed by Brown was subsequently introduced in the California State Legislature. (62-99197-26-45)

Brown advised this Bureau on July 5, 1956, that he was opposed to any provision giving the individual states the right to prosecute subversives. He felt that they were incapable and inadequately equipped to handle such a job. He added, "I assure you that I recognize the menace of subversive activities and I desire to do all in my power to aid and assist you as well as other security agencies of our Government." (62-76249-32)

This information is furnished for your use and should not be disseminated outside of your agency.

b1
b3
b5
- 5 -
CONFIDENTIAL
Office Memorandum  •  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, San Francisco

DATE: 3/12/57

SUBJECT: STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
        SAC LETTER 56-31

Re SAC Letter 56-31 (C) dated 6/6/56.

EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN remains the Attorney General for the
State of California, having been reelected for a new term. I
last saw him on January 16 and February 13, 1957.

2 Bureau
1 SF (80-265)
HP: ekk
(3)
Office Memorandum

TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, San Francisco
SUBJECT: EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

On 6/7/57 Mr. BROWN telephonically advised me that the Bohemian Club, in connection with their annual encampment, have a play put on by the members. The play this year has a locale of Las Vegas, which calls for two slot machines as part of the scenery. Mr. BROWN stated he was inquiring as to whether not the transporting of two disabled slot machines from Nevada to the site of the encampment under police guard and keeping them under police guard until they are returned to Nevada so they could not be played would be a violation of the Federal law.

I advised Mr. BROWN that the law is quite plain as to interstate transportation of gambling devices but that any clarification of it would have to be a matter for discussion with the Department.

Mr. BROWN continued that he was not making any request for any decision at this time inasmuch as he did not even know if the Bohemian Club would actually want to have slot machines as part of the script. He stated that the mere possession of the slot machines in California is a violation of the state law and that he, of course, would have to act in his legal capacity as Attorney General to seize such machines unless they were disabled and handled under police guard with full knowledge of their use as props beforehand. He advised that if the matter progressed any further he would personally discuss it with the Department in Washington and that, if he did, he would advise me as to the results of his discussion.

The above is being furnished for the Bureau's information and no action is being taken here. The Bureau, I think, is aware of the background of the Bohemian Club, it being a most reputable business club in San Francisco.

2 Bureau
1 SF
HGP:ekk
(3)
Date: January 29, 1958

To: Mr. Russell C. Harrington
    Commissioner
    Internal Revenue Service
    Treasury Department
    Washington 25, D.C.

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
       Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN
         California Attorney General
         INFORMATION CONCERNING

The following data has come to the attention of the FBI and it is being furnished for your information and for any action which you may deem advisable. It should be noted that while our source for this material is considered reliable, he has specifically stated that he cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information and has been unable to determine its original source.

...has been suspected for a number of years in the bookmaking racket in Los Angeles and Culver City, California. There have been numerous rumors concerning his gambling and political activities. ...has been one of the leaders in the legalized poker establishments in Gardena, California, and was formerly involved in gambling at Reno, Nevada.

Note: See Director's memo to Attorney General dated 1/29/58 under same caption.
Office Memorandum

TO:   Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Los Angeles (94-336)

SUBJECT: EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN, California Attorney General
INFORMATION CONCERNING

The following information has been received from [redacted] cannot vouch for the accuracy of the information. He said he received it from [redacted] does not know the original source of the information. He states that local law enforcement investigators do not operate in the manner of the Bureau, do not necessarily record the source of their information in an effort to protect the identity of that source completely, and sometimes he finds he is unable to obtain the investigator's original source. He furnished the information for whatever value it may have to the Bureau. The story as he received it is as follows:

[Redacted]

DKB: fJW
INDEXED 23
LA 94-335

...whom he described as a local political figure in gambling circles around Los Angeles for many years.

...a suburb of Los Angeles in the San Fernando Valley, to Gardena, in an automobile with an unidentified individual, described as a tall Italian, who appears... He said the name of this has not been determined.

...stopping in Gardena and after leaving there, and also in similar diverting tactics when they stop at the...

...on one occasion Investigators for the District Attorney's Office observed at the Normandie Club, enter, and leave almost immediately thereafter. In conducting ... the District Attorney Investigators shortly thereafter,

He advised that on Monday, 1/6/58, Investigators for the District Attorney attempted to conduct... in an attempt to check on the information set forth above. They found that... residence on that date, and they learned absolutely nothing more regarding the above situation.

On 1/13/58, all of the information he presently possesses regarding the State Attorney General, and that he intends to conduct additional investigation in February in an attempt to verify the data or to disprove it, as he claims the incident happens only once each month. He stated on 1/13/58 that Investigators for the District Attorney have conducted a surveillance of... and that on 1/13/58 Palm Springs, California. He said the purpose of the trip has not been determined.
This office has no verification of the foregoing information, and it is submitted as an item of information only.

[redacted] has been connected for a number of years in the bookmaking racket in Los Angeles and Culver City, California. There have been numerous rumors concerning his gambling and political activities. One of the leaders in the legalized poker gambling places in Gardena, California, and for a time was involved in gambling at Reno, Nevada.

There are current attempts being made by a citizens' group in Gardena to have legalized gambling outlawed in that municipality. Attempts have also been made in the past through the State Legislature to abolish gambling of this type throughout the State. Those efforts were unsuccessful.
The Attorney General

January 29, 1958

Director, FBI

RECORDED: 23-76247-37

EDMUND G. (PAT) BROWN
California Attorney General
INFORMATION CONCERNING

The following information concerning captioned individual has been received by the FBI from a source which is considered reliable. This individual stated that he could not vouch for the accuracy of this data and stated he did not know its original source.

[Redacted]

[Redacted] has been connected for a number of years in the bookmaking racket in Los Angeles and Culver City, California. There have been numerous rumors concerning his gambling and political activities. [Redacted] one of the leaders in the legalized poker establishments in Gardena, California, and was formerly involved in gambling at Reno, Nevada.

This information is presently being made available to the Internal Revenue Service for whatever action that agency may deem appropriate.

cc: 1 - Mr. Lawrence E. Walsh
Deputy Attorney General

1 - Mr. G. A. Nease, Room 5640 (Detached)
Note: A letter forwarding this information has also been prepared for the Internal Revenue Service. Although it is not specifically indicated in Los Angeles letter of 1/13/58 requested that his name be kept in confidence, it is not considered advisable to attribute this information to him. It will be recalled that Brown is an avowed candidate for the office of Governor of the State of California and is currently Attorney General of that state and possible political implications might seriously affect for the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office.
Mr. John Edgar Hoover, Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
United States Department of Justice  
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Hoover:

In re: Edmund G. (Pat) Brown  
California Attorney General

This will acknowledge receipt of your memorandum dated January 29, 1958, addressed to Commissioner Russell C. Harrington relative to alleged payoffs to the subject-named.

The information you furnished has been forwarded to our appropriate Regional office for consideration.

We appreciate you making this information available to the Service.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

J. Perry August  
Director, Intelligence Division

[Stamp]  
REC-17  
EX-136  
62-76249-40  
12 FEB 19  58

57 FEB 19 1958
MAY 29, 1958

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. TOLSON
    MR. BOARDMAN
    MR. BELMONT
    MR. ROSEN
    MR. NEASE
    MR. MOHR

The Attorney General indicated that Attorney General Pat Brown of California would be in Washington on June 6th and was planning to see the Attorney General.
who advised he was associated with Attorney General Pat Brown of California, called locally from the Mayflower Hotel, Room 728, to advised Attorney General Brown was in Washington today and would like very much an opportunity of seeing the Director this afternoon. He stated that Mr. Brown desired to discuss with the Director generally the situation in California and particularly wanted to discuss with him matters pertaining to crime reports and statistics in California.

I advised the Director was presently out of the office and his schedule this afternoon called for the Director to be out of the office in outside conferences, but his request would be brought to the Director's attention and would be advised.

If the Director agrees, I will call back at the Mayflower Hotel and advise the Director regrets his inability to see Mr. Brown in view of the outside conferences that have been scheduled for some time.

It will be recalled that at the Attorney General's Staff Meeting on May 27, 1958, the Attorney General indicated that Attorney General Brown would be in Washington on June 5th and was planning to see the Attorney General.
Office Memorandum

TO: MR. TOLSON

FROM: J. P. MOHR

SUBJECT: CALIFORNIA STATE BUREAU OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION AND IDENTIFICATION

July 18, 1958

July 18, 1958


The Agent in Charge also advises that Chief of Police Carl R. Eggers of Glendale, California, President of the California Police Officers Association, has designated SAC Burke to serve on the Crime Reporting and Criminal Statistics Committee of the California Association. Unless advised to the contrary, Burke plans to accept. With reference to this matter, I would like to point out that Carl R. Eggers, Chief of Police at Glendale, serves on the Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and is friendly to the Bureau. Actually, his name was suggested by us to be a member of that committee. I see no objection to Burke serving.

The item in the San Francisco Examiner has a number of parts of interest to us. Attorney General Edmund G. Brown (Pat) indicated that major crime rose 12.8% in California in 1957. He does not define "major crime" and then he charges that the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports of California presents the state in "an unjustifiable, unfavorable light" in that the FBI sets the figure at 35%. We are unable to identify any place in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin where Brown could have arrived at his figure of an increase in 35% which he said we showed for California last year. Table 26 on page 82 of the bulletin presents our crime trend figures for the State of California from 1956 to 1957 according to the reports we received both of those years from 186 city police departments. The total of all offenses increased by 12.9%, which is only one-tenth of one percent in excess of the figure Brown used to show the trend according to the state compilations.

Brown goes on to complain about the FBI changing the number of crimes per unit of population on the 1950 census, and this apparently is a continuation of the Jacobson complaint to Time concerning Time's crime rates which they published in the June 26 issue.

Enclosures

July 22, 1958

D. B. (Out direct)
Memo to Mr. Tolson

With reference to the use of 1950 population figures, we do use this source as a basis for the calculation of crime rates for groups of cities, either by population groups or by geographical division or state. (Page 92, latest UCR enclosed as an example) But, as indicated in previous memoranda, we do not calculate any such rates for individual cities. For each city we only show the number of offenses they report to us. (Page 102 of UCR enclosed as example) We must use the latest available, nationally compiled populations figures to calculate average crime rates for groups of cities as above, and the only thing we have available are the 1950 figures. It would not be sound, for example, in calculating the crime rate for cities with populations from 100,000 to 250,000 as a group to use local Chamber of Commerce estimates of the population for each place in view of the lack of uniformity under which such estimates are made. This is explained adequately, I believe, in the first paragraph beginning on page 91 of the Uniform Crime Reports for last year, (enclosed). On that page we point out that the 1957 rates for the city groups are based on the 1950 population figures because no later data are available on a nation-wide basis. We go on in that particular section of the text to give a somewhat technical presentation of the problems involved in the calculation of rates based on various population figures to satisfy the sociologists and research students.

Incidentally, we have been in contact from time to time with the Census Bureau people and they have been unable to furnish us current population figures for the various reporting cities in the crime reporting program and for the rural areas separately. This population problem was the number one item on the agenda furnished the current Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting, headed by Dr. Peter P. Lejins of the Department of Sociology, University of Maryland.

The current committee has completed their work and within the next week or ten days we will have a draft of their final report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1 - That the attached letter go forward to Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, transmitting to him a copy of the Director's letter to Time magazine dated July 18, 1958, and a copy of the annual issue of the Uniform Crime Reports for last year pointing out to him that our figures do not show a 35% increase in California crime last year.
Memo to Mr. Tolson

2 - That the attached letter go forward to Mr. [Redacted], Law Enforcement Representative, Law Enforcement Section of the Office of the Attorney General of California, transmitting to him a copy of the Director's letter to Time magazine.

3 - That copies of the foregoing correspondence be forwarded to all California SACs.

4 - That the attached letter go forward to the Special Agent in Charge, San Francisco, advising that he may accept an appointment to the Crime Reporting and Statistics Committee of the California Police Officers Association and transmitting to him copies of the correspondence mentioned above.

5 - That we prepare an SAC Letter transmitting to the field, copies of the Director's letter of July 18, 1958, to Time magazine with instructions that the SAC in each city mentioned in the Time article, deliver a copy of the Director's letter to the Administrative head of the Police Agency of that city.
TIME MAGAZINE STORY JUNE 30, 1958
CRIME RATES FOR INDIVIDUAL CITIES
RECENT PUBLICITY

The recent unfavorable publicity concerning the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) is attributable exclusively not to any misstatements within the UCR or mismanagement of the UCR program by the FBI. It resulted entirely from a terrible mistake by Time magazine in their June 30, 1958, issue. Completely without justification, they laid the blame for their errors to the FBI in the June 30 issue and again in their July 21 issue. Copy of each is attached.

THE JUNE 30 ISSUE OF TIME MAGAZINE

This represents a conglomerate of just about everything it is possible to do wrong with crime statistics as follows:

1. Time states "In the FBI list of felony rates in U. S. cities, Chicago ranks second most law abiding..." This is absolutely false. The UCR has never listed "felony rates in U. S. cities." We never calculate any rates for individual cities. To the contrary, we have refused many requests to do so and regularly in the UCR we caution against such tactics. Time is responsible for the rates they published, not the FBI. All we ever publish for individual cities is the total number of offenses in each category, such as, murder, robbery, larceny, etc., the police report to us. TABLE 12-55 p. 48 - UCR 1957 Annual - COPY ATTACHED. 2 P. 97.

2. In calculating the rates for cities they listed, Time used the 1950 census figures from published Census Bureau reports and the number of offenses for each city from the UCR. They thus arrived at the number of offenses for 1000 inhabitants for each of the 22 cities they listed. Presumably they used the 1950 census figures because the Census Bureau has no more recent population figures for all cities. Obviously, if since 1950 any city has increased, for instance, upwards to 60% in population, a crime rate calculated using 1957 crimes and 1950 census figures will constitute a distortion of the true facts. Such a city can not be compared with others. That is why the FBI has never done this.

3. "Time added together all categories of offenses and calculated a "composite" crime rates for each city." For example, Time added together that city's reported murders, robberies, and larcenies.

ENCLOSURE

AFC: 102 3/56
J. P. Nease

July 18, 1958
assaults, burglaries, larcenies, and auto thefts as published in UCR for 1957 to get a grand total of crime for Los Angeles. Then, with that figure and the 1950 census figure, Time prepared a crime rate, (Number of offenses divided by population times 1000) the fallacy in this is apparent. This procedure gives the same weight to each larceny offense as to murder.

EXAMPLE

Two cities with same population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY A</th>
<th>CITY B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Thefts</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Time procedure, City A, above, is more crime ridden than City B, simply because it has more total offenses reported. In fact, however, City B is truly crime ridden because of the high number of murders, robberies and assaults. We never make this type of "lumped" comparison in the UCR.

4. Time made a direct comparison of crime between cities. In each issue of the UCR we specifically caution against such comparisons and set forth many reasons why it is improper. - P. 47 1957 ANNUAL UCR - COPY ATTACHED

5. Time lifted most of its article from the New York Times issue of June 22, 1958. Time went to press June 22 on its June 30, 1958, issue and failed to have its Washington Bureau check the figures with us. The Times item is attached. There was virtually no reaction to the New York Times article but there has been widespread reaction to the Time article which erroneously quotes the FBI as the source.

THE JULY 21, 1958, ISSUE OF TIME MAGAZINE

A letter to the editor of Time on page 4 (attached) questions the use of 1950 population in calculating crime rates. Time again erred and inserted after this letter to the editor "Time should have pointed out that for all cities listed
Memo to Mr. Tolson

The FBI used 1957 crime figures and 1950 census figures. This statement is false. We did not do it -- Time did.

Time's Washington Bureau has admitted to us their June 30 and July 21, 1958, articles were erroneous. Their city crime rate listing they admit was "lifted" bodily from the New York Times without checking. The Washington Bureau of Time (News Editor) called us July 17, 1958, asking us to answer several questions about FBI-UCR figures which caused them to receive unfavorable mail. We blessed but Time and straightened them out as to their error. We made no mistake; they did, as did the New York Times.

Fred Bruin, Time Washington News Editor, admitted the

The foregoing summary of careless reporting by Time has brought unfavorable reaction from California's Attorney General Pat Brown (who could hardly wait to write about it.) Also, from Atlanta, Denver and there will probably be others. When a magazine like Time charges the FBI with full blame for Times' fiasco, those complaining to us can hardly be criticized. When the full facts of the case are brought to light I think it is only fair to state that the present situation did not result from inadequate supervision of UCR at the FBI. To the contrary, we have carefully avoided and regularly cautioned against the very thing Time and the New York Times did. It is most unfortunate Time published such a vulnerable piece and doubly unfortunate they blamed us for the error.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the attached letter be forwarded to Henry R. Luce of Time. This will set the record straight and serve henceforth as a basis for answering those complaining about "FBI figures" in Time Magazine.

* A separate memorandum is being submitted on this.
My dear Mr. Attorney General:

I have read an article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner of July 16, 1958, captioned 'FBI Crime Report Unfair, Brown Says.' I have also read the article appearing in Time magazine under date of June 30, 1958, showing a listing of crime rates for selected large cities in the United States.

With reference to the article in Time magazine I am enclosing for your information a copy of my letter of July 18, 1958, to the editor of Time which I believe you will find self-explanatory.

I am also enclosing a copy of the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin for 1957 for your convenience and I would like to point out that the only place in this publication where we make any attempt to indicate the trend of crime in California appears on page 92. On this page we show the number of offenses reported to the FBI by 186 cities in California during each of the years 1956 and 1957. Only the number of offenses is shown since we did not convert the figures into terms of the number of crimes per unit of population. These figures show that the total crimes reported to us by these cities in California increased 12.9 per cent from 1956 to 1957 which I am sure you will agree is quite close to the 12.8 per cent increase which you are quoted as indicating for California in the item in the San Francisco Examiner mentioned above. We did not make any statement in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin to the effect that California crime increased 35 per cent as you indicated to the press.
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover,
Director FBI
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Brother Hoover:

The San Francisco Bay Area newspapers, two or three weeks ago, published some figures from your last crime report. The astonishing increase of crime in California aroused State Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, who endeavored through news releases, to show that no blame attached to him or other State law enforcement officers.

Your last report was not received by me, although I had been on the mailing list; I will appreciate a copy.

Brown being a candidate for Governor, as you well know, against my friend, Senator William F. Knowland, is trying to avoid political implications. Very frankly, as you also know I am anxious to use the implications.

I also have loftier motives which I am sure coincide with yours, and they are to help in decreasing major crime and for that reason to obtain a correct analysis.

The enclosed clipping from our legal newspaper, The Inter-City Express, sets forth Brown's tactics.

Also enclosed is tear sheet from Oakland Tribune of July 20th, the first 2 paragraphs of which were written by my friend, Doc Hoag, who is one of the finest newspapermen that we have here and not only a Past Master of his own Lodge but of many other things.

Will you help us? Our understanding is that your Report is not broken down by States and does not analyze the State of California individually. Is it practicable to furnish figures of 3 or 4 States in which the increases by themselves will compose the increase of crime in California with that of other States, such as New York? Then we can pick out the figures for California and make judgment comparison.
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover

I hope to talk with you, even though it may only be for a few minutes, at the American Bar Association Meeting in Los Angeles. I shall endeavor to attend the meeting at which you will be the Moderator. My wife, Marie and I will be at the Biltmore.

With kind personal wishes, I am

Fraternally,

Cyril W. McClean

CWM:k
Encls.
Via Airmail
ATTORNEY GENERAL CALLED ‘MISINFORMED’

J. Edgar Hoover Scores Brown For FBI Criticism

J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, yesterday said Atty. Gen. Brown was misinformed when he criticized the FBI for assertingly publishing incorrect figures on the crime rate in California.

In an exclusive interview with The San Diego Union, Hoover also took issue with Brown for saying the crime figures submitted to the FBI by Los Angeles were accurate while those for New York, Chicago and Detroit were not.

Hoover, who is vacationing in La Jolla, was interviewed in the San Diego FBI office in the San Diego Trust & Savings Building.

Asked if crime was increasing in California, Hoover said it “definitely” was.

“Recently the attorney general of Cali-
J. Edgar Hoover Refutes Brown

(Continued from a-13)

and said that Los Angeles had submitted accurate figures whereas New York, Chicago and Detroit had not," he said. "I don't think he knew what he was talking about there either.

"I can't vouch for the complete accuracy of the figures for New York, Chicago or Los Angeles, or San Diego or San Francisco. I'm depending on the basic integrity of the chiefs of police. I think it's wrong to assume that the chief of police, or police commissioner, of New York has given us phony statistics."

Hoover said many persons in the United States have been lulled into a false sense of security because of the drop in Communist Party membership in the last few years.

"The Communists are smaller numerically but practically stronger," he said. "Those members who have strayed from loyalty to the Kremlin have been purged from membership, leaving a hard core of fanatic Communists."

He said the Communist Party is infiltrating labor unions and racial groups.

Hoover said much of the work of the FBI in San Diego is in the security field, involving the aircraft plants, the naval establishments and Camp Pendleton.

FINGERPRINTS FILED

Last year the FBI obtained convictions in 98.6 per cent of its cases which went to trial, he said. The defendants pleaded guilty in 93 per cent of the cases. This indicates the expertness with which the cases were prepared, he said.

Hoover said the FBI's fingerprint file, the largest in the world, contains the fingerprints of 74 million persons. In addition to providing a check on the identity of criminals or fugitives from justice, the file is invaluable in identifying victims of disasters, he said.

The FBI sends a team to the scene of plane crashes or train wrecks to check fingerprints. Hoover said. In the recent plane crash near Las Vegas, the FBI was able to identify all of the victims through fingerprints, he said.

Hoover said there is no "so-called king" or central governing body of crime in the nation.

"However," he said, "the gangs and syndicates try to observe each other's prerogatives in territory. They seldom cross over. When that happens, you have some killings."

PUBLICATION FAVORED

The FBI chief said he believes in holding adults responsible, criminally and financially, for the acts of their children.

He said he also believes in publishing the names of youths who commit serious crimes.

"Nailing the identity down has an excellent psychological effect and acts as a deterrent," he said.

Hoover said he had completed his annual health examination at the La Jolla Medical Clinic. He said he has lost 30 pounds in the last year.
Brown’s Short Memory

EDMUND BROWN, California’s attorney general and Democratic candidate for governor, knows his political ropes.

When J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, accused Mr. Brown of misinforming the public on California crime figures, the attorney general took a common political refuge.

He said he didn’t want to get into a battle of statistics with Mr. Hoover and then quickly switched off to a diverting issue—Tijuana. Tijuana came in for a beating.

If elected governor, Mr. Brown said, he would see that something was done. He said the border should be closed to those under 21 to keep them from contact with “sordid things which they are too young to appraise.”

If he can’t fight Mr. Hoover, he can fight Tijuana. There aren’t any votes to lose in Tijuana.

The point might be raised that as governor Mr. Brown would be the chief executive officer of the state. As attorney general he has been the chief law enforcement officer. What he could do as governor that he was prevented from doing as attorney general for eight years is not too clear.

As a matter of fact Mr. Brown met with Mexican officials in San Diego on common border problems, including juveniles and narcotics, in May of 1957. He stated at that time:

“We seek to keep the border unimpaired as a generator of good will and of economic and cultural exchange. There are offenders against international amity on both sides of the border and we intend to launch a coordinated drive on them.”

Mr. Brown recognized at that time the problem of the border does not belong in politics. Exploitation of this issue for political advantage can only make the reaching of proper agreements between the two countries much more difficult. Mr. Brown knows that—or did a year ago.
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THE TRUTH ABOUT KNOWLAND'S OPPONENT

By OLIVER CARLSON

LOS ANGELES—Edmund G. “Pat” Brown, who aspires to be California’s next Governor, is fervently hoping that the moderate and conservative Democrats of this state have bought a myth. The myth is that Pat Brown, like them, is a moderate, slightly right-of-center Democrat. He looks like one. And before the numerous business and professional groups which he carefully cultivates, his speeches make him sound like one.

Why is Brown’s “moderation” a myth? Let’s look at the record. And while we look, let’s bear in mind that with the rapidly worsening situation in the Far East, California is the most vital and sensitive state in all the West. Mao and Khrushchev are aware of the great concentration of aircraft, missile, electronic and chemical plants here, of our oil fields and refineries, of our great ports and airfields. They know, too—even if Pat Brown is unaware of it—that Communist party membership and concentration in California is the second highest in the Nation. They know that Harry Bridges and Lou Goldblatt continue to boss the International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union, and hence control Pacific Coast shipping. They know there are powerful forces within the Democratic party of California who want to abandon Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek’s government to the mercy of the Reds; withdraw the Seventh Fleet; recognize Red China; admit her to the United Nations; and in general appease the USSR no matter what the cost to us or to the rest of the free world.

Indicative of the advances made by these forces within the Democratic ranks is the proposal put forward, in this year’s state Democratic platform, that California repeal the loyalty oath of all public employees, of candidates for public office, and for the use of public school property.” A further sign of where California Democrats are going is the fact that the Young Democrats, in drafting their platform, came out for recognition of Red China and called for the immediate aboli- tion of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

One clear voice has stood out above all others—warning of the danger of appeasing world communism—that of Senator William F. Knowland.

But what of Pat Brown? For eight years now he has been the chief legal officer of the State of California. Prior to that he was District Attorney for San Francisco. For the past four years he has been commonly recognized as the undisputed leader of the state’s Democratic party. The following is his record on communism and Communists.

Organizations established in the middle 1930’s was the National Lawyers Guild. The San Francisco chapter was both large and vocal. Pat Brown, sensing its importance to a young man eager for acclaim and public office, joined up and remained a good-standing member until the beginning of World War II. Of course, the unwarranted attacks of the mighty USSR against little Finland in the late fall of 1939, followed by the Hitler-Stalin Pact of June 1940, made communism and its numerous front organizations anathema to the American people. It was a very appropriate time to get out. And Brown did.

Three years later we were in the war, an ally of Soviet Russia. The Communists and their fellow travelers, who shortly before had denounced President Roosevelt as a warmonger, did a quick about-face when the Nazis invaded Russia. Many front organizations—including the National Lawyers Guild—blossomed forth stronger than ever. Under the circumstances, an eager-beaver lawyer with political aspirations would join up. This is exactly what Pat Brown did. In fact, he became so active that he was elected its vice president.

By 1946 Stalin had lowered the Iron Curtain over Eastern Europe. The Cold War was on. Communist spies and secret agents were uncovered all over the world, including the United States. The order went out from Moscow that Communists everywhere must openly declare their loyalty to the Soviet Union. American public opinion once more became alarmed at Communist infiltration in schools, motion pictures, labor unions and professional organizations. From New York to Los Angeles the duped, the timid and the opportunists joined in a mass exodus from Communist-dominated organizations. So, apparently, did Brown, who claimed to have just discovered that the National Lawyers Guild was dominated by the Reds. And, if Brown denounced the Communists at that time it must have been sotto voce, for he continued to get favorable mention in the Communist People’s World all through 1946.

February, 1945, District Attorney Brown of San Francisco actively supported a move to grant United States citizenship to Harry Bridges. He denounced moves by the US Immigration Department to have Bridges deported to his native Australia as “a threat to industrial peace.” Thanks to the good work of Pat Brown and his friends, Harry Bridges is now an American citizen, and still heads the potent Longshoreman’s Union.

When, in 1946, Brown ran for the first time as Democratic candidate for Attorney General, he was formally endorsed by the following organizations,
all of which were Communist-influenced or dominated at that time: Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of Arts, Sciences and Professions; National Citizens' Political Action Committee; CIO Council of California; United Committee for Political Action; Conference of Studio Unions.

Always ready to make a speech, he addressed many an organization of dubious origin. According to the People's World for June 17, 1946, he was one of the speakers at a big Los Angeles rally under the auspices of a commie front, the "Mobilization for Democracy." The People's World of November 7, 1945 also listed Brown as a committee member for the banquet honoring the "American Youth for Democracy," a well-known Communist front.

The heart and center of Communist indoctrination for all of Northern California was the "California Labor School" at San Francisco. Here were trained in mass organizations. Here artists, writers and entertainers were taught how to turn their talents to the use of communism. The documentation which now exists upon that school would fill volumes. But when, in November, 1946, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities in California called upon District Attorney Brown of San Francisco to assist in an investigation of the California Labor School, Brown refused.

In 1950 Pat Brown was the only Democrat to be elected to a major state office. He became Attorney General. He was the legal arm of the state.

During the past eight years, state and congressional investigation committees have conducted innumerable probes on subversives and subversive movements in this state. Certainly it was the duty of the Attorney General and his staff to assist in this work. But while Brown found it expedient, from time to time, to sound off against the dangers of communism in general, he was strangely reluctant to do anything about it in California. His office supposedly has a special division devoted to checking on subversive activities here, but I have searched in vain to find out what it has done in the past eight years. It appears to be completely dormant.

Such vagaries, it should be noted, are not "ancient history"—events confined to the past of a decade or so ago. The most amazing development out of Pat Brown's office took place just this year—in April, 1958—when the Attorney General sent out to the leading Peace Officers of California, (Sheriffs, Police Chiefs, etc.) an official booklet prepared and printed by the Justice Department of California, Division of Criminal Law and Enforcement, entitled: "Guide to Community Relations for Peace Officers."

In this official document, prepared under the direct guidance of Assistant Attorney General Emmet Daly, and with the official blessing of the Attorney General himself, is a bibliography of selected books, pamphlets, and audio-visual aids designed to give the Peace Officers of California a thorough understanding of the many aspects of minority groups. The idea is a splendid one—except for one thing: That bibliography is a loaded list—loaded with books and pamphlets by authors well known for their Communist or pro-Communist affiliations.

Here for police officers to study at the recommendation of the Attorney General are works by:

GEORGEL WEITFUSE. Social anthropologist. She is probably best remembered for her public speeches during the Korean War when she insisted that our troops had used germ warfare, as charged by the Chinese Communists. She took an active part on a host of Communist-front organizations. She was one of the signers of the statement in defense of Gerhart Eisler, notorious agent of the Communist International in the United States. One of her pamphlets, The Races of Mankind, which the Attorney General recommends, was barred from use by the War Department because its declared aim was to create racial antagonism.

FRANZ BOAS and RUTH BENEDICT. Social anthropologists. Boas' record as an active supporter of Communist causes goes back at least to 1931. Ruth Benedict was a close co-worker with Gene Weltfish. All their writings which are recommended are given a pro-Communist slant.

MAXWELL S. STEWART. Author and editor. Identified as sponsor of active participant in at least 36 Communist-front organizations. At one time editor of "Soviet Russia Today." Dr. E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER. Negro sociologist. The reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities contain 18 citations of Frazier's connections with Communist causes in the United States. His book was highly praised in the Communist press and literary journals when it first appeared in 1949.

CAREY MCWILLIAMS. Editor and writer. Three of his books are included in the recommended bibliography. McWilliams is at present editor of The Nation. In 1949 he was one of the attorneys for "Amtorg," the official Soviet trading organization in the United States. He was also a leading member of the National Lawyers' Guild at the time Pat Brown belonged to it. All three of his books on Brown's recommended list have been highly praised by the Communist press.

Space does not permit me to cite the many other well known pro-Communists whose books or pamphlets are likewise recommended reading for California police officers. Had this reading list been loaded—for example—with racist literature, you can be sure there would have been a hue and cry from Oregon to the Mexican border.

How did it happen that Brown and his staff issued such a slanted list of readings? Was it intentional? Was it due to carelessness? Or was it stupidity? Whatever the reason—and I hope Brown gives us the answer—the responsibility is his.

If, in the face of the record I have cited above, moderate California Democrats think Pat Brown is the kind of a man they want for Governor—Heaven help them—and us! Of course he's no Communist; he's just an opportunist whose pink slip is showing.

Oliver Carlson is a well-known writer on political subjects. The author of many books, he has contributed frequently to such magazines as The Freeman and Reader's Digest.
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OCTOBER 6, 1958
Edmund Brown, the Democratic nominee for Governor of California, is hoping that the conservative and moderate Democrats of the state will think that he is one of them. A cursory look at his record will show that this pose is sharply in contrast with his past record.

California has the second largest concentration of Communists in the country. Indicative of the advances made by the Reds in the Democratic Party this year is the Democratic platform which calls for the abolition of the loyalty oaths still required of public employees, of candidates for public office and for the use of public school property. The Young Democrats came out for recognition of Red China and the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. Brown himself of the National Lawyers Guild, a highly successful Communist front organization. In fact, he joined it on two separate occasions and served as its vice-president. Brown continued to get favorable mention in the Communist "People's World" through 1946. In 1945, as DA of San Francisco, Brown supported a move to grant US citizenship to Harry Bridges. In 1946, when Brown ran for Attorney-General, he got
the support of 8 Communist organizations, and he spoke at least twice at rallies of Communist organizations. The nerve center of Communism in Northern California was the California Labor School at San Francisco. DA Brown was asked by the State Senate to investigate this establishment and he refused. In the 8 years that he has served as Attorney-General, his office had done little or nothing about subversive activities in the state. In 1958, the Attorney General's office put out a pamphlet designed to help peace officers in their relations with minority groups. Cited by the Attorney General for additional reading by peace officers were books by such well-known Reds as Gene Weltfish, who insisted that our troops had used germ warfare in the Korean War and whose pamphlet, "The Races of Mankind" was banned by the War; Maxwell S. Stewart who was identified with 36 Communist organizations; Dr. E. Franklin Frazier who has been connected with 18 Communist causes. Was this selection of reading material made by Attorney-General Brown or was it due to carelessness? It is up to the voters to decide. Of course, Brown is no Communist; he's just an opportunist whose pink slip is showing.
Ziffren Linked To Gangster By Knowland

SAN FRANCISCO, Oct. 16 (AP) - Senator Knowland charges that Attorney General Edmund O. Brown and his imported Chicago machine-type political organization seek to impose a package deal on the historic Democratic Party and the people of this State.

Addressing a Republican rally at the California Club last night, the G. O. P. candidate for Governor sought to link Democratic National Committeeman Paul Ziffren of Los Angeles with a dead Chicago gangster.

Senator Knowland charged Mr. Ziffren is the political architect behind my opponent for Governor. He cited testimony from the Kefauver Committee crime report indicating Mr. Ziffren had business dealings with Alex Louis Greenberg.

Senator Knowland said his investigation "revealed the existence in California of a shadowland powerful force infiltrating our political and economic life."

"I am speaking," he said, "of what should be termed the 'overworld'—that place where illicitly obtained money is placed into business and political life of our communities and where the power to control is achieved through this power to finance."

Denounce Charge

In Los Angeles Mr. Ziffren told the San Francisco Chronicle by telephone 'this sounds to me like another Joe Kamp pamphlet of absurdities,' he added:

'I've never believed in talking about dead men and I don't propose to engage the Knowland-Kamp campaign on such a ghoulish level.'

Mr. Ziffren said he had not heard of any Kefauver Committee records involving him.

Senator Knowland's speech gave an involved account of what he said was the background on Mr. Ziffren's relations with Mr. Greenberg, including an alleged partnership with the gangster in a San Bernardino (Calif.) property.

Sees 'Infiltration'

The Senate Minority Leader asserted also that Mr. Ziffren was a partner in the law firm of Jake Arvey of Chicago—"the same Arvey who is the machine political boss of Chicago and a business affiliate of Alex Louis Greenberg."

Senator Knowland said his investigation "revealed the existence in California of a shadowland powerful force infiltrating our political and economic life."

"I am speaking," he said, "of what should be termed the 'overworld'—that place where illicitly obtained money is placed into business and political life of our communities and where the power to control is achieved through this power to finance."

NOT RECORDED
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It is unfortunate that the people of California have to turn to sources other than Mr. Atty. Gen. Edmund G. Brown to learn the true status of the crime threat in California. It is true that Mr. Brown has offered some assurance that organized crime often are in contradiction of other views he has expressed in the past. The testimony of the Democratic party's candidate's statements on crime is interesting. In 1953 he said there was no organized crime in California. Three months later he asked a Senate Advisory Committee for more investigations.

December, 1953, found Mr. Brown asserting a shocking increase in criminal activity that he professed that crime was leveling off, only to add three months later that a "drastic slash down" was needed. Two weeks ago Mr. Brown said that organized crime had been "secretly recruited" under his administration. On the very day he made this statement, United States Atty. Gen. William Rogers announced that the Justice Department had sent agents into California to investigate crime and the top-ranking racketeers who have moved into our state from the east.

The Assembly Judiciary Committee, in its hearings here, has since uncovered evidence that Mafia links extend to San Diego. The Mafia is an organized crime on an international scale. In the course of detailing Mafia activities to the committee, Capt. James E. Hamilton of the Los Angeles police, said that organized crime has increased 100 per cent in California since 1950.

The people of California may well ask how these facts have escaped the attention of Mr. Brown, the state's chief law enforcement officer. They are known to Atty. Gen. Rogers, Capt. Hamilton and J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover has disputed Mr. Brown's crime statistics and offered impressive evidence to show that crime in the state is definitely on the rise.

Mr. Brown's statements and performance indicate that he is confused and indecisive. If he has evidence to the contrary, let him submit it to the jury of the people of California.

SAN DIEGO UNION
OCT. 18, 1958
Cloud Over The State

David Lawrence says:

San Diego
Pat Brown Plans Drive on Crime

By CLINT MOSHER
Examiner Political Editor

Palm Springs, Nov. 9—Governor-elect Edmund G. Brown tonight announced a tough anti-crime program he will put into effect when he takes office in January.

The Democratic victor in last Tuesday's election spoke his piece after conferring during the afternoon, at his desert hideaway, with Superior Judge Stanley Mosk of Los Angeles, the State Attorney General elect, and District Attorney Thomas Lynch of San Francisco.

HIGH POINTS.
High points in the incoming Governor's program are these:

1—He will crack down on the Adult Authority, part of the State Department of Corrections, to see that many time losers, particularly sex offenders, serve longer terms.

2—Brown is working on a plan tentatively calling for a one day conference of all district attorneys, sheriffs and chiefs of police, at which he will introduce them to the new Attorney General, state his overall feeling about means to reduce crime and then let Mosk and the local officials set up a liaison arrangement and a uniform system for crime reduction.

INTER-STATE PLAN.
3—The new governor and Mosk propose to establish a working arrangement with law enforcement officials in Oregon and Washington for constant interchange of information on the movements and activities of known criminals along the Pacific seaboard.

4—Mosk said that in agreement with Brown, he will maintain constant surveillance over known gangsters and racketeers in California no matter how well behaved they may be at any particular time since they will be regarded by the Brown Administration as "potential enemies of our State."

The Governor, Mosk and Lynch discussed crime after Brown had flown to Los Angeles for a coast to coast question and answer telecast.

After the television show, Brown dropped into a nearby church, then flew back to Palm Springs.

It is known that Brown also intends to have a round table talk with the other Democratic, elected State officials to impress upon them the necessity of avoiding any conflict of interest or other slip which would not make integrity in office the order of the administration which comes into power with a sweep for only the second time since the turn of the century.

TOUGHER POLICY.

Speaking with some vehemence, Brown announced that under his administration the Adult Authority will follow a "much tougher policy."

The Governor-elect indicated he was particularly outraged about the case of Jack Rainsberger, Los Angeles handyman, who is held in Las Vegas in the "sacrifice" slaying of 23 year old Erline Folk. Rainsberger said he killed the woman in a secret ritual because "my voices told me to."

Brown, whom Mosk replaces in January as Attorney General, said:

"I'm going to see that there is a closer relationship between the peace officers who handle arrests and prosecution of criminals, and the Department of Corrections, which is under the jurisdiction of the Governor.

"Too often, in my opinion," the police have arrested people who have committed crimes of violence and then seen them turned loose for reasons that are difficult to understand.

"I have in mind the Adult Authority:"

"In the recent case of the 'sacrifice' murder in Nevada, that man committed three assaults with knives on women and served three terms in the reformatory."

"Then he came to California and committed two armed robberies with a knife and was released after three years."

"Those are things on which I will demand a much tougher policy."

"On crimes against property, we can take a greater chance, but not on this sort of thing."

Brown said he will rely on Mosk "very much for all of my legal advice."

He explained various State departments have their own lawyers, too, and that he will work with them, but "in the last analysis the Attorney General will be my lawyer—there must be one final legal authority as a matter of policy."

Brown, his staff and his family will fly back to San Francisco tomorrow afternoon.

He will be at his desk in the Attorney General's office Tuesday.
Gov. Brown to Have Voice On Democrats’ Nominee

SAN FRANCISCO. — California’s seventy-four votes are going to have a lot to say about who will be the 1960 Democratic Presidential nominee. And because these seventy-four delegates will be formally pledged to him as “favorite son,” Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown is going to have a lot to say about it, too.

No wonder the leading prospective candidates are making the pilgrimage to Sacramento. They always end up in the Governor’s office or join him on the golf course to talk politics where they can’t be overheard.

Sen. Kennedy has been here—so has Sen. Fingston. The reluctant Adlai Stevenson has turned up at the same fountain proclaiming that he is not looking for another drink. So has the reluctant Hubert Humphrey and Govs. Meany and Gov. Williams. Gov. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut was on hand a few days ago aggressively courting the field for Kennedy. And Sen. Landon has been invited to come just as soon as he can safely leave Washington.

These 1960-minded Democrats are not coming here just to breathe the California air. They are coming here to test the political climate, to find out if possible what Gov. Brown is likely to do with his seventy-four California votes after the first two ballots (or earlier) and to see if there is anything they can do to help him make up his mind the way they have been doing it.

The Governor is remaining uncommitted to anybody but Pat Brown. It is clear that he has no intention of showing his hand in his talk with him. Should he make any hard political facts are these:

1. Gov. Brown is not going to permit any Democratic Presidential aspirant to go back on the California delegation. If he can prevent it, he probably can. He is openly warning them that it would be to their shame to do so.

2. I do not believe that Gov. Brown is confused by the over anxious suggestions that he should and can by next year be the front runner for the top place on the ticket himself. I don’t mean that some unexpected turn of events might not give him the nomination, but I doubt if he is going to put himself in the position of an avowed candidate for so early in his Govern-

Sceo Drummond Reports

Drummond
As Pegler Sees It:

Gov. Brown Likes Job—And Pension

By WESTBROOK PEGLER

PAT BROWN, the Governor of California, informs me on the Governor's official stationery that he certainly will insist on the pension of $16,000 which preceding waves of similar politicians have provided for every one of their kind who hits the jackpot in the election returns. California's ex-Governors become eligible at the age of 63. Brown's eligibility begins in 1968. Two ex-Governors now are eligible, Earl Warren, the Chief Justice, and Goodwin Knight, Republican, who lost out in the last election.

Brown is now flaring his nostrils, arching his neck and tossing his mane for the Democratic Presidential nomination at this year's convention. That, however, is just futurity matter, looking toward 1964. He will not really go to the post in 1960 except to the extent of complimentary mention in gaseous amenities preceding the practical rites of the smoke-filled room.

Brown is an old-style political roughneck, reminiscent of Ed Kelly of Chicago and Frank Hague of New Jersey. Like Warren before him, he runs with the labor union machines and gets the allegiance of a problematical element of union serfs who think of themselves in warm endearment as labor while beating their wives and throwing acid on new automobiles in parking lots which have been declared unfair.

Unlike the old age Social Security benefits, available to the common man, the California ex-Governors' pension is an unconditional vested financial lien on the people's taxes. Lesser pensions to statesmen in descending array down to civil service lavatory man, are equally secure and payable in the sweat of those who toil.

Pay at Lifetime High

Brown sets forth a belief that a year's time which he put in campaigning for the job in his own interest and at no popular insistence constituted a precious public service. The specific value and nature of the public benefit thus conferred by a man seeking a job at $40,000 a year, Brown's highest pay in all his life, and a $16,000 pension for life, are not examined in the Governor's letter. He is, by formal certificate, a lawyer, but he set forth this claim with no probative material.
A portion of that year was spent travelling with Mrs. Brown to Israel and Rome which do not appear on any available map of the State of California. They have no treaties or declared political relations with California. He does not set forth the cost of such travel or who paid it. Neither, for that matter, does Governor Brown reconcile his sacrifice by absence from his family with the fact that Mrs. Brown was with him on this luxurious voluntary journey and on many forays within the State, all at his own initiative in his own interest.

“Go there will be no misunderstanding,” the letter says, “when I attain the age of 63, nine years from now, I certainly will accept the pension. Before running for Governor, I was offered a position at a greater salary and a greater pension in private business.”

He submits no evidence on either of these points. Notwithstanding his certification as a lawyer, Mr. Brown assumes that the State of California was competing with an unidentified rival for the intelligence and morality of a man who could base his claim on this ground.

Doesn’t Think He’s Overpaid

California did not seek Mr. Brown for Governor on any terms. And unlike most employers in private commerce, California did not legally require as much as a letter from his pastor. I raise no doubt that he could have met this condition. But he did not have to. The public is much less exacting in such things than say a bonding company underwriting a chain store cashier.

“I live in a goldfish bowl and every move I make is criticized by someone who doesn’t know anything about the problems with which I have to contend,” the Governor continues. “With all of this, I like the job or I wouldn’t be here. But I don’t think I am overpaid and, actually, the pension is a part of the consideration that induced me to stay in public life.

“You are all wrong on this, both Warren and Knight are entitled to the pension. Any fair reappraisal must necessarily lead you to the same conclusion. If this does not give you a platform to denounce me, I am not entitled to the Governorship nor to the pension.”

Governor Brown closed with a courteous invitation to his office in Sacramento for further discussion.
Parker, Brown Feud Gets Hotter
Chief in Blast at Law Enforcement Attack

More fuel was heaped on the bitter feud between Police Chief Parker and Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. when Parker accused the Governor of "unwar\ntied attacks" on law enforcement in Los Angeles City and County.

In his blistering counterblast, Parker said the state's chief executive was "mal\nted by some ulterior purpose" in criticizing local law enforcement, and scored Brown for "misluse of statistics."

Parker, in a 19-page letter to Brown, part of which he used in a speech yesterday before the Downtown Optimists Club at the Baltimore Hotel, charged the Governor had made "gratuitous and vituperative comments" concerning Parker's performance of his duties.

It is difficult to understand the reason for your unwarranted attack upon me in view of my public statements concerning your role in the legislative process and your action in the Erwin machine Gun Walker case, Parker wrote.

CITES CRITICISM

The police official pointed out "others were far more critical of you than I, and yet Sheriff (Peter J.) Pitchess and I are singled out for attack."

"I must conclude you are motivated by some ulterior purpose."

With the exception of the state of Nevada, California has the highest crime rate in the nation, but a breakdown of statistics shows the rate of increase in Los Angeles City and County lagged behind the state as a whole over a six year period.

"Crime in California constitutes a clear and present danger to the state itself," Parker asserted, "and the supposed improvements in the administration of criminal justice seem to have aggravated the problem."

"Respectfully submit it time the voices and opinions of dedicated, experienced and qualified law enforcement officers are needed in the halls of decision."

Parker included a breakdown of statistics in his letter, showing that in the six years between 1954 and 1960 the crime rate in the state increased 20 per cent, as compared with a county increase of 38.6 per cent and a city increase of 24.6 per cent.

"Parker said he believed a statement he filed with the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 27 in which he used the word "patronage." Parker "apparently provoked" Governor's anger. He agreed that statement as saying:

"The position of the Governor, as it is conveyed through his staff to the legis\lature, carries great weight in terms of patronage."

NOT ACCUSATION

This statement, Parker declared, "does not charge you with the use of patronage, but merely reflects a factual situation that can be applied to each Governor of every state."

The police chief did remind the Governor, however, of a dinner conversation in the Governor's Sacramento \n\nmission last February, writing:

You openly stated that when the governor sought the favor of the Legislature he was required to grant some favor in return.

You said it was a case of quid pro quo, that you had to give a judgeship or something and thus could not afford to go to the Legislature too often."

Parker cited a newspaper article which reported that Regents, former Los Angeles attorney now Brown's legislative secretary, must keep track of 78 bills, in addition to which he "has to ride herd on individual legislators and committee chairmen, encouraging, cajoling, sometimes threatening them."

The police chief cited the case as an illustration of the difficulty reconciling your attack upon me with my innocuous statement concerning patronage."

Parker pointed out he apparently incurred further gubernatorial anger with a statement concerning the commutation of the death sentence of Erwin Walker, who shot and killed a California Highway patrolman and shot two Los Angeles policemen, one of whom is still paralyzed as a result.

The governor's action in commuting the sentence, Parker charged, "illuminates his lack of concern for the problems of the police."

OTHER SITUATIONS

This conclusion, the police chief said, "was not based upon the Walker case alone but has its genesis in a series of situations" in which Brown was lured into giving his districts attorney of San Francisco and attorney general of California.

The governor's "first conflict with the police" came during trial of three defendants accused of murder in connection with the slaying of Nick DeJohn in San Francisco on May 7, 1947, according to Parker, who charged:...
"During the trial of three of the defendants charged with his (DeJohn's) murder, and while the jury was deliberating, you, as the District Attorney of San Francisco, moved for a dismissal of the jury although defendant Leonard Calamia was suspected of having been involved in a previous killing of one Caramussa in Chicago and although Calamia had not testified in the trial."

**BOOKIE DECISION**

Parker said the next "situation that caused me some concern" arose in a case in which Brown, as attorney general, was asked by the Los Angeles district attorney for an opinion in a case involving use of listening devices by Long Beach police investigating a bookie ring, charging:

"The uncertainty as to the propriety of police action raised by your opinion, and the Cahan decision that followed, caused a re-enforcement in enforcement action even in areas that might have been met with subsequent approval and despite the fact that the practice was approved by a penal code section."

Parker cited a long list of discrepancies between statements the Governor had made in speeches while he was a "potential candidate for governor" in 1957 and his actions following his election in 1958.

The police chief reminded Brown that during the 1960 budget session of the Legislature he (Parker) met with the Governor, "as an official spokesman, for the City of Los Angeles in support of a special session on narcotics legislation," adding:

"Not only did you refuse to call a special session on narcotics but during the second meeting you strongly indicated that you believed the responsibility for our inability to contain the illicit narcotics trade rested largely with the Los Angeles Police Department and particularly me."

"Nevertheless, you did call a special session on capital punishment and you sponsored a bill to repeal it in California."

"With other law enforcement representatives, I spoke in opposition to the bill and it failed in committee by one vote. "Some believe the failure of this bill determined the final disposition of the Chessman case."

**TOO INDEFINITE**

In meetings of a legislative liaison committee, which had representatives of the governor's office, the attorney general, peace officers' associations, sheriffs and district attorneys, Parker said, there was "a free exchange of ideas and proposals with the exception of your representative:" pointing out:

"We are unable to determine your position on narcotics legislation which was not made known until Feb. 27, 1961, and by that time our program had been approved and our bills introduced."

"In the light of this history, it is difficult to understand what you intend to convey when you say in your April 2, 1961, letter to me, "I stand ready to meet with you at any mutually convenient time to discuss further improvements in the administration of criminal justice."
Brown Gets Pointers From JFK

When you're trying to bypass a horde of Johnsons, it helps to have your own back room, as did Roger Blough of U.S. Steel, who wrote the President, asking for cooperation and an explanation of the steel price hikes. JFK approved the price hikes, but said Blough should not be put on the spot by the public. The President did not promise cooperation, but said he would discuss the matter with steel executives.

One business letter writer, however, got a straight answer from the President. Earl Tupper, chairman of the NCC, wrote to JFK, who had put development of the steel industry on the agenda for the next meeting of the Economic Council. Tupper asked the President if he thought the steel industry was making a contribution to the economy. JFK replied: "I think the steel industry is making a contribution to the economy, and I think the price hikes are justified."
against Roosevelt in his bitterest heyday.

Coupled with this stream of oral abuse was the economic sitdown previously reported in this column. The closing of marginal plants has required a great deal of capital, and the investment losses in European Europe. All this is tributed to the 400 market taboogains.

Today, following the economic policy started by the White House, the boys along Wall Street are singing a similar tune. They are calling on the President where they want him. When it is now apparent that the President is making no moves in the direction of increasing new equipment, plus wages and concessions, a new equipment plus, probably an across-the-board tax cut.

This is the one thing they want, and it's a lot. That's why some of those now saying they're the President are saying, 'He who laughs last laughs best. Not last, though they're singing a song backward old friends once.
Assemblyman Raps Brown's FBI Statement

Gov. Brown was challenged Tuesday to identify the FBI man who informed the governor the FBI could put their hands on every Communist in California in 10 minutes.

Assemblyman Howard Behin, Glendale Republican, said, "It's shocking to hear that any responsible official of the FBI would have made any such statement to the governor.

Behin said, "This is not to say that the FBI is not doing the best job humanly possible in keeping track of the Communists. But for a responsible FBI official to make the complacent statement attributed to him by Brown, just doesn't make sense." He charged that Brown's statement obviously seeks to discount the significance of..."
Phony Photograph Used in Campaign

By Richard Bergholtz

LOS ANGELES—You might call it the Case of the Phony Photograph. And it might refer to the controversial booklet "California: A Minefield of Red Menace," printed during the days of the "Red Scare" and "The Communist Menace," that was distributed by the California Democratic Council. The booklet, written by Karl Prouse, is a thinly disguised attack on Governor Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General Stanley Mosk, and Controller Alan Cranston. It's a piece of literature that has been widely distributed, but has not been thoroughly investigated.

On page 24, there is a picture that conveys the impression that Brown is praying in the direction of a Communist flag. The picture appears alongside the text on the page.

In case the reader misses the implication, the page carries the line, "This is a Red Apparatus."

The catch is that Brown was not praying. What happened was this: Earlier this year, there was a demonstration from Los Angeles, California, among others, the Governor. Pictures were taken, and the statements were shown in the traditional Buddhist gesture of greeting called "sambho"—hands palm together and beneath the chin.

Mr. Gale
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Oct 17, 1962
LOS ANGELES—A LEADING SPOKESMAN FOR THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY TONIGHT SAID CHARGES BY CALIFORNIA GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN WERE FALSE, AND IN TURN DESCRIBED THE CALIFORNIA CHIEF EXECUTIVE AS "AN APOSTLE OF INDECISION AND A TOWER OF JELLY."

JOHN ROUSSELOT, DISTRICT GOVERNOR OF THE SOCIETY FOR SIX WESTERN STATES, REFERRED TO BROWN'S STATEMENTS AT A DEMOCRATIC PARTY FUNCTION IN SALT LAKE, IN WHICH BROWN WAS QUOTED AS CALLING THE JOHN BIRCH MEMBERS "RACISTS, WARMONGERS AND APOSTLES OF NONTHINK."

"GOVERNOR BROWN FULL-WELL KNOWS THESE STATEMENTS ARE FALSE," RUSSELOT SAID. "APPARENTLY HE HAS NOT READ A REPORT RELEASED BY THE DEMOCRAT (SIC) CONTROLLED CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE FACT FINDING COMMITTEE ON UNAMERICAN ACTIVITIES WHICH CLEARLY STATES THAT THE SOCIETY IS NONE OF THOSE WHICH THE GOVERNOR PERSISTS IN CALLING IT."

"THE REPORT DESCRIBES THE SOCIETY AS A FUNDAMENTALIST, AMERICAN ORGANIZATION."

9/19--AM1103 PED
SALT LAKE CITY--CALIFORNIA GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN TONIGHT ASKED WESTERN DEMOCRATS TO "TAKE OFF THE GLOVES" AND FORCE THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TO COME TO TERMS WITH THE "RADICAL RIGHT."

HE SPOKE AT A DINNER SESSION OF THE 13-STATE WESTERN DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, ALTERNATELY ATTACKING THE GOP AND PRAISING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY.

BROWN SAID THE REPUBLICANS CAN'T "PAY LIP SERVICE TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN, WHILE THEY EMBRACE RABBLE-ROUSING BIRCHERS WHO WOULD LEAVE THE FATE OF AMERICAN NEGROES IN THE TENDER HANDS OF (ALABAMA GOV. GEORGE WALLACE)."

"THEY CAN'T PREACH LAW AND ORDER WHILE THEY SWING INTO LINE BESIDE THOSE WHO CALL FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF (CHIEF JUSTICE) EARL WARREN--AND THOSE WHO CRY "BOMB CUBA NO.""

THE CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR SAID REPUBLICANS NEED TO DRAW A "CLEAR LINE BETWEEN THE GOALS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THE OBJECTIVES OF ROBERT WELCH," WELCH HEADS THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY.

"I CALL ON DEMOCRATS TO GET IN THE FIGHT TO SHOW THE BIRCHERS FOR WHAT THEY ARE--Racists, Warmongers, Hatemongers and Postles of Nonthink," BROWN TOLD THE DEMOCRATS.
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consideration must be given to the President's fatigue, his sore hand, and his sleep.

**Merry-Go-Round**

One of the most accurate pollsters used by President Johnson, Oliver Quayle, has made a survey of the United Steelworkers line-up in the election battle between President Dave McDonald and Secretary J. W. Abel. It shows McDonald leading with a substantial margin of 44.5 per cent. Abel has only 41 per cent, with 1 per cent undecided. The poll, a thorough one, included locals in basic steel, aluminum, nonferrous metals and miscellaneous industries.

California Republicans have elected actor George Murphy to the U.S. Senate, but are talking about running Ronald Reagan, right-wing General Electric TV commentator, for governor against Pat Brown. If so, Pat's slogan will be: "One movie actor is enough."

—The slogan that hurt Perry Smith in the California Senate race was coined after Bobby Kennedy had entered the race for the Senate in New York. The slogan was: "Vote for the candidate of your choice in the state of his choice."

© 1964, Bell-McClure Syndicate, Inc.

Drew Pearson will report on how bigotry affects Christians in Mississippi over Radio WTOP at 6:40 tonight.

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**
LOS ANGELES--GEORGE CHRISTOPHER, REPUBLICAN GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE, SUED UPI-25C PEARSON FOR $5 MILLION YESTERDAY, CLAIMING THE COLUMNIST'S EARLIER LIBEL SUIT AGAINST HIM WAS A "SMEAR PLOTTED AND INSPIRED" BY GOV. EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN.
PEARSON SUED CHRISTOPHER, THE FORMER MAYOR OF SAN FRANCISCO, FOR $2,625,000 LAST MONDAY. PEARSON SUED FOR "LIBEL" AND CLAIMED "INTERFERENCE WITH BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS."

IN HIS CROSS-COMPLAINT, CHRISTOPHER CHARGED THAT PEARSON'S STATEMENTS WERE "UNQUESTIONABLY MOTIVATED BY PAT BROWN" AND THAT THE COLUMNIST'S SUIT WAS "INTENDED TO PREVENT MY NOMINATION, AS EVERY POLL SHOWS THAT I AM THE ONLY REPUBLICAN WHO CAN DEFEAT EVERY DEMOCRATIC PARTY NOMINEE, INCLUDING THE INCUMBENT GOVERNOR." BROWN CAMPAIGN AIDES MEANTIME DISCLOSED THAT DEMOCRATIC INVESTIGATORS HAVE BEEN LOOKING INTO THE PERSONAL AND POLITICAL LIFE OF CHRISTOPHER AND TWO OTHER BROWN OPPONENTS IN THE JUNE 7 PRIMARY, RONALD REAGAN AND SAMUEL YORTY, MAYOR OF LOS ANGELES.

5/19--GE1013A
I received today a copy of a letter that Stanley R. Schrotel, Chief of Police at Cincinnati, wrote to Pat Brown, Attorney General of California dated July 28, 1959. Mr. Schrotel takes issue with the Attorney General for his use of the word "unjustifiably" in their annual report in commenting upon the use by the FBI of 1950 census figures.

Enclosure

We certainly did with ourAMA using 1950 census figures.
July 28, 1958

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Attorney General
State of California
600 State Building
San Francisco 2, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

In reviewing your publication, "Crime in California - 1957", I have observed your statement on page 13 concerning the use by the FBI in the Uniform Crime Reports of 1950 census figures in calculating crime rates, and that this places California in an unjustifiably unfavorable light. There can be little question that the use of 1950 census figures places California in an unfavorable light, although this may not be said for all states, but I take strong exception to your characterization of that procedure as unjustified.

In the latest Uniform Crime Reports, the crime rates tables are clearly noted for all to see that the 1950 census figures were used and the reasons for their use is nationally compiled figures, as well as cautionary comments as to their value, are presented on page 92.

It does seem to me that before charging in your publication that the FBI procedure was without justification you would have communicated your suggestions to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, or the FBI.

Very truly yours,

Stanley R. Schroedel

STANLEY R. SCHROEDEL, Chairman
Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting
International Association of Chiefs of Police

Enclosure
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
United States Department of Justice  
Washington 25, D.C.

July 31, 1958

Dear Mr. Hoover:


You may note in The Examiner story on our report that this office is not quoted as giving out the figure of 35 per cent, but that the statement is used unquoted at the end of paragraph 4 without the source being qualified.

The heading of The Examiner story was a matter of editorial selection within the newspaper office, and was picked for the "lead" from a paragraph on the second page of our release. (Enclosed)

In the matter of the 35 per cent mentioned by The Examiner, this might have been a conservative estimate based on a May 12 statement by Senator Knowland of California before the United Press editors in convention in Ojai. The Los Angeles Times quotes the Senator as saying that FBI statistics show an increase in crime rate of 77 per cent in California from 1950 to 1957. Of course, for this increase I am blamed. As a chief law enforcement officer myself, I believe that such a statement is as unfair as if you were held responsible for the national crime increase. (Copy enclosed) The San Francisco Call-Bulletin also quotes the figure of 77 per cent, as did most California newspapers. (Copy enclosed)
Honorable J. Edgar Hoover

You may wish to clarify the quoted figures of the Senator, in view of his statement in the Call-Bulletin that he got the figures from the FBI.

I will endeavor to bring to public attention this discrepancy in crime statistics, to the end that such errors are not, through repetition, given the semblance of facts.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

EGB:MC
Encs.
The rates are based on the number of occurrences for each 100,000 persons in the State based on the 1957 population.

Exception is taken in the report to the figures of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its Uniform Crime Reports in using the decennial United States Census. This presents California's crime in "an unjustifiable unfavorable light as the State is one-third greater in population over 1957 than it was in 1950."

California's 1957 population, on estimates of the State Department of Finance, was 14,160,000.

The seven major crimes in 1957 in comparison with 1956 are listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1957</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willful homicide</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>10,182</td>
<td>11,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>13,620</td>
<td>15,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>84,771</td>
<td>101,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft, except auto</td>
<td>15,364</td>
<td>17,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto theft</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>45,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>2,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These seven major crimes show an increase of 12.8 per cent in 1957 over 1956.

Arrests for adult felony are up 10.6 per cent.
Felony complaints increased 11.6 per cent.
Number of defendants prosecuted rose 13.7 per cent.

"This means that serious crime has increased in California between 10 per cent and 13 per cent faster than the rise in population," says the report to the Attorney General.

Rises in rates are general in all counties, but San Francisco and Alameda Counties are listed as still relatively low, with the average for the Bay Area and seven other counties being 7.1 per cent.

Los Angeles County had a rise of 14.9, and nine other Southern California counties had an average of 17.8 per cent.

It is pointed out that the increase in population from 1950 to 1957 is estimated at 54.6 per cent in the nine Southern counties.
MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESS
FOR RELEASE: JULY 16, 1958

The number of major criminal matters handled by law enforcement agencies and courts in California rose 12.8% during 1957, Attorney General Edmund G. Brown reported today in a summary entitled "Crime in California, 1957."

"The data, compiled by the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in my Department, are the result of the best criminal reporting system in the country. It is a compilation in which dedicated civil servants of the State Department of Justice and local police agencies in California are working together as equal partners.

"A large part of the statistical increase in crime is due to better reporting, better procedures for obtaining data, and better law enforcement methods.

"But beyond those factors, there is still an underlying increase in unlawful conduct in our communities. That increase is one of the disturbing symptoms of our times both in California and across the nation.

"For that problem, the blame can no more be put on law enforcement officials, sheriffs, and district attorneys than placing blame for a rising divorce rate," Brown said.

Comparison of the California situation with that reported by the FBI for the entire country, shows that while police and criminal court work in California rose 10 to 13% faster than the State's population increase, crime last year rose four times faster than the population increase for the nation as a whole.

The information on California's crime trends was based on four separate series of data:
1. Seven major felony offenses;
2. The number of adults arrested and booked on all felony charges;
3. The number of adults arrested who have appeared in court on felony complaints;
Ten Sacramento Valley counties increased 14.9 per cent in crime, with seven San Joaquin Valley counties showing a 3.5 per cent rise.

In adult felony arrests there was a total of 75,802 (18 years of age and over), for a rate of 535.3 persons per 100,000 population. Highest increase in arrests was for forgery, with 19.3 per cent. Numerically, burglary in 1957 accounted for the highest number of arrests: 16,509, followed by narcotics arrests of 10,353, and checks 9,120.

There was an increase in the number of felony complaints, with burglary complaints up 16.5 per cent, grand theft 16.7, auto theft 16.8, checks 17.8.

In 1957 there were 23,969 defendants filed on in superior court on felony charges, compared with 20,252 in 1956. All offenses brought to court showed rate increase, with the exception of homicide which had a 7.2 decrease (1956 - 494; 1957 - 477).

The Crime in California Report, 1957, was compiled by the staff of Ronald H. Beattie, Chief of the Bureau of Criminal Statistics, and has been sent to all peace officers and press media.
Brown Rips Knowland

... And Vice Versa

By JACK McDOWELL
Call-Bulletin Political Editor

CAI, May 12 — The two
first names are fighting to be
come California's next gov-
ernor, and the campaign
took a turn today after one of
the leaders said he was
worried about the outcome.

It was a hard-fought battle,
with both candidates
ailed and their campaigns
struggling. But in the end,
the voters decided. Brown
won by a narrow margin,
51% to 49%.

FAT BROWN (LEFT) AND
WILLIAM KNOWLAND
Join Before The State
Call-In

Brown said he was overjoyed
with the victory. "I'm so
happy," he said. "I'm going
to work hard for the people of
California and make sure they
have a better future."
Major crime rose 12.8 per cent in California during 1957, Attorney General Edmund G. Brown reported yesterday in taking exception to the FBI's higher crime statistics for the State.

Brown, noting a general increase in all counties, said it increased from 60 per cent to San Francisco and Alameda 68 per cent.

Counties had relatively low overall crime rates.

San Francisco's increase was 8.5 per cent and Alameda 9 per cent.

County was 19 per cent for all six. But Brown said.

OBJECTIVITY HITS

He charged that the FBI's rate of increase for the state-

Uniform Crime Reports, published each November, the FBI has released its annual crime statistics for the state.

The FBI's report states that the number of crime occurrences for each 10,000 persons in the state for the non-California population figures under the new code.

Brown and his aides say that the statistical basis of the population in the 1950 Census was the population of 1950.

Brown said the new method of calculation for computing the FBI's figures was a major factor in the increase.

It is based on the former law enforcement method of calculating crime rates on the basis of population estimates for each county.

Brown noted that the law enforcement method of computing crime rates in California is based on the population of the state as of the last Census.

The FBI, in contrast, uses the number of crimes committed in each county as the basis for computing the crime rates.

Brown said the new method of calculation for computing the FBI's figures was a major factor in the increase.

It is based on the former law enforcement method of calculating crime rates on the basis of population estimates for each county.

Brown noted that the law enforcement method of computing crime rates in California is based on the population of the state as of the last Census.
Knowland Flays Brown
Performance in Office

BY THE WATCHMAN - In urging those Democrats who voted for Sen. Knowland yesterday to protest what he calls "prejudice," his Democratic opponent, Alfonso M. Trenham, plans two
Talks Here Today.

Trenham will address two
President's Day meetings in Los Angeles County
Today.
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Under date of July 21, 1958, the Director wrote a letter to Attorney General Edmund G. Brown of California as a result of an article which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner of July 16, 1958, captioned, "FBI Crime Report Unfair, Brown Says." A tickler copy of our memorandum dated July 18 and the letter to Brown are enclosed. Our letter to Attorney General Brown was also based on a letter to the editor of Time Magazine by Bern M. Jacobson of the Law Enforcement Section of the Attorney General's Office, which letter Chief William H. Parker of the Los Angeles Police Department made public. Jacobson took issue with Time Magazine and was critical of our uniform crime reporting program as well as law enforcement agencies outside of California. We sent a cursory letter to Jacobson enclosing a copy of the Director's letter to Time Magazine and Jacobson sent in a bare acknowledgement.

There is enclosed a communication from Attorney General Brown dated July 31, 1958, in answer to the Director's letter to him of July 21, 1958. Brown's letter indicates he knows little about crime reporting or he is deliberately attempting to distort the issue. He cites the fact that Senator Knowland has been quoted in California papers as saying that FBI statistics show an increased crime rate of 77% in California from 1950 to 1957. He then says, "Of course for this increase I am blamed. As a chief law enforcement officer yourself, I believe that such a statement is as unfair as if you are held responsible for the national crime increase." Brown enclosed a copy of his press release dated July 16, 1958, which precipitated the headline story in the San Francisco Examiner to the effect that "FBI Crime Reporting Unfair." He also encloses copies of three newspaper clippings.

On page 2 of his letter, Brown states, "You may wish to clarify the quoted figures of the Senator (Knowland), in view of his statement in the Call/Bulletin that he got the figures from the FBI. And I strongly feel that we should not allow this statement of Brown's to go unchallenged. We feel that the attached letter should go forward to Brown, which clearly and simply cites the facts and leaves the only source that Brown can attack, law enforcement agencies in California."
Memo to Mr. Tolson
Re: Uniform Crime Reporting - California

RECOMMENDATION:

I recommend the attached letter go forward to Attorney General Brown.

[Signature]
August 7, 1958

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Attorney General
State of California
600 State Building
San Francisco 2, California

My dear Mr. Attorney General:

I received your letter of July 31, 1958, concerning crime in California. In your letter you seem to question the accuracy of the data which has appeared in the press in California concerning the comparison of crime in 1957 with that of 1950.

So that you will understand how the figure of 77 per cent was derived, a computation was made of the total number of crimes reported to us in 1950 by cities in California and that figure compared with the total crimes reported by the same cities in 1957. This reflected a 76.7 per cent increase. The data which was used in computing this percentage was submitted to this Bureau by law enforcement agencies in California. Consequently, the per cent change indicated is based not upon any FBI data but is based entirely upon data submitted by California law enforcement agencies. I am not unmindful of the fact that population estimates of the U. S. Census Bureau reflect that there was a population increase in California from 1950 to 1957 of 32 per cent.

Since receiving your letter we have reviewed your publication, "Crime in California, 1957" and compared the figures therein relating to felony crimes reported to your Bureau with similar data presented in your first publication for 1952 and this reflects an increase of approximately 70 per cent for this five-year period.

I hope that the foregoing clarifies our position for you and assures you of the accuracy of the data which has been compiled from statistics submitted by California law enforcement agencies.

Sincerely yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director
August 15, 1958

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover
Del Charro Hotel
La Jolla, California

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Enclosed find copy of letter sent to Stanley Schrotel in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Ronald Beattie, Chief of the Bureau of Criminal Statistics, Department of Justice, I believe makes very clear our position. If there is anything you can do to resolve the situation, I am sure it will be appreciated by all law enforcement officers in this state.

Sincerely

EDMUND G. BROWN, Attorney General
Memorandum to Mr. Tolson
Re: Edmund G. Brown
Attorney General
State of California

calculated in the absence of population estimates by the Census Bureau from individual places from which we received crime reports.

In September 1957, [redacted] of our Statistical Section in Philadelphia and requested specific criticisms of the Uniform Crime Reports. After considerable conversation [redacted] admitted we should continue to calculate our rates as we now do, and the only real suggestion had to do with the elimination of statutory rape, which has been done.

On December 4, 1957, [redacted] spent several hours at the Bureau of Criminal Statistics in Sacramento in conversation with [redacted] of the Statistical Bureau and their field representative [redacted]. On three occasions [redacted] asked the point-blank question as to what suggestions the California Bureau has as to improvement or changes in the Uniform Crime Reports and received no suggestions from them. It should be observed that Mr. Beattie was out of the city and not available.

Beattie, in his letter to Schrotel, changes his position slightly in connection with the use of 1950 census figures and criticizes their use because the "published rates are unjustifiably used beyond their true validity even though readers are specifically cautioned that this should not be done." He goes on the suggest that it might be better if the crime rate tables be eliminated altogether if current population figures are not available. This problem is being covered in the report of the Consultant Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting. Also, the Director has instructed that we are never again to use the 1950 census figures in the Uniform Crime Reports bulletin.

RECOMMENDATION:

The letter from Attorney General Brown itself does not indicate a reply should be made, and to initiate any further correspondence on the subject of Mr. Beattie's letter to Schrotel would unnecessarily continue an argument over one word "unjustifiably" presented in the annual publication of the State of California. Under the circumstances, it is recommended that no action be taken.
August 14, 1958

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover  
Del Charro Hotel  
San Diego, California  

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Your interview with the San Diego Union has been called to my attention. I had seen it before I saw you at home last night. I would have liked to discuss it with you at that time but felt that it would be improper to do so at a social occasion such as the very pleasant evening we had together.

I do want you to know, however, that I never, at any time, any place, anywhere, have criticized the statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I haven't the slightest idea where you obtained the information that I had made any critical remarks at all. It is true that my staff in the Bureau of Statistics stated that the FBI statistics were based upon the 1950 population, but this was not in any manner whatsoever meant to be derogatory of the great work that your bureau is doing in the field of crime.

We have so much in common, and I am engaged in such a difficult political campaign, that I regret very much that you felt it necessary to criticize me in a very unfriendly newspaper.

I do hope that I have the opportunity to discuss this with you personally at some time convenient to you.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Honorável Edmund G. Brown  
Attorney General  
State of California  
600 State Building  
San Francisco 2, California  

My dear Mr. Attorney General:  

I received your letter of August 14th and I certainly enjoyed the evening at [redacted]. It was a very pleasant affair.

I am somewhat concerned about the position you have taken with respect to my remarks to a representative of the San Diego Union on August 11th. During the time that I have been in California I have received comments from various individuals concerning your criticism of the FBI which has appeared in the local press. My associates in California have been closely queried about your attitude toward the FBI and the critical comments that have appeared in the press about the Uniform Crime Reporting program which this Bureau handles for the International Association of Chiefs of Police. My position is based on the following facts.

In the San Francisco Examiner of July 16th, there appeared an article captioned, "FBI Crime Report Unfair, Brown Says." It was apparent from this article that it was based on a release from you in connection with the issuance of your statistical report, "Crime in California - 1957." The opening sentence in the article stated, "Major crime rose 12.6% in California during 1951. Attorney General Edmund G. Brown reported yesterday in taking exception to the FBI's higher crime statistics for the State." In the fourth paragraph of the same article it was stated, "He (Brown) charged that the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports, as California presented California crime in "an unjustifiable, unfavorable light." The FBI set the figure at 15 percent."

In your letter to me of July 31, 1958, in the second paragraph, you point out that the Examiner story was based on your press release of July 16, 1958, and in the third paragraph of your letter you acknowledged that the heading of the Examiner story was a matter of editorial selection based upon material.
Honorable Edmund G. Brown

in the second page of your press release. Had you been inaccurately quoted in connection with this article, I assume you would have taken prompt steps to correct the erroneous presentation.

I have been asked why you used the word “unjustifiable” with regard to the Uniform Crime Reporting program. This has been interpreted as a direct attack on this program by you. The same language appears on page thirteen of your statistical report, “Crime in California - 1957.”

Another item emanating from your office which gives me a great deal of concern is a letter dated July 2nd which your assistant, Mr. Bern M. Jacobson, wrote to Time magazine wherein he took the position that Los Angeles has a high crime rate because the police department in that city reports the incidence of crime honestly and completely and that other major cities such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit do not submit honest and complete reports in conjunction with the Uniform Crime Reporting program. This is certainly an unwarranted assumption on the part of Mr. Jacobson and his comments can only bring discredit on the entire Uniform Crime Reporting program and impeach the honesty of brother law enforcement officers.

I hope that the foregoing explains my position in this matter and that you now understand the factual basis for my comments.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

TO

OFFICIAL INDICATED BELOW BY CHECK MARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Check Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tolson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Belmont</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mohr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nease</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rosen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tamm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Trotter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. C. Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Holloman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Gandy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Me ( )
Note and Return ( )
Prepare Reply ( )
For Your Recommendation ( )
What are the facts? ( )
Remarks:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
Office Memorandum

TO: Mr. A. H. Belmont
FROM: W. C. Sullivan

DATE: December 12, 1958

SUBJECT: EDMUND G. BROWN
CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR-ELECT
INFORMATION CONCERNING
CENTRAL RESEARCH MATTER

SAC San Francisco advised that former SA Harold G. Robinson, currently Deputy Director of the Division of Criminal Law and Enforcement for the State of California, had commented concerning the stand of Governor-elect Brown on the subject of capital punishment. Brown's final report to the California Legislature as Attorney General recommends that consideration of capital punishment as a deterrent to homicides should be faced squarely and should be the subject of continued study. According to Robinson, Brown feels that a history of 86 years of capital punishment in California has not proven it to be an effective deterrent to homicides.

It is noteworthy in this regard that the 1958 California Legislature rejected a proposed discontinuation of capital punishment for a trial period. (Current Developments in Criminal Matters--Crimdel--San Francisco, 12/9/58)

For information, it is noted that former SA Harold G. Robinson served as a Special Agent from 1934 to 1941. He resigned voluntarily indicating that he might be persuaded to withdraw his resignation if there were an opportunity for reallocation. He was rated as an average but not outstanding agent. He served as an investigator on the Truman and Kefauver Senate Committees and in recent years has been a principal aide to Attorney General Edmund G. Brown in California. (67-33228)

RECOMMENDATION:

For the information of the Director.

WEO:ela
(7)
1 - Section tickler
1 - W. E. O'Neill
1 - Mr. Belmont
1 - Mr. Rosen
1 - Mr. Mohr
1 - Mr. Nease

66 FEB 201959
On the afternoon of January 27, 1959, I called upon Governor BROWN in his Sacramento office.

I was graciously received by the Governor, and he enthusiastically expressed a desire to cooperate freely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the San Francisco Office. He also expressed, in a complimentary manner, his personal feelings concerning the efficiency of the Bureau.

I discussed with the Governor the details concerning the Young American Medals Awards for Service and Bravery. I also advised him of the Bureau's desire to cooperate with his office on matters of a mutual interest.
The Name Check Section has received a request from Navy for the results of any investigations conducted by the FBI concerning the captioned person. Commander J. L. Rutledge, Office of Naval Intelligence, on 8-27-59 advised that his office was not aware of the reason for the request which originated with the District Intelligence Office, 12th Naval District, San Francisco, California. Commander Rutledge speculated that the request could possibly be in connection with some tour Governor Brown would be making at a naval facility.

Bureau files reveal that Governor Brown has never been investigated by the FBI. In an article in a California newspaper under date of 7-16-58, Brown, then Attorney General of California, charged the FBI Uniform Crime Reports presented California in an "unjustifiable and unfavorable light" because of the manner in which the statistics were compiled. He subsequently stated the article was not in any manner meant to be derogatory concerning the "great work" being done by the FBI. Our files also reveal allegations received in the past indicating Brown sought the aid of communists and communist-infiltrated organizations during his political rise. In 1945 he reportedly opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges, a west coast labor leader accused of membership in the Communist Party. On a Personnel Security Questionnaire submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission in July, 1959, Brown admitted past membership in the National Lawyers Guild (NLG) in 1946. An article in the "San Francisco Chronicle," a California newspaper, under date of 8-9-49, announced Brown had been elected vice president of the San Francisco Chapter of the NLG. The NLG has been cited as a communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Atomic Energy Commission is presently considering whether or not it will require an investigation of Brown by the FBI in view of Brown's position as a member of the Board of Regents at the University of California, which position holds a high degree of importance and sensitivity under the Atomic Energy Act. The Atomic Energy Commission Security Director, John A. Waters, on 8-12-59 advised our liaison representative that the matter had not yet been decided but that he, Waters, would let the Bureau know as soon as a decision in the case has been reached at AEC.
Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
RE: EDMUND GERALD BROWN

ACTION:

Inasmuch as Navy requested specifically only the results of investigations conducted concerning Brown, the name check request is being answered with the statement that the Bureau has conducted no investigation concerning the subject of its inquiry.

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.
September 30, 1959

Honorable John Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

My dear Director:

Let me convey my thanks and personal appreciation for the copy of the Uniform Crime Reports of 1958 and your accompanying letter. I will certainly be interested in studying this document.

As you know, throughout my years as District Attorney and Attorney General I have had a deep interest in criminal statistical reports, and the greatest respect and confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation under your directorship. It is a matter of deep regret that misunderstanding should have arisen in the interpretation of the facts, the true meaning of which is of such grave importance to the entire country. I am sure that Attorney General Mosk is likewise gravely concerned with a true portrayal of the crime picture in this and in other states, and I shall personally ask his office to reexamine both sets of reports.

May I reiterate my confidence, both in you and the Bureau, for the splendid work for which we are all so grateful.

With kindest personal regards

Sincerely

EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor
I am sure you will be amused at the fact that I had an allegedly ten-minute courtesy-call visit with the Governor today in order that he would know me. This stretched into an hour when he found that he had met me several times before though he could not recall the instances.

It was the usual courtesy situation which rapidly developed into general conversation and opinions back and forth. But one thing was his comment, "I am sure I have been off base with your boss. Hells bells I had enough trouble with the campaign without trying to take on the No. 1 important official of this country. I just had a new letter from him (this was the Bureau's letter to him about the annual statistics) and it looks like everything is all right. Gee, I hope I didn't forget to answer that one and I must see about that right now!"

BROWN is very cordial and, while I will deal with circumspection with him, it would appear that he is very much aware of the prestige and authority of you and the Bureau. In fact, this came out very plainly in his recent selection of members of a state commission known as the Minimum Standards and Education Commission on Law Enforcement. All of the appointees are friendly to the Bureau and all five of the law enforcement members of the Commission are National Academy graduates.
URGENT 2-9-60 10-46 AM PST VEG
TO DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM SAC, SAN FRANCISCO 1 P
IMMEDIATE ATTENTION.. ASSISTANT DIRECTOR CARThA DE LOACH
GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN, INFORMATION CONCERNING BUREAU ADVISED SAC
CONTACT ABLE TO MAKE SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS BY CANCELLING SEVERAL OTHER APPOINTMENTS TO ENABLE ME TO HANDLE THIS MATTER TODAY AND I HAVE APPOINTMENT WITH GOVERNOR THREE THIRTY PM TODAY AT SACRAMENTO. BUREAU WILL BE ADVISED OF RESULTS.
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DIRECTOR, FBI (100-351585)          2/4/60
SAC, WFO (105-14317)

VISITORS TO IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES
IS - R

Re: WFO airtel to the Bureau dated 1/27/60, captioned "MIKHAIL A. MENSHEIKOV; IS - R."

Enclosed for the Bureau are five copies and for San Francisco one information copy of a letterhead memorandum dated and captioned as above.

The first informant mentioned in the memorandum is and the information furnished was set out in a letterhead enclosed with airtel. The second informant in the memorandum is a highly confidential source (documentation anonymous).

The enclosed memorandum has been classified "Confidential" as it reflects investigatory interest in a diplomat of a foreign power and because information from informants could reasonably result in the identification of informants of continuing value and compromise the future effectiveness thereof.

Information copy furnished SF inasmuch as further information relative to this matter may come to the attention of that office.

(2) - Bureau (Encls. 5)
1 - San Francisco (Encl. 1) (Info) (AM) (RM)
2 - WFO
   (1 - 105-24305) [MENSHEIKOV] (3-44)

HEF: ac
(5)
6/3/68
CLASSIFIED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ)
CLASSIFIED BY: 25X7.6
DECLASSIFIED ON: 6/9/83

67 FEB 17 1960
VISITORS TO IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

The December, 1959, "Diplomatic List," published by the United States Department of State, describes Mikhail A. Menshikov as Ambassador, Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), Washington, D.C. ($)


The January, 1960, "Congressional Directory" lists Edmund G. (Pat) Brown as the Governor of the state of California.

A confidential informant, who has furnished reliable information in the past, learned on January 26, 1960, that Drew Pearson and Governor Brown of California had an appointment to have lunch with Soviet Ambassador Menshikov at the Embassy of the USSR on January 26, 1960. ($) (u)

Another confidential informant, who has furnished reliable information in the past, learned on February 2, 1960, that Drew Pearson had informed Menshikov that since their lunch he had talked further with Governor Brown and learned that the Governor definitely desires to visit Moscow, USSR, approximately in the middle of April, 1960. Pearson plans to go to Moscow with Governor Brown. (X) (u)

According to the second informant, Pearson formally requested Menshikov to arrange for Pearson to have a televised interview with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev in about mid-April. Pearson pointed out that he would submit questions in advance and would like to use Soviet technicians and cameramen. He pointed out that such an interview, coming before the Summit Conference, would do much toward promoting better understanding. (u)

SECRET

WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
February 4, 1960

CONFIDENTIAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

In Reply, Please Refer to File No.
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CH. 2/21/61
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CLASSIFIED BY... F 02/9/70
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standing. Pearson suggested that Governor Brown be included in the interview and further suggested that Khrushchev ask Brown questions about the United States and that he, Pearson, ask questions of both men. Pearson described Governor Brown as one of the leading Catholics in the United States who is a very sincere believer in world peace and cooperation with the USSR.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is locked to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.
Office Memorandum

TO: Director, FBI

IMMEDIATE ATTENTION:

DATE: 2/10/60

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR CARLTON DE LOACH

FROM: SAC, San Francisco

SUBJECT: EDMUND G. BROWN
GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

Instructions of Mr. DE LOACH to see the Governor concerning an English examination question of UCLA published in the Los Angeles newspapers.

I was finally able to make arrangements through SAC Contact to the Governor, so that he was able to rearrange his schedule to see me. I was taken through the back way into his personal study so we would not be disturbed and so that the nine people waiting for him would not know he was even in his office. We spent a moment discussing about the fact that he was arranging a six-hundred-million-dollar allocation in the next seven years for California highways and that it was not nearly sufficient. He noted that the situation must be important to drive 100 miles through the heavy rains to handle it right away and noted specifically that all I had to do was to indicate that the Director had something on his mind and it made no difference what his personal situation was he would change it to try and be of assistance.

I reviewed the situation from the exhibits I had, i.e., copies of the Los Angeles newspapers, whereupon it became clear that he had absolutely no knowledge of it. He called to whom it had been routed and found that had been ill and out of the office for the past three days and that nothing had occurred. He then called in his two personal secretaries and raised the devil with them for not even having the communication acknowledged. He took up the point that I had made about to the American Legion which had authored the letter and told the secretaries that he was much disturbed that no action had been taken. He said, "I'll bet this kind of thing wouldn't happen in Mr. Hoover's outfit." At that time he went on to lecture them as to what the Bureau and the American Legion think of his group if the routes were as sloppy as this situation," etc.

We then got down to business and he stated he would see the answering letter, which would be available to the press, went today to as he felt that the question was obviously loaded and said that it was a terrible thing to indoctrinate kids this way; that the FBI was wonderful and as a matter of fact, he sometimes wondered why we didn't get into more situations than we did.
as we were obviously needed. He went on in considerable detail to state that he felt that this was a completely unfair situation and that whoever did it didn't have any experience from which to draw. He said that in his own past law enforcement experience as a prosecuting attorney and as Attorney General he had found that without exception the FBI's policy was impeccable and he had wished a number of times in those capacities -- and now -- that he had an organization half as good.

The Governor stated that his assistant, would write the communication and gave instructions that was to make a copy of the letter to immediately available to the Chancellor of UCLA for immediate action. He said he would not have the communication directed to President CLARK KERR as KERR is traveling in Latin America. Further, he said he would not wait until the next meeting of the Regents, which is 2/23/60, as he wanted this thing done right now. He instructed to call the Chancellor and tell him that he would appreciate an immediate investigation be made to fix responsibility and authorship of the question and to specifically ascertain "what the man had as an alibi" for such a question. He also told to make it clear telephonically to the Chancellor that the Governor was having enough trouble with the University's budget at this time and didn't want to incur the wrath of the FBI as an additional handicap. He then turned to me and said, "There'll be no fight on the matter but I have to be careful about the situation. I have usually made it a policy not to try to tell the University specifically what to do unless it is directly in my capacity as Governor concerning fiscal matters." He said, "I have had a number of fights with the liberals there because I feel that they are not helping the reputation of the University but they are very sensitive and actually have Constitutional rights and privileges that I cannot invade. Instead, I act in concert with the regents and they usually go along with me."

To help the Governor and in the answer, I furnished him a copy of your Dallas speech wherein you decried the problem of a national police. He was quick to note that he was friendly with Senator Lyndon Johnson after I pointed out the circumstances of the purpose of the speech. I also gave him a copy of the Law Enforcement Bulletin for October, 1953, and referred him to your editorial about the danger of a national police force, as well as your comments on Page 5 therein as to the speech you gave before the ABA at Los Angeles that summer and noted the country-wide coverage of the situation through the Bulletin and the ABA.
I told the Governor that we were getting "inquiries" about this situation in the Los Angeles area in order to try to insure that we followed through to do what the Governor instructed.

We closed off the meeting with the fact that he also intends to write you personally as to the situation and that I should continue to feel free at any time to advise him of anything in which you thought he could be of assistance as he would be only too glad to do so. His final comment was, "Someday when you and I both have a little more time it would be nice if you would survey my staff and put some FBI procedures into effect!"

I shall follow up with the press here in accordance with Mr. DE LOACH's suggestion so that inquiries are made of the Governor's office to help insure that there is a follow-through.

In view of the past history of the Governor with the Bureau, I was very much impressed with his obvious desire to be of assistance, his cordiality as shown by the fact that he broke off a considerable amount of obviously important matters to see me immediately and his general sincerity. There is no question from his comments of his continued admiration for you personally.
February 9, 1960

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover  
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation  
4936 - 30th Place  
Washington D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Your special agent in charge of San Francisco,  
Mr. Richard Auerbach, was in to see me today  
in connection with derogatory statements con-  
tained in questions submitted to young people  
in our universities.

I have ordered an immediate investigation of  
the person who was responsible for the questions,  
and as soon as I have any facts I will communi-  
cate with your local people.

I appreciate your directing this to my attention.

Sincerely

EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor
February 17, 1960

REG: 75
EX: 132

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
The Governor of California
Sacramento, California

My dear Governor Brown:

Your letter of February 9, 1960, has been received, and I do appreciate the interest which prompted you to write.

Mr. Auerbach has advised me of his conversation with you concerning the derogatory comments about the FBI contained in the aptitude test at the University of California. I do want to thank you for your thoughtful consideration and willingness to talk to Mr. Auerbach. It is indeed most encouraging to all of us in the FBI.

I was amazed to learn that such an unfair and grossly misleading question was included in the University aptitude test. This question categorically characterized the FBI as a national police. Hence, students were being confronted with a complete falsehood under the guise of alleged truth. The very essence of free society means that error must be corrected by the true facts.

Sincerely yours,

NOTE: Bureau has had cordial contacts with Brown, though in 1959 we had some difficulty concerning crime statistics with members of his state administration. (62-76249)
SAC, San Francisco, by letter, 2-17-60 requests authority to advise Governor Edmund G. Brown of California on an off-the-record basis of the Northern District of California Communist Party (CP), USA, interest in the California Democratic Council convention, Fresno, California, 2/12-14/60 and the background and identities of the individuals responsible for the adoption of a resolution at this convention which requests a presidential review of the case of Morton Sobell. Sobell, together with the Rosenbergs, was convicted for conspiracy to commit espionage and is serving a 30-year sentence.

San Francisco advises that a San Francisco attorney, was responsible for the above resolution and reportedly had turned the resolution over to who was serving on the resolution committee of the convention and who is on the San Francisco County Committee of the Democratic Party. reportedly attended this convention with . With the exception of the individuals referred to above are all Security Index subjects of the San Francisco Office and old-time CP members. (who is retired, was formerly an organizer for the International Workers of the World. He served as chairman of the East Bay Rosenberg-Sobell Committee in 1956 and 1957 and has been affiliated with many communist front organizations in the San Francisco Bay area. He continues to be active in the Sobell committee.

San Francisco has previously furnished information concerning communist interest and influence exerted at this convention. In addition to the Sobell resolution, the convention called for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, revision of the Walter McCarran Immigration Law and cessation of nuclear bomb testing. coordinator of the CP delegates at the convention, remarked that everything the CP had hoped for had gone through on the agenda at the convention.

Bureau files reveal that the Bureau has had cordial contacts with Governor Brown, although in 1958 we had some difficulty concerning crime statistics with members of his state administration.
Memorandum Mr. Belmont to Mr. Parsons
Re: Edmund G. Brown
(62-76249)
Cominfil of the Council of
Democratic Clubs
(100-432594)

OBSERVATIONS:

There is no question but that the Communist Party has been able
to exert considerable influence on the Democratic Council of California.
Not only would Governor Brown deeply appreciate receiving information
concerning the activities of the Communist Party in this regard but it
would serve the additional purpose of enabling Governor Brown to take
positive action to prevent a recurrence of similar types of communist
tactics in the future.

ACTION:

There is attached for your approval a letter to SAC, San Francis-
instructing him to discreetly advise Governor Brown of the communit
sponsorship of the Sobell resolution passed at the Democratic Council
convention. Under no circumstances will this information be attributed
to the Bureau.
February 25, 1960

Re: Memorandum 2-17-60. Bureau authority is granted to advise Governor Brown on a confidential basis of the pertinent information set forth in that memorandum. Governor Brown should be advised that under no circumstances should this information be attributed to the Bureau. Advise the Bureau of the results of your contact with the Governor.

NOTE ON YELLOW:

See cover memorandum Mr. Belmont to Mr. Parsons, same caption, dated 2-24-60, prepared by AJD/djd.
Office Memoandum

Director, FBI

SUBJECT: EDMUND G. BROWN
GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA
INFORMATION CONCERNING
COMINFIL OF THE COUNCIL OF
DEMOCRATIC CLUBS
IS - C

While discussing another matter with the Governor, he advised me that he was "terribly disturbed" by a resolution passed at the California Democratic Council convention at Fresno, California, on February 12-14, 1960, which requested a Presidential review of the case of MORTON SOBELL, who was convicted of espionage.

The Governor stated he was very interested in ascertaining who prepared and was responsible for the adoption of such a resolution.

The Governor stated that there were some 3,000 people in attendance at the convention and that he was at a loss as to where to begin to fix responsibility for such a resolution. He stated further that he was ashamed that the meeting had taken place in his state inasmuch as such a stupid matter had been considered. He observed that this incident should afford proof to the Democratic leaders that obviously the Communists are wielding some influence.

By San Francisco letterhead memorandum dated February 12, 1960, it was noted that Communist Party leaders in Northern California were plotting to exert an influence on the various panels and in the adoption of resolutions at the convention out of proportion to the number of delegates which they were able to send. San Francisco airmail dated February 15, 1960, reported that more than 25 "ultraliberal" resolutions in direct conformity with the announced political aims of the Communist Party had been adopted at the Democratic Council convention.

On February 17, 1960, a meeting of the Political Committee of the Communist Party was held at the residence of the Communist Party on February 15, 1960. It was reported that more than 25 "ultraliberal" resolutions in direct conformity with the announced political aims of the Communist Party had been adopted at the Democratic Council convention. It was also noted that the resolution in regard to MORTON SOBELL was responsible for the adoption of such a resolution. This resolution...
It should be noted that all Security Index subjects of the San Francisco Democratic Party, including those who were on the resolutions committee of the Democratic Party, reportedly were turned over to who was on the San Francisco County Committee of the Democratic Party.

![Image of the document page with text]

The text on the page includes a series of statements about a person's activities and affiliations, mentioning their involvement in various organizations and activities, such as the Communist Party, the Professional Section of the Communist Party, Independent Voters of California, and the Bay Area Council. The text also notes that this individual was admitted to the practice of law in California in 1936 and has been active in various political and social causes.
FELLOW ABUSED VOTER:

The California Defense Committee is a non-partisan organization dedicated to control of irresponsible politicians.

As you know, RIGHT NOW we are engaged in a RECALL CAMPAIGN of Governor Edmund G. Brown of California because of his arrogant refusal to fulfill his campaign pledges and his oath of office.

We have investigated and found numerous instances of Brown's betrayal of the voters and taxpayers of California, and we would like to tell every California voter and taxpayer about some of these matters.

To do so, we will have to use Radio and TV, and that means that we must have the funds to pay for such time. Your contribution will help make that possible.

Please use the envelope accompanying this plea and send as much as you can to HELP finance the Radio and TV program for BROWN'S RECALL.

Make your checks payable to CALIFORNIA DEFENSE COMMITTEE - 511 E. Broadway, Glendale, California - and organize your friends and neighbors into RECALL BROWN CLUBS.

INSURE YOUR EQUITY IN CALIFORNIA WITH YOUR CONTRIBUTION TODAY.

Roderick J. Wilson
By

[Signature]

RE: 30 62-76249-5

12 Mar 17 1960

8MCX
THE DARK BROWN STORY OF F. E. P. C.

By Roderick J. Wilson

THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER foisted on the people of California by Edmund G. Brown for the alleged purpose of telling private employers whom they shall or shall not hire, has now been exposed as just another bureaucratic agency designed to help build the Brown Patronage Machine. This disclosure was made when the proposed budget of the F.E.P.C. showed that it had now decided to fatten up its appointive staff at the expense of the Taxpayers — thereby affording Brown additional opportunities to make Patronage Appointments and build a stronger "minority" power machine to dominate the Democratic Party, so that in 1964 Brown can be a real candidate for President.

NOT TOO MUCH at first — but more and more later — seems to be the pattern of Brown's expensive Patronage Commissions. This is illustrated by the budget revelations of the past nine months of operation of the F.E.P.C., and the proposed coming twelve-month budget of the Commission. Here is the 'nutshell' story:

For the first nine months only $212,953 was taken out of the pockets of California Taxpayers for this monstrosity of socialistic-communistic intervention between the relationships of employers and employees. This included $42,750 for the salaries of the nine politicians appointed as Commissioners (Russian would be "Commissars") by Brown. Now, after nine months of gestation, bureaucratic pregnancy is beginning to show its political development, and the Commission wants $288,106 for the coming fiscal year.

This would be an INCREASE of $75,153 in operating expense alone — almost 100% in this category.

WHEN WE UNPACK THE PACKAGE, we find the total salaries and wages would be increased by $62,735 (43.5%); and the present number of positions would be increased from 27 to 53 (96).

NOW WE'RE ABOUT TO BE EDUCATED -- if the Commission and Brown get the money out of our Tax-Pocket. Because the F.E.P.C. want to establish an education (this could mean brainwashing by propaganda or coercion by intimidation) and research section. This would involve five (5) positions and related expenses. The explanation given with the budget request is: "such additional funds are necessary to carry out the provisions of the labor code which deals with anti-discrimination.

THE LAW DOESN'T SAY THAT. It cannot be found anywhere in the law, that the Commission is directed to carry on a formal education program or engage in original research. In fact, the legislative auditor says, "the law did not contemplate the F.E.P.C. employing a full-time education and research staff, nor does it seem the legislature specifically directs the Commission to engage in research. This is a higher level of service than was authorized by the legislature when it approved the original budget request."
TWO MORE FIELD REPRESENTATIVES are also included in the proposed tax grab by Brown's F.E.P.C.; and here again the vigilance of the legislative auditor sounds a warning with the opinion that they are not justified under the present work load, and that the request is an arbitrary one for a higher level of service than that authorized by the legislature.

SIX ADMINISTRATORS over ONLY six Field Representatives -- a ratio of ONE SUPERVISOR for each employee -- is also disclosed by the legislative auditor's report, and the additional observation is made that "no other state agency has such a ratio of one supervisor for one employee." In Industry and Labor Relations this type of 'make work' program is commonly termed 'feather bedding.' Now it would appear that in his bold new concept of Government by Appointive Managers, Brown has found a new term - "FERC".

COMMENT - study of Socialist and Communist political action programs for the past 50 years finds repeated reference to destruction of the employees and employer relations by interference of bureaucratic commissions and agencies, and destruction of management solidarity and labor cohesion by forced integration of social and racial problems.

Nothing new can be found in the present audacious attempt to start spreading out the power and expense of the F.E.P.C., and its interference with labor-management-consumer relations. This was anticipated and predicted by experienced labor-management relations experts and consumer market analysts both before and after the creation of the F.E.P.C.

BUT, unless management and labor are resigned to letting the Brown Juggernaut completely dominate all future relationships between management and labor, IMMEDIATE STEPS must be taken to get at the source of the problem -- RECALL BROWN!

THE FACTS ABOUT A RECALL ARE that it will take approximately 656,000 good signatures on petitions to bring about a RECALL ELECTION of the Governor of California, and -- in addition -- funds for the election campaign of his successor will be required. Present estimates are that it will cost approximately 50¢ for each signature obtained on the recall petitions -- making a round figure of $318,000 to obtain necessary signatures for BROWN'S RECALL.

THE ALTERNATIVE to the expenditure of such a sum of money for a RECALL is LOSS OF MUCH MORE MONEY over a period of time in the form of EXTORTIONATE TAXATION to pay the salaries of Brown's Personal Political Machine, and complete domination of both management and labor by Brown's appointed Commissioners, Managers, and Directors. The money factor does not, of course, take into consideration the social and political aspects of living and doing business under the domination of the bureaus and agencies of Brown's Welfare State.

All contributions of funds for the RECALL OF BROWN may be made to the CALIFORNIA DEFENSE COMMITTEE and mailed to 511 E. Broadway, Glendale, California.
had gotten into a philosophical critique of the material and pointed out that undoubtedly the reason for the case being bounced back and forth for such a long period of time between the various courts was because the courts had "that teeny weeny little element of doubt in their minds" as to the "complete guilt" of Chessman. Governor Brown stated that while he had been Attorney General of California he had tried to get a policy through the Association of Attorneys General to record their stand and feeling that no single Federal Judge should be able to grant a writ of habeas corpus or take any action to counteract a decision of a whole bench of a Supreme Court of a state. He said it was his feeling that if the Federal Courts were to be allowed to overturn such a decision it should be only by a whole District Court decision of judges sitting en banc; further, that he intended at some future date to again push this proposition.

The Governor is exceedingly cordial, obviously is very friendly to the Bureau and, as a parting statement, noted that some time in the near future he would like to take me fishing with him so that he could learn more about the Bureau.

As any developments are received, the Bureau will be advised.
For the Bureau's information, Governor BROWN was in Mazatlan, Mexico, on vacation from 4/16/60 through 4/20/60. SA was in Mazatlan during part of this time on official business and contacted Governor BROWN on my instructions. The Governor's party included

The Governor invited SA to accompany him, to the bull fights on Sunday afternoon, 4/17/60, and was of considerable assistance in acting as interpreter and explaining bull fighting to the Governor and his party.

SA advises that the Governor was most appreciative of the assistance afforded him and expressed great admiration for the Director, the Bureau, and SAC AUERBACH of the San Francisco Office.

2 - Bureau
1 - Mexico City
JFD: plb
(3)
In accordance with your instructions through Mr. De Loach, I confidentially advised the Governor as to the Communist Party background of California State Legislative Joint Committee Chairman. The Governor was obviously terribly put out and stated that he himself did not know and had not personally made the appointment, it having been done through the Chairman of the Joint Committee. He deplored the situation and said that the general organization was so loose that things like this could occur and he would immediately take steps to see that the situation was corrected. He was very voluble in his appreciation of your courtesy in assisting him and reflected that, in his opinion, this was another good example of your impersonal desire to assist in good government. He then went on at considerable length as to the unique position that you had as the finest example of a Government administrator that he could think of. He went on to note that he would be very careful with his handling of the situation in order to insure that his relationship with the Bureau was not impaired in any way.

The Governor talked at considerable length about the problems that he was facing with a poor personal staff as he had previously done and said that so many things were going on, this being an election year, that he had difficulty staying up with the many facets of not only the Governorship responsibility itself but his position in connection with the coming convention and campaign.

The Governor then went on in detail as to a variety of points and specifically mentioned that of the Democratic National Committeeman who, he said, had been flushed down the river as being a power any longer in California Democratic politics. He said that a number of people must have been tremendously surprised that Brown was supporting Attorney General Stanley Mosk as a replacement except that they did not know that Mosk was about the only one "acceptable to the Los Angeles bunch." He said that Mosk would not have been his personal choice but that he had more or less been forced into the situation in order to have a unified group. He said that perhaps he shouldn't talk like this, being a Roman Catholic, but that a background reason that they could...
not talk about included the fact that there were some powerful Jewish interests which were backing Mosk and which could not be ignored. He also noted that he would like very much to get Mosk back on to the bench and out of the Attorney Generalship so that he could appoint San Francisco District Attorney Tom Lynch in his place. He said he felt that Mosk was not generally acceptable to the law enforcement crowd in California but didn't know what he could do about it except to try and push him upstairs.

The Governor gave quite a frank personal opinion on the various Democratic candidates and noted that for all of the fact that Kennedy had an excellent war record and was obviously a bright man, yet he just looked too youthful and among all the candidates appeared as a boy among men. He feels that, if there is any kind of a real big conflict at the convention, Stuart Symington could very well wind up as the compromise candidate and wished that Symington was a more personable individual, at least on TV. It seemed to me that he discounted entirely the prospects of Lyndon Johnson.

The Governor spent a considerable amount of time reflecting that he had received quite a drubbing from the newspapers on his own situation and said that it obviously was merely political conversation because after all he had received 69 per cent of the total Democratic vote and would call it a clear-cut mandate that he was representing the Democratic Party and would have the votes of the delegates in his vest pocket to deal with.

The Governor asked me if we were satisfied with the outcome of the Standards and Qualifications Commission made by having former San Diego Police Department Captain Gene Muehleisen as the replacement for Holstrom. I told him we were very well satisfied with it and noted that Muehleisen was a National Academy graduate just like all the rest of the law enforcement on the Commission. Seizing this as an opportunity, I noted that two of the members of the Commission had originally received one-year appointments which would terminate this October and suggested that, since the Commission was just getting started, he might want to reappoint them for continuity. He asked me if I knew them personally and I told him that I did and that they were fine representatives, whereupon he stated he would not announce it now but would wait until the term was over in October and then would reappoint them. He said that he was terribly surprised when he
heard the full story on as being a complete alcoholic
and noted that he had only met once and that he'd been
pushed into the matter by "the Berkeley bunch." He said that he
expected that the Commission would discuss all of its policies
with the FBI before putting them into effect and that at the first
opportunity he had to talk with Muehleisen would point this out
to him. He noted that he felt very proud of the fact the Commission
had finally become law as he said that the legislation was a dead
issue until he himself had gotten interested in it to push it and,
since he felt he was a sponsor, he intended to follow the situation
carefully.

The Governor also again recounted the story of his meeting
with you several years ago in California and made the statement
that you had given him a complete whipping just prior to election
and that he couldn't understand why you hadn't waited until after-
wards. He went on to note that he was certainly glad that his
relationship with you had changed now and that if there was anything
at all that you wanted, you had but to call upon him and he would
do his very best to deliver.
Memorandum

TO: Mr. DeLoach
FROM: M. A. Jones

DATE: 8-11-60

SUBJECT: "LET'S ABOLISH CAPITAL PUNISHMENT"
ARTICLE BY GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN (D-CAL)
AUGUST, 1960, ISSUE "GOOD HOUSEKEEPING MAGAZINE"

SYNOPSIS:

Captioned article analyzed item by item in accordance with Director's request. Article does not mention Bureau or Director. Article begins with Brown's decision on 2-18-60, to grant Chessman 8th reprieve. Brown fails to mention that one of most important factors he considered in reaching this decision was State Department telegram advising Chessman's execution might lead to hostile demonstrations against President Eisenhower when he visited Uruguay. Brown's popularity declined over his handling of Chessman case and this article may be shrewd attempt by Brown to recapture lost political ground.

Many statistics in article are self-serving, inaccurate, and indicate sloppy job of research. For example, Brown cites a 1953 survey by Elmo Roper Associates which revealed that only 42 per cent of American people favored death penalty, 50 per cent opposed it, and 8 per cent had no opinion. Brown, however, fails to mention that a U.S. Gallup poll conducted in March, 1960, reflected 51 per cent of American population favored death penalty, 36 per cent opposed it and 13 per cent were undecided.

Calling for "a nationwide educational campaign that will show the case for the abolition of capital punishment without generating hatred or maudlin sympathy," Brown notes "some states" that abolished the death penalty have put it back on their books. Actually, it appears that legislatures of numerous states are more discerning in dealing with capital punishment than are the starry-eyed idealists who clamor for its abolition. Nine states which had abolished the death penalty later reinstated it. Only one state has recently abolished the death penalty (Delaware in 1958), and nine states in past two years have rejected proposals to abolish capital punishment.

Some of the more glaring inaccuracies in Brown's article are:
1. Brown said that from 1938-53, there were 117 executions in California. Figure of Federal Bureau of Prisons reflect 117 executions in California from 1938-53.
2. "Women commit one out of every seven murders..." Latest Bureau figures (1958) reflect one out of every five persons arrested for murder is a woman.

Enclosure.

1 - Mr. DeLoach
BS: (7)
Jones to DeLoach
Re: Gov. Brown

(3) Brown claims a yearly average of 48 persons are executed out of 7,000 brought to trial for killing. While it cannot be determined what period of time Brown used in arriving at this figure, it is noted that during past 10 years, an average of 72 persons were executed each year, and (4) Brown states in 1941, there were 6,990 cases of murder in the U.S. and 119 executions, while in 1957, there were 7,000 murder cases and 65 executions. Federal Bureau of Prisons and UCR show that in 1941, there were 7,562 murders and 123 executions, and in 1957, there were 6,920 cases of murder and 65 executions.

Brown points out he is well acquainted with police problems and notes his father-in-law, Arthur D. Layne, was a captain in the San Francisco Police Department for many years. Buffaloes reflect Captain Layne was cooperative with the San Francisco Office in the late 1930's. Brown states his critics have said that a state that abolishes capital punishment sends hundreds of policemen and prison guards to their deaths. He claims other states and nations have not found this to be true. Bureau survey of 4,000 cities across Nation reflects that on the average the same number of police officers are killed in states which have abolished death penalty as in states which retain death penalty.

Brown feels revocation of death penalty alone is not enough and suggests a threefold plan: (1) Segregate irresponsible or permanently vicious criminals with irrevocable life sentences, (2) set up modern correctional facilities for those who can be reformed and redeemed, and (3) launch a vigorous program of law enforcement and crime prevention, putting faith in alertness and hard work rather than relying on terror. Apparently, this is Brown's "humanitarian" approach to the problem. It is noted, however, that on one occasion Brown removed "no-possibility-of-parole" stipulation from life-termer Jack D. Green's sentence as first step toward granting him an eventual parole. Green killed a Los Angeles police lieutenant during a theater robbery in 1932, and in 1934, his death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment with provision there would never be any possibility of parole. In January, 1960, Brown commuted death sentence of two-time killer James Merkouris provided there would never be any "possibility of parole." As the Los Angeles newspaper pointed out, it appears Brown has found a new way of combating capital punishment. First, he commutes sentence of a particularly brutal killer while public sentiment is strong by adding proviso against parole. Then when sentiment dies down, he removes proviso and makes it possible for the killer to be released to again "imperil the lives of innocent persons."

Article concludes by pointing out there is no doubt that world trend is toward abolition of death penalty, and sets forth statements by different religious faiths which have gone on record against it. A detailed analysis of article is set forth under "Details."

RECOMMENDATION:
For the Director's information.
The Director has requested an item by item analysis of Governor Brown's article (copy attached) entitled "Let's Abolish Capital Punishment," which appeared in the August, 1960, issue of "Good Housekeeping Magazine." It is noted that the article does not mention the Bureau or the Director.

**STATEMENT:**

Brown points out that in reaching his decision to grant Caryl Chessman his eighth reprieve on the night of 2-18-60, "It all boiled down to one thing. I believe that capital punishment is wrong. I knew I had to give Chessman one last chance." The following week, Brown urged the California Legislature to repeal the death penalty. When it was apparent that they would not, he suggested the death penalty be suspended for 3 1/2 years as an experiment in humanitarianism. This was turned down by a senate judiciary committee vote of 8 to 7.

**COMMENT:**

Brown fails to mention that one of the most important factors he considered before reaching his decision to reprieve Chessman was a State Department telegram advising that the Chessman execution might lead to hostile demonstrations against President Eisenhower in connection with his visit to Uruguay in early March, 1960. Brown's attempts to have the death penalty repealed or suspended by the California legislature are factual according to newspaper accounts.

**STATEMENT:**

Brown advises he will not give up the fight to abolish the death penalty. He believes capital punishment is brutal and degrading to society and has been a gross failure.

**COMMENT:**

Brown is adamant in his belief on this controversial subject. His popularity declined as a result of his handling of the Chessman case and this article may be a shrewd attempt on his part to recapture lost political ground.

**STATEMENT:**

A 1958 nationwide survey by Elmo Roper Associates revealed that only 42 per cent of the American people favored the death penalty, 50 per cent opposed it and 8 per cent had no opinion.
COMMENT:

These figures are accurate as reported in the 2-9-59 issue of Roper's "The Public Pulse." It is noted, however, that public opinion polls can be most self-serving. For example, a U. S. Gallup poll conducted in March, 1960, reflected 51 per cent of the American population favored the death penalty, 36 per cent opposed it and 13 per cent were undecided.

STATEMENT:

Brown calls for "a nationwide educational campaign that will show the case for the abolition of capital punishment without generating hatred or maudlin sympathy." He states, "Some states that abolished the death penalty have put it back on their books after a frightening crime wave."

COMMENT:

It would appear that the legislatures of numerous states are more discerning in dealing with capital punishment than are the starry-eyed idealists who clamor for its abolition. Nine states (Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Washington) which had abolished the death penalty at one time, later instituted it. Only one state has recently abolished the death penalty (Delaware in 1958). Nine states in the last two years have rejected proposals to abolish capital punishment (California, Oregon, Connecticut, Virginia, Florida, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and Ohio). (From "A Study of Capital Punishment As a Deterrent To Crime" prepared for the Director in March, 1960.)

STATEMENT:

The article goes into a rather lengthy review of the salient points of the Chessman case.

COMMENT:

The facts pertaining to Chessman are accurate based on information in Butiles.

STATEMENT:

Brown cites the inequality of capital punishment, claiming it is levied against the "downtrodden and defenseless," the "weak, the poor, the ignorant, and against racial minorities." Brown points out that former Warden
Lewis E. Lawes of Sing Sing and Warden Clinton P. Duffy of San Quentin have said that people who have either money or prestige are seldom convicted of a capital crime, and even more seldom are executed. Brown said that in California during a 15-year period from 1938 to 1953, there were 110 executions of which 30 per cent were Mexicans and Negroes. He said this was more than double the percentage these two groups represented in the state population.

COMMENT:

An article by John R. Mulligan entitled "The Poor Man's Penalty," which appeared in the 5-15-60 issue of "The American Weekly," quoted Warden Lawes substantially along the lines that Brown indicates above. No comment by Warden Duffy on this topic could be located in files. No comment by Warden Duffy on this topic could be located in files. (It is noted that Duffy's middle initial is "T," not "P" as set forth in the article.) Brown's figure of 110 executions in California from 1938-53, is incorrect. According to the "National Prisoner Statistics" issued by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in February, 1960, there were 117 civil executions in California during the 15-year period from 1938 to 1953. The Bureau is not in possession of any figures which would indicate the percentage of Negroes and Mexicans who were executed in California from 1938-53. It is noted, however, that Federal Bureau of Prisons figures for the period from 1930 to 1959, reflect that a total of 262 persons were executed in California, of whom 199 were white, 45 were Negro and 18 were "other." This means that the racial minority of Negroes and "others" totaled 24 per cent of the persons executed in California during this period.

STATEMENT:

"Women commit one out of every seven murders, yet only about one woman per year is executed."

COMMENT:

Latest Bureau figures (1958) reflect that one out of every five persons arrested for murder is a woman. In the past 30 years, a total of 29 women have been executed in the Nation--an average of almost one per year.

STATEMENT:

Commenting on the element of human error in connection with capital punishment, Brown noted that despite the relatively small number of people who are actually executed--a yearly average of 48 out of 7,000 brought to
trial for killing--there are a number of mistakes. Brown cites the case of John Henry Fry whom he pardoned after Fry had been wrongfully convicted of killing his wife. The article mentions the case of John Rexinger who was arrested for rape in San Francisco in 1957, and who was saved when the actual criminal confessed to the crime. Another example is the case of James Foster, who was convicted of murder in Georgia in 1956 and who, after numerous appeals and stays of execution, was released in 1958 after another man confessed to the crime. Noting that eye-witness identification is the decisive point on which many murder convictions are obtained, the article points out that a Los Angeles Police Department survey once indicated that 28 percent of identifications made of suspects in line-ups are later proved false.

**COMMENT:**

While it cannot be determined what period of time Brown used in arriving at the figure of 48 persons executed on a yearly average, it is noted that during the past 10 years, an average of 72 persons were executed each year. Bufiles contain no information identifiable with James Foster; however, the following information on Fry and Rexinger was obtained from the files of the Identification Division. It is noted that prior to his arrest for murder in San Francisco in 1958, Fry was arrested no less than 8 times for intoxication, assault and battery, violation of parole and other charges. Since his pardon by Governor Brown on the murder charge in June, 1959, Fry has managed to get arrested on three occasions in San Francisco for assault with a dangerous weapon, defrauding an innkeeper, and battery. Prior to his arrest for rape in 1957, Rexinger had been arrested on 4 occasions for rape, robbery, and forgery. Subsequent to being released on the rape charge in 1957, Rexinger was arrested three times for theft, larceny and fraudulent checks. Bufiles contain no information relating to the Los Angeles Police Department survey of line-ups.

**STATEMENT:**

The article sets forth a very brief summary of the history of the death penalty in which it is pointed out that Austria was the first nation to abolish capital punishment, that France is the only country in Western Europe still using the death penalty, that most South American countries have abolished capital punishment, and that the Soviet Union says it inflicts it only for political crimes.

**COMMENT:**

The above history of capital punishment is factual based upon an article in the 3-3-60 issue of the "New York Times."
STATEMENT:

Between 1938-53, 27 per cent of Californians executed were men who killed wives, mistresses and girlfriends in crimes of passion. A majority of these killed while under the influence of alcohol. A 15-year psychiatric survey at San Quentin showed that most prisoners in Death Row were insane or totally irresponsible for whatever they had done. Three of every 5 murders in California between 1938-53 resulted from an interrupted armed robbery.

COMMENT:

Buffles contain no data relating to the above information. It appears that these statements were taken almost verbatim from a pamphlet of The Friends Committee on Legislation, Washington, D.C., excerpts of which appeared in the June, 1960, issue of "The Police Chief."

STATEMENT:

Brown points out he is well acquainted with police problems and states that his father-in-law, Arthur D. Layne, was a captain in the San Francisco Police Department for many years. Brown states his critics have said that a state that abolishes capital punishment sends hundreds of policemen and prison guards to their deaths. Brown says "other states and nations have not found this to be true." He said that Rhode Island which abolished capital punishment in 1852, has the third lowest murder rate in the Nation. Its neighboring state of Massachusetts retains the death penalty and both states have about the same general rate of killings. A 1950 study of 266 cities in 17 states--of which 6 had abolished the death penalty and 11 had not--showed that "on the whole, states that have abolished capital punishment have had fewer police killings, but the difference is small."

COMMENT:

Buffles reflect that Captain Arthur D. Layne, San Francisco Police Department, was cooperative with the San Francisco Office in the late 1930's. "Who's Who" reflects Governor Brown married Bernice Layne in 1930. Buffles reflect that Rhode Island does have the third lowest murder rate in the Nation and that Massachusetts has the eighth lowest murder rate. The 1950 study of 266 cities was made by Dr. Thorsten Sellin, who wrote a book entitled "The Death Penalty and Police Safety." It is noted that Uniform Crime Reports survey of 4,000 cities across the Nation reflects that on the average the same number of police officers are killed in states which have abolished the death penalty as in states which retain the death penalty. The study of murder rates in states which do and do not have capital punishment is inconclusive. Many social human and material factors are involved in murder which cannot be accurately measured.
STATEMENT:

California has an automatic appeal to the State Supreme Court in all death penalty cases. Between 1942-57, 180 cases involving death were appealed. Twenty-five of these were reversed. On retrial, only three of these were re-sentenced to death. Six were dismissed or completely acquitted.

COMMENT:

Buffers contain no information pertaining to this matter.

STATEMENT:

The article points out that execution for murder or rape is the safest kind of criminal risk. In 1941, there were 6,990 cases of murder in the United States and 119 executions. In 1957, there were 7,000 cases of murder and 65 executions.

COMMENT:

A review of the Bureau's Uniform Crime Reports statistics and the "National Prisoner Statistics" issued by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in February, 1960, reflected that in 1941 there were 7,562 murders and 123 executions. In 1957, there were 6,920 cases of murder and 65 persons we executed.

STATEMENT:

A report by a group of Quakers in California disclosed that in a 10-year period, 342 convicted first-degree murderers were paroled from California prisons. They served an average of 12 years and 5 months. Of these, only 37 violated their parole in any way and only 9 were sent back to prison. Further, from 1955-57, parolees in California committed a total of 17 murders. Only one murder was committed by a paroled murderer.

COMMENT:

Buffers contain no information concerning this Quaker report.

STATEMENT:

Brown feels that revocation of the death penalty alone is not enough and suggests a threefold plan: (1) Segregate irresponsible or permanently vicious criminals with irrevocable life sentences, (2) set up modern correctional facilities for those who can be reformed and redeemed, and (3) launch a vigorous program of law enforcement and crime prevention, putting faith in alertness and hard work rather than relying on terror.
COMMENT:

Apparently, this is Brown's "humanitarian" approach to the problem. It is noted that on one occasion Governor Brown removed the "no-possibility-of-parole" stipulation from life-termer Jack D. Green's sentence as the first step towards granting him an eventual parole. Green had been convicted of killing a Los Angeles police lieutenant during the course of a theater robbery in 1932, and in 1934, his death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment with the provision that there would never be any possibility of parole. In January, 1960, Brown announced the last-minute commutation of the death sentence of two-time killer James Merkouris provided there would never be any "possibility of parole." Merkouris was convicted several years ago of the brutal pistol-whipping and slaying of his former wife and her second husband. As the "Los Angeles Herald Express" pointed out, it appears that Brown has found a new way of combating capital punishment. First, he commutes the sentence of a particularly brutal killer while public sentiment is still strong by adding the proviso against parole. Then, when the sentiment dies down, he removes the proviso and makes it possible for the killer to be released to again "imperil the lives of innocent persons."

STATEMENT:

In conclusion, the article points out that there is no doubt that the world trend is toward the abolition of the death penalty. The article notes that authoritative spokesmen for all religious faiths have gone on record against it, and sets forth several of these statements.

COMMENT:

The statements by various religious groups coincide with data set forth in a publication entitled "What Do The Churches Say On Capital Punishment" which was prepared by the Connecticut Friends Committee on Social Order, West Hartford, Connecticut. The 3-3-60 issue of the "New York Times" and the 3-21-60 issue of "Time Magazine" carried articles on capital punishment which reflected that there is world trend toward abolishing the death penalty. Since 1900, 26 countries have abolished capital punishment, 15 of these having taken this action since 1930. These countries are located in Europe, Central and South America, Australia, Asia and also Greenland and Iceland. This world trend, however, is not reflected in the United States where 41 states retain the death penalty and 9 have abolished it. Since 1900, only four states have abolished the death penalty--Minnesota, 1911; Alaska and Hawaii, 1957; and Delaware, 1958.
You will recall that at the Director's request, we analyzed an article by Governor Brown entitled "Let's Abolish Capital Punishment" which appeared in the August, 1960, issue of "Good Housekeeping Magazine." It was pointed out in this analysis (attached) that on one occasion Brown removed the "no-possibility-of-parole" stipulation from life-termer Jack D. Green's sentence as the first step toward granting him an eventual parole. Green was involved in a robbery in 1932 in which a Los Angeles policeman was killed, and in 1934, Green's death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Further, in January 1960, Brown commuted the death sentence of two-time killer James Merkouris provided there would never be any "possibility of parole." One Los Angeles newspaper pointed out that it appeared Brown had found a new way of combating capital punishment. First, he commutes the sentence of a particularly brutal killer while public sentiment is strong by adding the proviso against parole. Then, when sentiment dies down, he removes the proviso and makes it possible for the killer to be released to again "imperil the lives of innocent persons."

The Director inquired when it was that Governor Brown had intervened in the Green and Merkouris cases. This information was not available in Bufiles, as Los Angeles Office was requested to furnish this data together with the facts of the Green and Merkouris cases. Attached are separate writeups containing summaries of pertinent data concerning the Green and Merkouris cases as received from Los Angeles and San Francisco Offices on 9-2-60.

OBSERVATION:
As noted in the attached writeup on Green, he was released on parole on 9-1-60. Thus, Governor Brown's action on 12-21-59 in removing the "without possibility of parole" stipulation from Green's sentence directly paved the way for Green's release from prison in a little over 8 months.

RECOMMENDATION:
For the Director's information.

Enclosures
1. Mr. DeLoach
JACK D. GREEN

In 1932, Green and a man named Regan participated in a $30 robbery of a Los Angeles theater which resulted in the murder, by Regan, of police Lieutenant Hugh Crowley. Both Green and Regan were convicted and sentenced to death. Regan's death sentence was carried out. Green was received at San Quentin on 3-23-32, and his initial execution date was 5-20-32. He received about ten stays of execution, and on 1-4-34, Governor James Rolph commuted Green's sentence to life imprisonment with no possibility of parole. On 11-1-41, the State Parole Board recommended that Green's sentence be modified to make him eligible for parole, and this was rejected by Governor Olson. Several applications for executive clemency were turned down between 1941-59.

On 5-7-59, Green applied for executive clemency to Governor Brown and on 6-12-59, the California Adult Authority (CAA) recommended that the parole restriction be removed from Green's sentence. On 12-21-59, Brown removed from Green's sentence the words "without possibility of parole," thus making it possible for Green's eventual release from prison. On 7-13-60, the CAA recommended Green for parole effective 9-1-60. Green was paroled from prison on 9-1-60, and will work for [illegible] of San Raphael's Parish, San Rafael, California. Green was released on a "life parole" which means he must report to parole authorities the rest of his life.
Jones to DeLoach Memorandum
Re: Governor Brown, 9-2-60

JAMES MERKOURIS

On 9-20-54, Mrs. Despine Forbes and her second husband, Robert Forbes, were shot and killed in their ceramics shop in Los Angeles. James Merkouris, age 40, Mrs. Forbes' first husband, was arrested five days later in Arkansas for the crime. In February, 1955, in Los Angeles, Merkouris was tried for the murder of his former wife. He was convicted and on 4-11-55, was sentenced to death in the gas chamber. Merkouris' conviction was automatically appealed to the State Supreme Court.

His conviction was reversed by the State Supreme Court on grounds of error in instructions to the jury and because Merkouris was permitted to withdraw an insanity plea over the objections of his attorneys. On 8-10-56, Merkouris was retried to determine his sanity. During the trial, Merkouris went into violent rages, smashed a chair in the courtroom and had to be strapped to a metal chair in a glass and metal "isolation booth." On 9-13-56, a jury found him insane and he was incarcerated at Atascadero State Mental Hospital in California. In August, 1957, Merkouris was declared "not presently insane" by authorities at the hospital.

At an arraignment on 8-26-57, as a preliminary to retrial, Merkouris struggled, shouted, cursed, smashed microphones and a water cooler before being restrained. The retrial was postponed pending additional mental examinations and Merkouris was again declared sane in March, 1958. His retrial on the murder charge involving his former wife began on 6-16-58, and on 7-30-58, the jury found him guilty and decreed that he should die in the gas chamber. On 7-31-58, the trial was continued to determine the defense's plea of not guilty by reason of insanity. On 8-13-58, the jury found Merkouris to be sane at the time he committed the murders. Merkouris was received at San Quentin's Death Row on 10-16-58.

Merkouris' conviction was reviewed by the State Supreme Court, and in October, 1959, the Court denied a rehearing. On 10-27-59, Los Angeles Superior Judge Lewis Drucker, set the date of 1-21-60 for Merkouris' execution. On 1-21-60, Governor Brown commuted Merkouris' death sentence to life imprisonment without possibility of parole. In explaining the commutation, Brown said that a majority of State Supreme Court justices and the trial judge had recommended that the death penalty not be carried out. He said there was still a grave and unresolved question of Merkouris' sanity, and noted that twenty-one psychiatrists were unable to agree during the two trials.

On 1-22-60, Merkouris was transferred from San Quentin to Vacaville, California, and on 2-18-60, he was incarcerated at the California Medical Facility at Vacaville where he is presently confined.
URGENT 1-7-61 1-20 PM  CC

TO DIRECTOR, FBI AND SAC SAN FRANCISCO
FROM SAC, LOS ANGELES  1P

GOVERNOR EDMOND G. BROWN. QUOTE LOS ANGELES EXAMINER UNQUOTE, TODAY, CARRIES ARTICLE ON PAGE FIVE, SECTION ONE, BY CARL GREENBERG, EXAMINER-S POLITICAL EDITOR, FROM SACRAMENTO, WHEREBY GOVERNOR BROWN ON FRIDAY CALLED FOR FAR MORE AGGRESSIVE ACTION TO HALT FLOW OF NARCOTICS ACROSS INTERNATIONAL BORDER AND DISCLOSED PLANS FOR A CONFERENCE WITH UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DESIGNATE ROBERT KENNEDY. ARTICLE CONTINUES WITH OTHER QUOTATIONS RE NARCOTICS PROBLEM. ARTICLE THEN QUOTES BROWN AS SAYING ON OTHER FRONTS THAT HE WANTED TO FIND OUT WHY DIRECTOR, FOR WHOM HE HAS QUOTE TEMENDOUS RESPECT UNQUOTE IS AGAINST A NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION AND INTENDS TO TALK TO HIM IN WASHINGTON. NO OTHER MENTION OF FBI OR DIRECTOR IN ARTICLE. FOR INFORMATION. ARTICLE FOLLOWS BY AIRTEL.

CORR FIRST LINE CORR DATE SHD BE 1-7-61
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4-26 PM OK FBI WA MSL
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Memorandum

To: Mr. Hoover

From: SAC Auerbach

DATE: 1/5/61

PERSONAL

SUBJECT: EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

For your personal information, Governor BROWN called me today to tell me that he had received an invitation from the Soviet Embassy to have dinner there during the course of the inauguration ceremonies in Washington and said that he wanted to discuss the situation with me concerning it. He said that he would be glad to do anything that the FBI wanted him to do in connection with the visit, i.e., ask specific questions of any kind of the Soviet Ambassador, etc.

I pointed out to the Governor that undoubtedly other Governors and prominent officials had received similar invitations and that it being a purely social occasion, I did not see that there would be any opportunity to "do any good" in connection with the visit.

Governor BROWN advised that when he went back several weeks ago to see President-elect KENNEDY, he had received an invitation at that time at his hotel to visit with the Soviet Ambassador, which he had turned down. He said that he felt that the invitation came about by the fact that several years ago he had gone to dinner with the Soviet Ambassador as a guest of DREW PEARSON and that he supposed that based on this incident, the Ambassador felt that he could utilize the visit from the California Governor for propaganda purposes.

In view of my comments that I did not see anything whereby he could be of value to us in the situation, Governor BROWN said that he was turning down the invitation flat.

It appears that the Governor has somewhat come of age with some maturity now and is thinking along the right lines when he comes to the FBI in connection with such situations and I thought you would like to know about it.

6 JAN 1961

18 JAN 1961
FBI

Date: 1/7/61

Transmit the following in plain text or code:

Via AIRTEL AIRMMAIL

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES

SUBJECT: GOVERNOR EDMOND G. BROWN

Remytel 1/7/61.

There is enclosed herewith for the Bureau and San Francisco one copy each of the article which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner on 1/7/61.

3 - Bureau (Enc. - 1)
1 - San Francisco (Enc. - 1)
1 - Los Angeles

WMA:skw
(5)
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Approved: Sent

Special Agent in Charge
Brown Asks Narcotic Crackdown in Mexico

By CARL GREENBERG
Examiner Political Editor

SACRAMENTO - Gov. Brown called Friday for "far more aggressive action in Mexico" to halt the flow of narcotics across the international border and disclosed plans for a conference with U. S. Atty. Gen. designate Robert Kennedy. He warned:

"As long as it pours in here there are going to be people that will proselytize and sell it no matter how tough we make the penalties."

At the same time, Brown strongly hinted he wouldn't like to see capital punishment injected into the 1962 gubernatorial race through a proposed constitutional amendment on the ballot outlawing death penalty.

While saying "I am going to leave that to the Legislature to handle," he told his first news conference in 1961:

"I hope they (the Legislature) will abolish capital punishment and I hope the bill reaches my desk."

If it did, that would mean the deep freeze for a ballot amendment with Democratic majorities in both Houses, administration forces may not have too much to worry about on that score.

Brown said he had talked to Mexican President Mateos and had been assured of his cooperation on narcotics smuggling, but said he still believes a White House conference would stimulate action among countries from which narcotics originate.

Red China, with which the U. S. does not maintain diplomatic relations, is another prolific source of narcotics.

Brown said there will be "unquestionably" tougher penalties enacted for narcotics violators, but he wants to talk to Kennedy to press for action against the flow of dope over California's borders.

On other fronts, Brown:

- WARNED "at the end of this session there is going to be a balanced budget and I intend to use the full powers of the Governor to see we don't go back to the deficit financing of the last four, five years before I became Governor."

- PROMISED to name another Southern Californian by Monday to the Public Utilities Commission.

- VOWED he'll do all he can to see that a new medical school is established in San Diego by the University of California. Senate President pro tempore Burns (D), wants it in his home county of Fresno.

- SAID he wants to find out why J. Edgar Hoover, FBI director, for whom he has "tremendous respect," is against a national crime commission, and intends to talk to him in Washington.

- SHIED from voicing opinion on a proposed State grand jury to investigate State agencies, saying, "We have a keen corps of newspapermen around here that do a grand jury job every day of the year."
Memorandum

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO

DATE: 1/9/61

SUBJECT: EDMUND BROWN
Governor of California
INFORMATION CONCERNING

On this date, JAMES P. CAVANAUGH, Agent in Charge, Security Office, U.S. Department of State, San Francisco, advised that he received a telephone call on 1/6/61 from Governor BROWN’s travel secretary as follows:

Governor BROWN received an invitation from the Soviet Embassy to meet and have lunch with Ambassador MENSHIKOV during BROWN’s visit to Washington, D.C., for the Presidential inauguration. Before accepting the invitation, BROWN checked with CAVANAUGH who in turn checked with State Department, Washington, as to whether they had any objection to this meeting. State Department, Washington, advised BROWN that they had no objection to the luncheon but suggested BROWN meet with State Department officials both prior to and after his luncheon with MENSHIKOV. BROWN’s secretary advised CAVANAUGH that BROWN has accepted the invitation and will have lunch with the Ambassador at the Soviet Embassy on 1/17/61.
Narcotics Evidence Relaxes Bill Fails

Other legislative news on pages A6, A7, C1, C2 and D6.

By Richard Rodda

The senate judiciary committee early today defeated legislation which would have permitted the police to relax the rules of evidence in the handling of narcotics cases. The legislation, SB 82, was designed to overcome the supreme court ruling of 1955 in the famous Cahan case.

The court threw out evidence shortly after midnight in this case because it was obtained by unreasonable search and seizure.

Under SB 82, Ragan and the bill to the floor of the others, such evidence would have been legalized in narcotics cases so long as the evidence did not deprive a person of due process of law.

Similar legislation also has been killed in the assembly committee on criminal procedure.

Five Hour Debate

The senate committee debated SB 82 for more than five hours and took a vote five minutes later.

The roll call on the motion to pass SB 82 was as follows:

FOR — Senators Christiansen, Dolwig, Grunsky, Shaw, and Ragan, 5.

AGAINST — Arnold, Cameron, Cobey, Holmdahl, Fair, Fisher, Raitigan, 7.

ABSENT—O'Sullivan.

The measure was supported by law enforcement agencies.
Solons Kill Bill Relaxing Narcotics Evidence Rules

Continued from page 1 but opposed vigorously by spokesmen for the State Bar of California, the American Civil Liberties Union and the Lawyers Club of Los Angeles.

loyd T. Chowdus, representing the State Bar, said the people have a right to be secure from unreasonable search and seizure and this right is protected in the Cahan case.

He also asserted narcotics offenders should have no fewer rights than other criminals.

Judicial Review

Coleman Blease of the ACLU said the Cahan case was a judicial review of police methods and that this was proper.

He said the police are against the decision because "nobody wants to have his activities scrutinized."

The witness said it is better for the police to err on the side of caution.

Chief of Police William H. Parker of Los Angeles was one of the key witnesses.

Parker, as did others, argued the Cahan decision has hampered police work in California.

"At present hundreds of police officers in this state are contributing thousands of hours of their own time, without compensation, to attempt effective performance in face of needless obstacles," said Parker. "It is doubtful that this spirit of self-sacrifice can be maintained indefinitely in view of what appears to be a lack of support borne of disinterest.

Brown Disagrees With Chief's Views

Governor Brown termed Chief Parker's statements intemperate at a press conference this morning.

"And it indicates why the legislature should be fearful of giving to the police the authority to completely determine when they can break into a home without a search warrant," added the governor.

Brown stated he is happy, however, that the police, the people on the firing line, are zealous.

He recalled that when he was district attorney in San Francisco the police seldom obtained search warrants.

"Now they have to do a little more work and make better cases," he declared.

"I repeated his statement that had the legislature passed a bill to overturn the Cahan case he would have vetoed it.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
ATTENTION: CRIME RECORDS

FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO (SC-449)

SUBJECT: GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING

Re Los Angeles teletype to Bureau 3/31/61 and Los Angeles telephone call to San Francisco same date.

Los Angeles telephonically advised on 3/31/61 that the night final edition of the "Herald Express" newspaper contained Governor BROWN's release attacking the city and county of Los Angeles for poor law enforcement and refers to comments by PARKER concerning his testimony in Sacramento on Monday, 3/27/61, in which he stated he used some of the Director's material as an authoritative source in defense of his arguments.

It appears that Chief of Police PARKER is referring to testimony before the California Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Senator E. J. REGAN which, on 3/27/61, held hearings concerning proposed narcotics legislation. There was considerable testimony and debate concerning Senate Bill 32, which was legislation designed to overcome 1955 ruling in the CAHAN case wherein the court threw out evidence because it was obtained by unreasonable search and seizure. This proposed legislation related only to narcotics offenses. Since Chief PARKER's testimony was before a Senate committee and did not consist of remarks on the House or Senate floors at Sacramento, it is not believed there would be any recorded record of his remarks. The "Sacramento Bee" for 3/28/61 contained an article entitled "Narcotics Evidence Relaxing Bill Fails" and describes this matter at some length. The Bureau will note that the Director's name does not appear in connection with this article which is probably as extensive an article as has appeared in any of the local papers.

In view of the above, the San Francisco Office, UACB, is taking no further action to specifically identify remarks by PARKER wherein he mentioned the Director.

1 San Francisco
GMP: chk
Approved: Special Agent in Charge

Sent M Per
United States Government

Memorandum

To: Mr. Mohr

From: J. F. Malone

Date: March 31, 1961

Subject: EDMUND "PAT" BROWN
GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA
INFORMATION CONCERNING

At 3:10 P.M., today, SAC William Simon called to advise that he had just received a call from [redacted] of Los Angeles County, and informed Simon that a UPI dispatch was just released from Sacramento, California indicating that Governor Brown criticized law enforcement in Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles. Brown is stated to have said, "A good job of law enforcement is not being done in the city and county of Los Angeles." Brown indicated that this did not include the chiefs of police in the cities surrounding Los Angeles but only the county areas. Brown added that the Chief of Police of Los Angeles has seen fit to criticize J. Edgar Hoover. "You will find J. Edgar Hoover agrees with me in regard to the quality of law enforcement in Los Angeles." SAC Simon indicated that he believes that this comment by Brown resulted from a feud which is developing between law enforcement in the Los Angeles area and Governor Brown.

SAC Simon indicated that Brown recently commuted the death sentence of Erwin M. Walker also known as "Machine Gun Walker", who was sentenced to death for the murder of a highway patrolman in California. Several law enforcement officials from the area of Los Angeles one of whom [redacted] criticized Brown for the commutation. It is believed that Brown's statement as indicated above was the result of a criticism leveled at him by the law enforcement officers in the area of Los Angeles.

SAC Simon asked what he should do in case the press called him. I advised him that he should make no comment but that it would be better for him to clear with Mr. DeLoach's Office. Mr. Wick, who is acting in the absence of Mr. DeLoach, advised that he instructed SAC Simon that in the event he receives any inquiry from any source whatsoever he is to say, "No comment."

Recommendation:

None.--------Informative.

1 - Mr. DeLoach
JFM:hcv
(3)
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TO:  Director, FBI (Attention: Crime Records)
FROM:  SAC, Los Angeles
SUBJECT:  EDMUND G. BROWN
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING

Transmitted herewith are articles appearing in the
LOS ANGELES TIMES and LOS ANGELES EXAMINER in connection with
captioned matter.

It is noted that in the LOS ANGELES TIMES article,
reporting activity of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles
County, County Supervisor KENNETH HAHN submitted a motion
which was adopted urging appointment of a permanent crime
commission similar to one which "worked effectively when
EARL WARREN was governor." HAHN is quoted as stating that
such a commission would have spotlighted the increase in
crime and narcotics traffic in California during the past
three years and would have demanded action by the Legislature
and the governor.

3 - Bureau (Enc. 4)
1 - San Diego (Enc. 4)
1 - San Francisco (Enc. 4)
1 - Los Angeles
WGS: esc
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Supervisors Back Pitchess, Parker

County Supervisors Tuesday gave a unanimous vote of confidence to Sheriff Pitchess and Police Chief Parker in their battle with Gov. Brown over law enforcement efficiency here.

Brown had said Parker and Pitchess have the "worst law enforcement record in the entire state" after the two then criticized him for commuting from death to life imprisonment without hope of parole the sentence of Erwin M. "Machine Gun" Walker, slayer of Highway Patrolman Loren Roosevelt.

The Supervisors approved a resolution voicing faith in Pitchess and Parker and declaring the Sheriff's Dept. is "world-renowned for its excellence and quality of service . . ."

Both Pitchess and Parker were only doing what they were told to do by the Supervisors and City Council in calling for stronger narcotic laws than those recommended by Gov. Brown, the Supervisors said.
Gov. Brown's Crime Figures False, Declares Parker

Police Chief Parker flicked off Gov. Brown's latest jab in their running battle over Los Angeles law enforcement Tuesday and said he is preparing a lengthy reply in defense of his department's efficiency.

"I do not know where Gov. Brown got his figures which are patently false," Chief Parker declared, referring to a recent charge by Brown that only 14,308 of 48,604 felony arrests in 1960 were brought to trial.

Chief Parker added: "The accurate figures show that 27,619 went to court with 3,398 released to other jurisdictions."

He continued: "I intend to show Brown's inconsistencies since the time he was Attorney General of the state."

The feud between the Governor and Los Angeles City and County hit its peak March 31 when Gov. Brown in a news conference accused Parker and Sheriff Pitchess of having "the worst law enforcement record in the entire state."

The Governor quoted figures from a 1960 Department of Justice (State) report and from an FBI review. He charged "the statistics show Los Angeles lags behind the rest of California in arrests brought to trial."

Board Lauds Pitchess and Criticizes Brown

Supervisors Praise Sheriff, 4,200 Men in Department for 'Unquestioned Loyalty'

BY RAY ZEMAN, Times County Bureau Chief

Gov. Brown was criticized and Sheriff Pitchess and the 4,200 members of his department were overwhelmingly praised Tuesday by the Board of Supervisors.

The board unanimously adopted a resolution introduced by Supervisor Warren M. Dorn. It hailed Pitchess and his department for "unquestioned loyalty, bravery and devotion" and consistently excellent law enforcement.

Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli said Gov. Brown placed Sheriff Pitchess "in a千古ly predication" with his "unfortunate, untimely and derogatory statement" criticizing law enforcement here. Bonelli insisted upon a unanimous vote of confidence for Pitchess because "a dark cloud has been cast."

Added Praise

Chairman Ernest E. Debs and Supervisors Dorn and Kenneth Hahn added praise for both Pitchess and the Los Angeles Police Department and tore at Brown for crippling the county's narcotics legislation.

Dorn said he was shocked by Brown's statement that he would veto a modification of search and seizure restrictions. Dorn and Debs insisted upon a law to permit search of an automobile without a warrant upon "reasonable cause" to believe it holds narcotics.

Peddlers Protected

Dorn traced the history of the county's disagreements with Brown over penalties, denial of probation to first-offending adults who sell hard narcotics to minors, and modifying of search restrictions.

He told how narcotics peddlers now boast of State Supreme Court rulings which protect their operations. He protested that Brown didn't even mention narcotics in his annual message when the Legislature opened.

"I think that when a law shackle an officer, that law should be changed," Dorn added. In introducing his resolution, he called the governor's criticisms of Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess "irrational, unfounded and unnecessary."

Pitchess said he was overwhelmed by the supervisors' praise and said he regretted Brown's use of his name to express personal animosity.

Statistics Questioned

He said Brown used some statistics out of context in his criticism of law enforcement here and used some that are erroneous.

"In 1960," Pitchess said, "our department got 97% in convictions in all cases taken before the Superior Court."

He said up-to-date statistics will be furnished to the governor's office.

In a statewide move against crime, the supervisors adopted a motion of Supervisor Hahn urging appointment of a permanent crime commission similar to which worked effectively when Earl Warren was governor.

Would Demand Action

"If a crime commission had been functioning the past three years," Hahn said, "I am sure its members would have spotlighted the increase in crime and narcotics traffic in California and would have demanded action by the Legislature and the governor."

In other actions Tuesday the Board of Supervisors:

Designated April 8-28 as Italian Centennial Week.

Appointed Leon Shapiro to the County Housing Authority.

Proclaimed April 17-27 as Bike Safety Week.

Approved a distinguished service medal for George Pepperdine, founder of Pepperdine College.

Designated April 16-19 as Pharmacy Week.

Endorsed Assembly Bill 920 to provide more highway funds for southern counties.

Endorsed Senate Bill 455 (House Resolution 3083) for federal air pollution research.

Authorized a four-month leave of absence for Dr. William S. Stewart, arboretum director, to study drought and fire-resistant plants in South Africa.

Asked for bids April 19 on a $28,751 development of Southwest Sportsman's Park at 9335 S Western Ave.

Asked for bids May 3 on a $226,443 development of Lane Park at Quartz Hill.

Approved a joint powers agreement with the city of Maywood to build a 3,000-sq.-ft. branch library at 4323 E Slauson Ave.

Approved final plans for a $44,500 enlargement of a county branch library at 222 Harvard Ave., Claremont.

Received a Greek Theater Assn. request for a $25,000 allotment in the annual county budget.

Received a California Mission Trails Assn. request for a $6,000 allotment.
Police Chief Parker lashed back at the governor Tuesday in their continuing feud over law enforcement and promised a report about Brown's law enforcement activities that won't be very flattering.

Parker received a letter from Gov. Brown with a statement that figures in the letter are "patently false." "I don't know where he got his figures," Parker said. "I looked over the letter in which the governor offered figures to prove his assertion that Los Angeles law enforcement isn't the best. "His figures are patently false."

The controversy, which has included statements not characterized by restraint, will get even more personal in the next round, Chief Parker indicated. "I intend to reply in great length," he said. "It will take me several days to prepare this reply as I will do it on the basis of his (Brown's) history in relation to law enforcement and my own."

Parker said he read the governor's letter first in the newspapers Tuesday morning. The original document arrived later in the day in the hands of the mailman.

Parker ticked off these statistics in reply to the figures presented by the governor:

In 1959 there were 48,504 felony arrests in Los Angeles County, of which 27,619 were brought to court and another 3,398 were transferred to other jurisdictions for action. The governor, according to Parker, said only 14,308 were brought to court.

In Los Angeles city in 1959, a total of 27,735 felony arrests were made of which 16,031 were brought to court and 1,437 released to other jurisdictions.

The grand total of all arrests in Los Angeles city in 1959 was 229,109, of which 83% were brought to court, Parker said. He said this proved that the city has not been lagging in bringing cases to court.

Parker also called attention to the narcotics arrest record for Los Angeles city in 1960. He said there were 5,845 narcotics arrests, with complaints filed against 70.4% of those arrested. This compared with a complaint filing record of 50.7% in 1959, the chief said.

The feud, brewing for months over narcotics and other legislation affecting police work, came to a head last week when Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess issued statements criticizing the governor for commuting the death sentence of a man convicted of killing a policeman.

The man had suffered a mental breakdown while in Death Row previously and had been under treatment in a mental institution.
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RE: GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
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There are enclosed herewith for the Bureau, San Francisco and San Diego copies of an article appearing in the "Los Angeles Evening Herald-Express" dated 3/31/61 reflecting a joint statement by Chief WILLIAM H. PARKER, Los Angeles PD, and Sheriff PETER J. PITCHESS of Los Angeles County, wherein they are replying to Governor BROWN's criticism directed at them, the details of which were furnished in above referenced communications.
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Chief, Sheriff Say Brown Ignorant

Reply to Blast About ‘Laxity’

Chief of Police William H. Parker and Sheriff Peter Pitchess today in an unprecedented joint interview lashed at Gov. Edmund Brown as being "irresponsible, ignorant and showing a complete lack of knowledge" of law enforcement problems in Southern California.

The tongue-lashing by the two top peace enforcement officials of Los Angeles County was in answer to vitriolic attack by Gov. Brown after he criticized Pitchess for his leniency toward Erwin "Machine Gun" Walker, convicted murderer, and on narcotics legislation.

Parker released statistics in which he showed that other areas in the state showed nearly as great, or greater, crime increases than the city and county of Los Angeles.

"UNJUSTIFIED"

"Brown’s statement is the most irresponsible and intemperate personal attack that I have ever been exposed to in my 25 years in law enforcement work," Sheriff Pitchess said.

"It was an unjustified attack, an indictment against 9,000 law enforcement officers in Los Angeles County who are recognized as among the finest in the entire country."

Pitchess added that his men were responsible for the capture of criminals resulting in 97 per cent convictions in cases going to courts and recovery of more than $5 million in personal property last year.

Chief Parker disclosed that Brown’s native city of San Francisco, which showed a decrease in population of 4.2 per cent in the last census, crime increased last year 17.3 per cent over 1959.

"In Sacramento, where Brown now resides, the increase was 38.9 per cent—the highest of any county in the state," Parker added.

"As reported, Gov. Brown’s statements reflect an appalling lack of knowledge of crime statistics in the state of California.

"Oakland showed an increase of 38.2 per cent in crime—and these were the areas which Brown indicated were doing fine police work. Los Angeles showed a crime rate increase of 18.5 per cent in 1960 over the previous year.

"These figures come from J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, the very person with whom Brown said I was in disagreement."

Los Angeles Register
HERALD-EXAM./L.A.
FLORENCE ARMS, CALIF.
EDWARD HARRISON, PUBL.
L.A. ANOTHER DAY
Governor Hits L.A. Officers

By JAMES C. ANDERSON

SACRAMENTO, March 31 (UPI) — Governor Edmund G. Brown said today a good job of law enforcement is not being done in the city and county of Los Angeles.

Obviously irritated, the governor told a news conference that political peace officers in Los Angeles who constantly criticize the courts, the Legislature and the governor are not doing law enforcement any good.

Brown refused to name the targets of his wrath but he obviously was referring to Chief of Police William H. Parker of Los Angeles and Sheriff Peter Pitchess of Los Angeles County. Both Parker and Pitchess criticized Brown for saving Erwin (Machine Gun) Walker, a highway patrolman's killer, from the gas chamber.

“Constant criticism by people who obviously are not doing good jobs them- selves is not doing law enforcement any good,” Brown said.

“Then you are saying the job of law enforcement is not being done in Los Angeles?”

“Definitely,” snapped the governor.

“EXCELLENT” IN S.F.

Asked if this applied to San Francisco or other centers of population in the state, Brown said he felt law enforcement was doing an “excellent job” in San Francisco, Alameda, Sacramento, Santa Clara and San Diego.

“The chief of police of Los Angeles has seen fit even to criticize J. Edgar Hoover (FBI head),” Brown said. “You’ll find that J. Edgar Hoover agrees with me on the quality of law enforcement in Los Angeles. The chief won’t even work with George White, the federal narcotics administrator.”

Brown said he was not criticizing chiefs of police in other incorporated cities in Los Angeles County but was referring to the city of Los Angeles proper and the unincorporated area which is in Pitchess’ jurisdiction.

“ENTIRE PICTURE”

“And I’m not just referring to narcotics enforcement,” the governor added. “I mean the entire law enforcement picture in the city and county.”

After Brown commuted Walker’s sentence to life in prison earlier this week, Parker issued a statement in which he said the governor’s action demonstrated his “soft attitude toward crime.” Pitchess also criticized the commutation.

“Our Southern California peace officers, none of whom were here or heard the testimony, have seen fit again to criticize the governor for exercising clemency power,” Brown said. “These are enforcement officials where we’ve seen the highest crime rate go up and up without any decrease in eight or nine years.”

KILLER “WAS INSANE”

Brown said all the testimony showed Walker was insane when he first was put in death row in 1949 and “all indications are this man would become insane again if he were returned to death row.”

“This would have been torture, not punishment,” Brown insisted.

The governor said he had used his clemency powers sparingly during his first two years in office and intended to use them sparingly for the remainder of his term.

(Continued from Page 1)
TO: Director, FBI (Attention: Crime Records)
FROM: SAC, Los Angeles
SUBJECT: EDMUND G. BROWN
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING

Remytel 3-31-61.

Transmitted herewith are additional news items relating to the criticism by Governor BROWN concerning law enforcement in Los Angeles County. Article in LOS ANGELES EXAMINER this date reflects that the City Council has given their support to Chief of Police WILLIAM H. PARKER and Sheriff PETER J. PITCHESS on this controversy with Governor BROWN.

On this date former SA [redacted] called and stated that there is a resolution before the Executive Committee of the LAPOA condemning BROWN for his action in criticizing law enforcement officers in Los Angeles County.

stated that he was merely calling this resolution to my attention inasmuch as I am a member of the Executive Committee, pointing out that he expected no comment from me and that a majority of the Executive Committee have voted in favor of the resolution and in placing it before the next general meeting of the LAPOA on April 12, 1961.

[Redacted] - Bureau (Ext. 2)
LAPD - Los Angeles
WGS: esc
I informed [Redacted] that I would abstain from any participation in this matter, and he stated that he understood.

Extreme caution is being exercised to avoid any involvement on the part of the Bureau in this controversy between local and state officials.
I hope the attached statistics will lead you to examine whether you might not have reason to be as critical of your own efforts as you are of the efforts of your fellow public officials.

Brown sent Parker and Pitchess tabulations showing that in 1960, Los Angeles County recorded 37,958 arrests with 14,976, or 25 per cent, complaints filed, as compared with 23 per cent in Alameda County and 30 per cent in San Francisco.

In 1959, according to the figures, Los Angeles showed filings in 29 per cent of the arrests, with San Francisco totaling 30, and San Diego and Alameda counties each 35 per cent. The Governor's office said:

"In the matter of narcotics law enforcement, Los Angeles lags even more markedly.

"The State Dept. of Corrections reports that in 1960 only one of every six persons arrested on felony narcotics charges in Los Angeles County was convicted.

"In the rest of the state, a conviction was obtained for every 3.1 arrests."

Also, it was said, in 1960 there were 3593 reports of felonies per 100,000 population in Los Angeles County, while in the rest of the state, there were 1145 felony reports per 100,000.

The City Council, Supervisor Dorn and the vice president of the Los Angeles Fire & Police League Monday gave their support to Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess in their battle with Gov. Brown.

The Governor had charged law enforcement agencies were not doing the jobs well. Lemolne Blanchard, author of the Council's resolution of confidence in Parker and Pitchess, said Brown "has no right to attack the integrity and effectiveness of one of the finest police units in the world."

Supervisor Dorn called upon both sides to "get together and solve the common problem of narcotics control," at a 50th anniversary luncheon of the Woman's Civic League.

Louis Nowell, Fire & Police League vice president, said Brown's charges of poor law enforcement "disregard the facts," as given by Mayor Pujol who has high regard for the police department's work.

The original attack by the Governor stemmed from their criticism of Brown's commutation from death to life imprisonment without hope of parole for Erwin M. "Machine Gun" Walker, slayer of Highway Patrolman Loren Roosevelt.

In his letter, Brown said "I do not intend to argue further the subjects concerned," then criticized their leadership and attached statistics it was asserted show Los Angeles "lags" behind the rest of California in the number of arrests actually brought to court. Brown asserted:

"I hope . . . that my statements have called your urgent attention to your primary responsibility of providing better leadership for law enforcement in Los Angeles City and County.

"It is true you have been busy. You have been telling judges how to conduct their courts, legislators how to write laws, and the Governor how to exercise his constitutional powers of clemency."

--The Excerimcer Bureau

SACRAMENTO - Gov. Brown dispatched a brusque letter to Los Angeles Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess Monday telling them law enforcement under their command has suffered while they tell others how to run their business.

Responding to the officials' demands for a transcript of his March 31 news conference, in which Brown accused the pair of having "the worst law enforcement record in the entire state," Brown complied with the request, but attached a letter renewing his assault on them.

The Examiner Bureau

The Examiner Bureau
PEOPLE'S WORLD from 1943 to 1952, and a former teacher of art at the CALIFORNIA LABOR SCHOOL. Her CP membership dates back to at least 1943, and she registered in a CP club in 1959.

for the "CALIFORNIA FARM REPORTER," an organ of the CALIFORNIA RESEARCH and LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. He was employed by the New Jersey CP Committee in 1933 and 1939, was a delegate on the CP ticket in New Jersey in 1940, instructed at the "Worker's School" in New York City in 1942 and 1943, was State Educational Director of the CP in 1942 and State Literatore Director of the CP in 1944 in New Jersey, and an instructor in Marxist-Leninst classes in Southern California in 1945 and 1946.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

(Bufiler 100-340214) is retired. He formerly was an
an East Bay Rosenberg-Sobell Committee in 1956 and 1957 and has been affiliated with many Communist front organizations in the San Francisco Bay area. He continues to be active in the Sobell committee.

It is recommended that I be instructed to advise the Governor in a general way, off the record, as to pertinent information set forth above with the understanding that the source not be revealed.
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI (62-76242) (100-432594)
FROM: SAC, San Francisco (100-45763) (30-249)

SUBJECT: EDWARD G. BROWN
GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA
INFORMATION CONCERNING

COMINFIL OF THE COUNCIL OF
DEMOCRATIC CLUBS
INTERNAL SECURITY - C

In accordance with Bureau authority, I saw Governor BROWN on 3/7/60 and furnished him the data as authorized by Bulletin of 2/25/60.

The Governor was exceedingly appreciative and stated that he would use the data for his own use completely and, if he had to give instructions concerning it, it would be as emanating from him alone with no source whatsoever.

As far as the Fresno conference of the Council of Democratic Clubs is concerned, Governor BROWN said he was so concerned with the water rights fight in the state and his effort to present that in the proper light that all other phases of the meeting had "gone by the board" as far as he was personally concerned, but that now that the resolution concerning SOBELL had gone through, he was going to have to work real hard in connection with this situation because he felt that the Democratic group had been exceedingly stupid to permit the resolution to pass or even be considered. There is no question in the Governor's mind but that the Republican group will use this as fine campaign material in the coming election which, to his mind, was absolutely unnecessary to provide.

It is interesting to note that Governor BROWN spent a considerable amount of time in talking about the reprieve of CARYL CHESSMAN. He said he personally was against the death penalty generally but that he had put aside that personal feeling in this case even though this was not recognized by the nation's press. He confidentially advised that the biggest factor leading him to grant the reprieve was a confidential conversation he had had with San Francisco, who had pointed out to him that since CHESSMAN was functioning as his own attorney in several instances during the trial he had a right to be present at any action that was taken concerning himself as a defendant as though he were the attorney for the defense. Further,
Brown Levels New Blast at Pitchess and Parker
Suggests They've Been So Busy Criticizing Others, They Neglected Their Own Jobs

Times Sacramento Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Gov. Brown Monday renewed his contention that Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess are not doing a good job by sending them his own crime statistics designed to prove the point.

But the Brown data does not jibe with figures for identical areas released by Parker and Pitchess Friday when they vehemently denied the governor's charge of being "political peace officers" who "are obviously not doing a good job."

Which of the two sets of statistics is correct is not debatable, according to Brown, who said flatly, "I do not intend to argue further the subjects covered."

Crime Rate Boost
One of the primary reasons why the information can not even be compared is that the governor did not include population increases while the two local law enforcement officials did.

Also, Brown dealt with the percentage of filings on actual arrests but Parker and Pitchess concentrated on the crime rate increase for Los Angeles and other metropolitan areas.

Both men asked Brown for a copy of his controversial press conference remarks that touched off the feud and he complied, adding a new verbal broadside.

He said, "I hope ... that my (prior) statements have called your urgent attention to your primary responsibility of providing better leadership for law enforcement in Los Angeles City and County.

'You've Been Busy'

"It is true that you have been busy. You have been telling judges how to conduct their courts, legislators how to write laws and the governor how to exercise his constitutional powers of clemency.

"As a result, law enforcement in the areas under your control seems to be suffering from neglect, from a lack of the kind of active on-the-job leadership the many splendid men on your forces deserve.

"I hope the attached statistics will lead you to examine whether you might not have reason to be as critical of your own efforts as you..."
are of the efforts of your fellow public officials.

Brown claimed Los Angeles "consistently lags behind the rest of the state in the number of arrests which were actually brought to court" in 1939 and 1960.

The statistics showed the Los Angeles percentage of filings on actual arrests was only 29% as compared to 35% figures for Alameda, San Diego and San Francisco counties.

The case filing percentage fell to 25% in 1960 in Los Angeles while San Francisco slipped to 30% and Alameda dropped to 29% with no comparable figures available for San Diego, according to Brown.

Turning to the specific subject of narcotics law enforcement, the governor was even more critical of the Los Angeles operations.

**Convictions Low**

"The State Department of Corrections," Brown asserted, "reports that in 1960 only one of every six persons arrested on felony narcotics charges in Los Angeles County was convicted.

"In the rest of the state, a conviction was obtained for every 3.1 arrests.

"In 1958 and 1959," the governor continued, "the Los Angeles ratio was one for each 5.4 arrests.

"Outside Los Angeles the ratio was one for each 2.6 arrests in 1959 and one for three in 1958."

The governor concluded his statistical survey by pointing out the 1960 felony crime rate per 100,000 population was 3,593 reported in Los Angeles but less than one-third that number, or 1,146 in the rest of the state.

---

**will Meet Them**

Brown, who cleared the release of his new charges before leaving Friday for a week of fishing in Mexico, told Parker and Pitchess he is willing to sit down with them any time and work out improvements in the administration of criminal justice.

"I ask only that the conversations be temperate, fair and free from the unfortunately political atmosphere in which your recent discussions have been held," he said.

Brown, Parker and Pitchess have recently been involved in a running verbal battle over the question of a stiffer narcotics penalty program on which the governor has stated he has several reservations.
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Pitchess and Parker Row With Brown

Governor Says 2 Lawmen Aren't Doing Good Job

Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess, accused Friday by Gov. Brown of "obviously not doing a good job," struck back a few hours later with charges that the governor was irresponsible and ignorant.

Parker and Pitchess held a press conference in the police building after Gov. Brown, at his morning press conference in Sacramento, said the Los Angeles officers were "not doing law enforcement in this state any good at all."

The governor did not name either Pitchess or Parker but left no doubt that he meant them when he referred to "political peace officers" in Los Angeles City and County.

'TNot Doing Good Jobs'

Brown specifically indicated his displeasure with Parker and Pitchess for opposing his action granting clemency to a Los Angeles police killer, Erwin (Machine Gun) Walker. The governor, an opponent of capital punishment, commuted Walker's sentence from death to life imprisonment.

Brown said that Walker is still mentally ill. "I did not want the spectacle of putting a man in a condemned cell and seeing him go insane again," he added.

"Constant criticism by people who obviously are not doing good jobs themselves is not doing law enforcement any good," Brown said.

"Then you are saying that a good job of law enforcement is not being done in Los Angeles," a reporter asked.

"Definitely," the governor said.

Talk to Newsmen

Parker and Pitchess conferred briefly in Parker's office before appearing before the press in the Police Commission hearing room.

They said they had sent identical telegrams to the governor demanding a complete transcript of the allegations which they said they knew of only through the newspapers.

The police chief and the sheriff said they were completely in agreement with each other in defending their records against the governor's assault.

Chief Parker said that if the governor's attack was political in intent it was ill-advised.

"At next Tuesday's election" Parker said, "the three front runners for mayor have all praised our law enforcement."

Called Intemperate

"The whole thing boils down to this," Parker said. "We peace officers have a legislative program the governor is opposed to. Now the conflict has degenerated into a hog-calling contest."

Sheriff Pitchess said he

Please Turn to Pg. 7, Col. 3
UNHAPPY LAWMEN—Police Chief Parker, left, and Sheriff Pitchess defend their records at a press conference here a few hours after Gov. Brown accused the two law officers of not doing a good job.
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was "astounded" by Gov. Brown's statement. He called it "an irresponsible and intemperate attack of personal animosity."

The sheriff said he had never been subjected to such an attack in 25 years of law enforcement work.

Noting that the governor said law enforcement was adequate in the Los Angeles area except within the city of Los Angeles itself and within the unincorporated areas, Sheriff Pitchess said he wondered if the governor realized that the sheriff's office was responsible for law enforcement in 23 Southern California incorporated communities under contract.

Quotes Figures
Parker said the governor's statement showed "an appalling lack of knowledge of the crime problem in the Greater Los Angeles area."

He said that the state's own figures show that in the first half of 1960, the latest figures available, the crime increase was lower in Los Angeles than it was in the San Francisco Bay area and the 10 counties of the Sacramento area, "his present headquarters."

He said Oakland, "which the governor singles out for praise," had a 26% crime increase last year, while the figure for Los Angeles, despite its population growth, was only 18.5%. San Francisco had a 4.2% population loss and a crime increase of 17.3%, he said.

Convictions at 97%
Sheriff Pitchess said he not only resented what he regarded as a personal attack upon himself but the implication that the "10,000 men and women in law enforcement work" also were inefficient.

He said the sheriff's de-
partment last year prosecuted 34,500 cases with 97% convictions.

Parker said that Gov. Brown, in his previous office as attorney general, "had almost a complete lack of knowledge of what was going on or didn't do anything about it."

Both of the officers expressed surprise at the governor's sudden attack.

Gov. Brown's observation that the two Los Angeles officers were involved in politics apparently was based on their outspoken opposition to the Walker commutation and the governor's narcotics legislation program, which law enforcement officers generally have criticized as too soft.

Chief Parker explained that he appeared before the Legislature as vice chairman of a legislative committee of the peace officers of the state of California.

Gov. Brown charged specifically that Chief Parker would not cooperate with George White, the federal narcotics administrator for the West Coast. Parker answered that his relations with the federal government in narcotics prosecution were "of the finest."

Brown said in his press conference that "the chief of police of Los Angeles has seen fit even to criticize J. Edgar Hoover. You'll find that J. Edgar Hoover agrees with me on the quality of law enforcement in Los Angeles."

Parker expressed amazement at this, declaring, "We're working with FBI men every day and every night."
Parker, Pitchess Lash Back at Governor

Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess replied angrily Friday to Gov. Brown's charges they have "the worst law enforcement record in the entire State.'

"This is the most unwarranted attack I have ever seen," Pitchess fumed.

"I cannot understand... I cannot see even how it serves Gov. Brown's political ends," Parker said.

They disclosed they have sent the Governor twin telegrams asking "complete transcripts" of a Sacramento press conference in which Brown made the assertions. Parker commenting:

"I want a complete copy so it can be studied for legal implications and intent."

The Police Chief quoted at length from FBI statistics, which he said show Los Angeles has "more efficient law enforcement than either Gov. Brown's home County (San Francisco) or the City where he resides as Governor."

Pitchess referred to previous statements by the Governor in which he (Pitchess) was called "a fine law enforcement officer," and said:

"I am speaking for and in defense of the more than 10,000 law enforcement officers of this City and County..."

"(I want) to make the Governor aware that the law enforcement of 23 municipalities which the Governor commands are handled under contract by the Sheriff's Office."
Brown Scores
Chief, Sheriff

By CARL GREENBERG
Examiner Political Editor

SACRAMENTO—Gov. Brown unleashed an angry and blistering attack on Los Angeles Police Chief Parker and Sheriff Pitchess Friday. They aren't doing a good law enforcement job, he asserted.

Later, in a TV appearance, Brown, former Attorney General, got even tougher, charging the pair has "the worst law enforcement record in the entire state" and I feel it's high time the people of Los Angeles know where the fault lies . . ." He asserted Los Angeles City "is a prime place for crime" and:

"There are more arrests and more refusals to prosecute by the District Attorney in the City of Los Angeles than any other city in our State."

And, charged the Governor, who identified Parker and Pitchess as "political peace officers."

"These are the people where we have seen the highest crime rate in the entire State of California go up and up without any decrease whatsoever over a period of the last eight or nine years."

The Governor clearly was irritated at his news conference over criticism of him voiced by Parker and Pitchess for commuting to life imprisonment without possibility of parole Erwin M. "Machine Gun" Walker, killer of State Highway Patrolman Loren Roosevelt in Los Angeles. Walker had been condemned to die.

He charged a good job of law enforcement in the City and County of Los Angeles "definitely" is not being done. but carefully made clear he was excluding the police departments of other incorporated cities in the County.

In contrast, he said, law enforcement is "excellent" in

Turn to Page 2, Col. 4
Brown: Says Parker Won't Cooperate With Dope Chief

From Page One

San Francisco and other major counties.

While the Governor avoided using Parker's and Pitchess' names, there wasn't any doubt who he was talking about.

"I want to call attention to the fact the chief of police has seen fit to criticize J. Edgar Hoover, one of the outstanding law enforcement people in the United States, and you will find out J. Edgar Hoover agrees with me in my appraisal of the law enforcement in the City of Los Angeles."

"He (Parker) won't work with the Federal Narcotic Administrator, George White, in San Francisco, and refused to meet with him."

Brown said at a meeting in his office in an attempt to bring coordination to narcotic enforcement, he asked "the Chief of Police of Los Angeles...to go in another room and talk about it and George White...agreed to do it, but the Chief of Police wouldn't do it."

Pressed how he knew Hoover agreed with him on the quality of law enforcement in Los Angeles—or the lack of it—Brown replied:

"Let me just say that—I mean, I just want to leave it that way. I don't want to quote anybody else in this thing."

Parker on Wednesday said Brown's commutation for Walker "illustrates his lack of concern for the problems of the police." Pitchess was described as "shocked" and, citing the fact another officer shot by Walker, C. C. Forbes, now retired, still has a bullet in his spine, said, "the sacrifices of these officers have gone in vain in view of the action taken by Gov. Brown."

The Governor opened up the attack on his own, saying:

"...Our Southern California peace officers, none of whom was here or heard the testimony in the case, have seen fit to criticize the Governor for the exercise of his clemency powers."

He said Walker's great-grandfather died in a mental institution, his grandfather once was in one, his father committed suicide, and Walker "was literally dragged from his cell in condemned row to the holding cell" in 1949 when he was held insane and confined to an institution.

Testimony showed Walker probably would go insane again if sent to Death Row 15 years after his original commitment, Brown declared, adding:

"...Of all the cases I have had since I have been Gov..."
error this would have been torture rather than punishment, and I didn't want the spectacle of putting a man in a condemned cell and seeing him go insane again.

"Now, I have never commuted a man who has committed a homicide against a peace officer since I have been Governor. Only a case with facts as strong as this would ever call upon me to grant clemency in these cases."

"I think it's time some of the political peace officers in Los Angeles County, if they oppose these things, would come up and listen to these hearings...."

He said Los Angeles Chief Dep. Dist. Atty. Manley Bowler, when asked if he thought Walker should die, "hesitated and then with manifest reluctance said, 'I think the law calls for it in this case.'"

"I don't know what their motivation is, but I think the constant criticism of the courts, the Legislature and the Governor by people who are obviously not doing a good job themselves is not doing law enforcement in this State any good at all.

"The sooner we get together and come into this room and find out how we can expedite the administration of criminal justice the better the lives and property of the people of this State will be."

Asked if he blamed "bad management or lack of personnel" for the law enforcement assertions he made about Los Angeles, Brown replied:

"Well, if you will just look at the records of people who are arrested, cases that are thrown out of court down there before they ever get to court, you'll find out these people should ask themselves some questions as to what is going on down there... people are arrested and the District Attorney refuses to file charges on the cases."

The Governor declared California has "the finest police officers... but they're not criticizing everybody every time something happens they don't like..."

Q. Your reference is not just then to narcotics arrests?

A. No, no. It's the entire law enforcement picture in the County. And I am referring to Los Angeles City... their problem is that they instead of looking at the mistakes in their own eye, they keep blaming... legislators, judges and Governor."

Brown recently teed off on Pitchess for engaging in Republican politics, saying he didn't think a peace officer with arrest functions and in a non-partisan post should be active in such things as serving as a Nixon-pledged delegate to the GOP National Convention.

He and Parker haven't seen eye to eye on narcotics legislation, the Governor holding out against repeal of the California case barring use of evidence obtained by unreasonable search and seizure, while Parker backing legislation to permit such evidence in narcotics cases.
GOV. BROWN ATTACKS PARKER
Brown refused to name the targets of his wrath but he obviously was referring to Chief of Police William H. Parker of Los Angeles and Sheriff Peter Pitchess of Los Angeles County. Both Parker and Pitchess criticized Brown for saving Erwin (Machine Gun) Walker, a highway patrolman's killer, from the gas chamber.

"Constant criticism by people who obviously are not doing good jobs themselves is not doing law enforcement any good," Brown said.

"Then you are saying that a good job of law enforcement is not being done in Los Angeles?"

"Definitely," snapped the governor.

"EXCELLENT IN S.F."

Asked if this applied to San Francisco or other centers of population in the state, Brown said he felt law enforcement was doing an "excellent job" in San Francisco, Alameda, Sacramento, Santa Clara and San Diego.

The chief of police of Los Angeles has seen it even to criticize J. Edgar Hoover (FBI head)," Brown said. "You'll find that J. Edgar Hoover agrees with me on the quality of law enforcement in Los Angeles. The chief won't even work with George White, the federal narcotics administrator."

Brown said he was not criticizing chiefs of police in other incorporated cities in Los Angeles County but was referring to the city of Los Angeles proper and the unincorporated area which is Pitchess' jurisdiction.

"ENTIRE PICTURE"

"And I'm not just referring to narcotics enforcement," the governor added. "I mean the entire law enforcement picture in the city and county."

After Brown commuted Walker's sentence to life in prison earlier this week, Parker issued a statement in which he said the governor's action demonstrated his "soft attitude toward crime." Pitchess also criticized the commutation.

"Our Southern California peace officers, none of whom were here or heard the testimony, have seen fit again to criticize the governor for exercising clemency power," Brown said. "These are enforcement officials where we've seen the highest crime rate go up and up without any decrease in eight or nine years."

"KILLER "WAS INSANE"

Brown said all the testimony showed Walker was insane when he first was put in death row in 1949 and "all indications are this man would become insane again if he were returned to death row."

"This would have been torture, not punishment," Brown insisted.

The governor said he had used his clemency powers sparingly during his first two years in office and intended to use them sparingly for the remainder of his term.
Prepare Joint Reply to Governor

Police Chief William H. Parker and Sheriff Peter J. Pitchess today were preparing a joint statement in reply to Governor Edmund G. Brown's charges that a good job of law enforcement is NOT being done in Los Angeles.

Chief Parker said: "This statement of the governor appears to cover quite a broad field.

"This merits the joint consideration and study of both Sheriff Pitchess and myself.

"We will request from the governor a full transcript of the conference out of which this story came, including all the utterances concerning both Sheriff Pitchess and myself."

QUOTED HOOVER

"With regard to the governor's statement that I have criticized FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover: In my appearance last Monday before the Legislature, I quoted J. Edgar Hoover at great length to back up my stand on the narcotic question.

"If I were critical of him, I certainly would not have used him as an authority.

"This is the kind of statement a lawyer ought to look at."

CONFERENCES IN D.C.

When Parker was in Washington recently he had a series of meetings with Harry J. Anslinger, head of federal narcotic law enforcement, it was reported in the civic center here today.

At these conferences it was agreed that Wayland Spear, assistant to Anslinger, would represent their Federal Bureau of Narcotics on all legislative matters in Southern California.
Governor Criticized for Leniency to Killer


Walker, 43, a World War II combat veteran, shot two Los Angeles policemen, Detas. C. C. Forbes and R. W. Johnson, and killed Roosevelt during robberies in this area in 1944.

He was scheduled to be executed in the San Quentin gas chamber April 13.

Police Chief Parker said the Governor's action Tuesday in Sacramento "illustrates his lack of concern for the problems of the police."

Shanitz Pitchess said he was "shocked" by the commutation, pointed out that Forbes still carries a bullet in his spine as a result of Walker's criminal actions," and added: "The sacrifices of these officers have gone in vain in view of the action taken by Gov. Brown."

"Law enforcement and the people they protect have suffered a major defeat."

"We believe he was sane at the time of the crime and we further believe he should have paid for his crime with his life."

Bowler, one of the prosecutors who obtained Walker's conviction, said the killer had a fair trial, he was "crafty and bold" in court and there was "overwhelming evidence that he knew the difference between right and wrong."

Brown commuted the death sentence to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

He said, however, he intends to reexamine the case in about a year to determine whether the parole ban should be lifted.
Parker Calls Governor Inconsistent

Police Chief Parker snapped back at Gov. Brown Wednesday and accused him of "inconsistency."

The chief was angered by Brown's remark that Parker had been "indifferent" in his efforts to the Senate Judiciary Committee that the Governor dangled patronage or judgeships to the Senators to win him over to his views on the controversial Cahan case.

Parker had supported and Brown had opposed legislation that would have modified the State Suprem Court's Cahan ruling restricting the search of seizure rights of police. Brown's views won.

In a press release Wednesday, Parker stated:

"The inconsistency of Gov. Brown in criticizing my appearance before the State Senate Judiciary Committee Monday evening is clearly established by his letter to me under date of March 14, 1961, in which he said, 'I wanted to drop you this note to let you know, personally, how much I do appreciate your support on the matters before the Senate Judiciary Committee this week.'"
Walker Vowed to Kill L.A. Officer
Captor Blasts Brown's Mercy to Murderer

(See Editorial on Page C-2)

By FOSTER GOSS and NORMAN JACOBY

If he ever is freed, Erwin M. "Machinegun" Walker, 43, has sworn to kill retired Det. Sgt. Marty Wynn, one of his captors, Wynn said today.


In an exclusive interview with the Herald Express, Wynn, now an insurance adjuster, said of the killer whose death sentence has been commuted by Governor Edmund G. Brown in the slaying of California Highway Patrolman Loren Roosevelt:

"Governor Brown has made a mockery of law and order in California. He has turned it into a criminal anarchy. If I were a crook, the first place I'd head for, would be California.

"Why should a peace officer risk his life in order to protect the citizens of California when you can't even get the backing of the governor?

"After his capture, Walker told me he would kill me if he ever got loose.

"KILL CRAZY"

"Walker told another inmate at the Atascadero institution for the criminally insane that all he was waiting for was to kill the man who shot him.

"In an ambulance, on the way to the hospital, Walker told Lt. Romeau: 'The only thing I'm sorry about is that I didn't wipe you guys out.' He meant the arresting officers.

"He was lying on a bed with a machine gun across his chest when we entered his apartment.

MURDER THREAT

"Later, in the hospital, Walker was afraid he was dying and he told me in what he thought was a death bed statement: 'I'm sorry I didn't kill all of you guys.'

"Once Walker told me that, before he was captured, two policemen stopped him for jaywalking on Hollywood bvy. Walker said that if they had insisted on identification, he would have killed them both.

"When the two officers detained him, Walker told me, he had a machinegun hooked to his belt under his overcoat. That's how he carried the gun. He had removed the gun's butt.

INSANITY BOOKS

"After Walker was removed from the San Quentin prison death row to Atascadero, they found a series of books on insanity in his cell.

"One book had been given to him by another inmate who had beaten a death sentence by pretending insanity.

"Walker was a near-genius who discovered on his own how to make a high-powered nitroglycerine with chemicals for blowing up safes.

"At the close of Walker's Superior Court trial in Los Angeles, Judge Harold B. Landreth said Walker was the most intelligent criminal witness ever to appear in his court.

NOT WAR HERO

"Contrary to some reports, Walker was not a war hero.

"He told me that he had premonitions twice and had moved from his outfit, rather than get killed when the Japanese wiped out his buddies somewhere in the Pacific.

"Walker told me that he had made up his mind while he was in the army that, since the government had made him work for $21 a month, he was going to get even.

"Walker said he decided to pull perfect crimes. Later, in Hollywood, he decided that he had achieved perfect crimes and planned to flee to Alaska. He told me that after his arrest.

"In his one-man crime wave, he had committed at least 20 crimes. They included burglaries, stealing..."
A Dangerous Decision

Erwin M. “Machine Gun” Walker went berserk in 1946 on a crime spree in Los Angeles and shot and killed a state highway patrol officer, Loren Roosevelt.

He also wounded two Los Angeles police officers, one of whom, C. W. Forbes, is still partially paralyzed with a bullet in his spine.

It should be clear that Walker is a desperate mass killer if he is allowed his freedom at any time.

And yet the way is being paved for just that possibility in an action taken by Governor Brown.

Walker, a 14-year veteran of San Quentin death row and state psychiatric care, has had his execution commuted to life imprisonment by the governor. But that is only part of the action.

Although the governor commuted the death sentence to life imprisonment without parole, he now says that he will review the case within a year and perhaps will give Walker a chance for parole if the Adult Authority approves such action.

If “Machine Gun” Walker is again freed to roam around among people, the probability is that he will go on another crime spree—and kill again. How many innocent persons will suffer death this time?

On last March 1, Walker, now 43, was found sane by a Marin County judge. He was due to be returned to San Quentin death row, although still under treatment at Vacaville Prison Medical Facility. That is, until the governor intervened.

The question about this man, now serving more as a human guinea pig for psychiatric study than as a murderer, is a moral and social one: How far should we go in helping criminals change their behavior? How much can we afford to pay in dollars and human lives?
Gov. Brown Spares Life of Machine Gun Walker

BY RICHARD BERGHOFF
Political Editor

SACRAMENTO—The old and vexing question—when is a man legally sane—has saved 40-year-old Erwin (Machine Gun) Walker from San Quentin's gas chamber.

Gov. Brown abruptly ended an hour-long clemency hearing Tuesday afternoon by saying, 'I've heard enough.' He issued an on-the-spot clemency ruling commuting the former Glendale man's death sentence to life imprisonment without possibility of parole.

Walker killed a California highway patrolman and wounded two Los Angeles policemen in 1946.

IN LOS ANGELES, Police Chief Parker today blasted the ruling, saying: 'The governor's action just illustrates his lack of concern for the problems of policemen.'

Brown wanted to know: Was Walker legally sane when he shot the officers and is he sane now?

Under the law a man is held to be legally sane if he knows right from wrong.

CHIEF DEP., Dist. Atty Mahley Bowler, co-prosecutor on the Walker case, 15 years ago, told Brown there was no question the machine gun-toting burglar was legally sane when he shot the officers.

Three psychiatrists agreed on this at Walker's trial.

'There is no question that Walker's sentence should be commuted,' Bowler said.

'THE PASSAGE of time tends to dim the memory, and dull the conscience—but not for the dead policeman's family, or for Sgt. C. C. Forbes, who to this day carries a bullet against his spine.

'It is still our position that Walker should pay for his crimes with his life.'

Walker's transcript showed that only an hour before he was to be executed on April 15, 1949, medical examiners told San Quentin Warden Clinton Duffy, Walker appeared to be going insane and the scheduled execution was stopped.

WALKER LATER was adjudged insane by the court and since then has been in state mental hospitals.

But on March 1, the Marin County Superior Court, after hearing, ruled Walker had regained sanity.
Protest Brown Veto Of Killer Execution

Three top Los Angeles law enforcement officials today criticized Governor Edmund G. Brown's commutation of the death sentence of Erwin M. "Machine gun" Walker, 43, killer of California highway patrolman, Loren Roosevelt, 43.


The three officials led a wave of public indignation over leniency for the dangerous criminal who also shot and wounded two Los Angeles police detectives. Walker was convicted of first degree murder in a Los Angeles Superior Court trial.

Retired Detective Colin Forbes, partially paralyzed from a bullet fired into his spine by Walker, said:

"My beef is with Governor Brown and public apathy. I saw a story the other day quoting Walker that he had only shot the officer twice. Actually, it was six times."

"It is like the Chessman case. The public really never has a chance to know the full details. This man will do it again if he has a chance."

INFLECTED WOUND

Officers said Forbes' retirement resulted in part from the wound inflicted by Walker.

Now serving in the bureau's fugitive division, Det. S. W. Johnson, another victim of Walker's shooting spree, said:

"Walker was sane when he committed the murder but found sane later, now he has been found sane again."

"Sooner or later he will be back on the street again. "From now on, I'm going to have eyes in the back of my head."

Chief Dep. Dist. Atty. Bowler, who prosecuted Walker in a Superior Court trial here at the request of Dist.

Atty. William B. McKesson, I was in Sacramento Tuesday to appear before Governor Brown's clemency hearing in the Walker case.

"In repeating our request that Walker be executed, I explained that our position has not changed since this man was convicted 15 years ago for murdering a peace officer and shooting a secretary."

"One of the victims—Colin Forbes—still carries scars and a bullet in his back as a reminder of that day."

"Much time tends to dim the memory and dull the conscience. It doesn't alter the fact that Walker killed one officer and severely wounded another."

"We believe he was sane at the time of the crime, and we further believe he should have paid for his crime with his life."

"The governor's action in commuting the sentence of machine gun Walker illustrates his lack of concern for the problems of the police."

Sheriff Peter J. Pitchess said:

I am shocked at the action of Governor Brown in commuting the death sentence of convicted police killer Erwin M. Walker.

"A California Highway patrolman, Loren Roosevelt, is dead, and a Los Angeles policeman, Colin C. Forbes, still carries a bullet in his spine as a result of Walker's criminal actions."

"The sacrifices of these officers have gone in vain in view of the action taken by Governor Brown. Law enforcement officers and the people they protect have suffered a major defeat."

Forbes and Johnson were shot by Walker April 25, 1946 as they surprised him attempting to dispose of stolen radar equipment.

Officers reported Walker, then unidentified, shot down Roosevelt in cold blood early June 5, 1946 on the 4000 block of Brunswick ave. Hollywood Roosevelt, en route to his home, 410 E. Maple ave. Glendale, stopped his car when he spotted a suspicious character.

The phantom approached Roosevelt's automobile and pumped five .45 pistol bullets into the victim, according to original reports.

BOWLER COMMENT

Bowler recalled these impressions from the Walker trial:

"As I remember the case, there are four things that stand out in my memory:"

1. Walker was sane when he committed the murder, but found insane later, now he has been found sane again.

2. Walker was sentenced to life imprisonment in a state prison for his murder of Forbes.

3. Walker was found insane at the time of his trial and was committed to a state mental hospital.

4. Walker was paroled from the mental hospital and committed a murder while on parole.
"1. The exceedingly fair afforded Erwin Walker by the late Judge Harold Landon.

2. The craftiness, boldness and brilliance of Erwin Walker. It was most impressive to hear him relate from the witness stand various formulas used in the making of nitroguanidine for the use of blowing up safes.

3. The overwhelming evidence in the trial showing without question that Walker knew the difference between right and wrong at the time he pumped the bullets into Officer Roosevelt.

4. His craftiness in planning the crimes, for on each occasion he took his flashlight, gun and gloves. These police officers were fine law enforcement men... We cannot forget this, governor.

"We felt he receive a fair trial... and that the judgment should be put in execution."
Spares Slayer of Officer

Brown Commutes Walker to Life

SACRAMENTO, Mar. 29 (UPI)—The death sentence of Erwin M. (Machinegun) Walker—a 14 year veteran of death row and state psychiatric care—has been commuted to life imprisonment by Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Walker, 43, was found sane by a Marin County Superior Court judge on March 1 and, although still undergoing treatment for mental disorders at Vacaville Prison Medical Facility, was due to be returned to San Quentin’s death row.

Brown said he would review the case within a year and perhaps give Walker a chance for parole if the Adult Authority approves it. Today’s ruling was for a life sentence without parole.

Dr. David G. Schmidt, chief psychiatrist at San Quentin, said Walker was “mentally ill although legally sane” during a 1946 crime spree in Los Angeles when he killed Highway Patrolman Loren Rossen and wounded two city police officers. One officer, C. W. Forbes, is still partially paralyzed with a bullet in his spine.

Former San Quentin Warden Clinton Duffy told Brown that Walker was the “worst...
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Re Los Angeles tel today.

There are enclosed herewith for the Bureau copies of articles appearing in the Los Angeles metropolitan newspapers on 3/29/61 and 3/30/61, concerning Governor BROWN's action in commuting the death sentence of 43-year-old ERWIN "MACHINE GUN" WALKER to life imprisonment.

It is noted that the 3/30/61 press item indicates that the Governor has been criticized by Chief WILLIAM H. PARKER, Sheriff PETER PITCHESS, and Chief Deputy District Attorney MANLEY BOWLER of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. There is also an editorial in the "Los Angeles Herald Express" on 3/30/61 which is critical of the Governor's action.

For the further attention of the Bureau, the article which appeared in the "Los Angeles Herald Express" on 3/31/61, concerning the criticism by BROWN of PARKER and PITCHESS is enclosed. A copy of this article is enclosed for San Francisco and for San Diego. It is noted that the article indicates that PARKER and PITCHESS were preparing a joint statement in reply to Governor BROWN's charges.

3-Bureau (7 Encls)
1-San Francisco (1 Encl)
1-San Diego (1 Encl)
1-Los Angeles
WMA:mmb
(6)

Approved: Special Agent in Charge

Sent M Per

50 APR 24 1961
It is also noted that Chief PARKER says, with regard to the Governor's statement that he, PARKER, had criticized the Director, that in his appearance before the Legislature on 3/27/61, he had quoted the Director at great length to back up his stand on the narcotics question and that he would not have quoted Mr. HOOVER if he were critical of him. It is felt that the appearance to which PARKER is referring is his appearance before the Senate Judiciary Committee in Sacramento on 3/27/61, when PARKER testified for legislation which would negate the effects of certain court decisions regarding revealing of informants in narcotics cases. The San Francisco Office is checking its sources to determine what statements made by PARKER are available and is advising the Bureau by airtel.

For the further information of the Bureau, this appears to be a continuation of exchange of criticism between Governor BROWN and Sheriff PITCHESS of Los Angeles County. It has been rumored in circles in and around Los Angeles that Sheriff PITCHESS was being considered as a possible candidate for Governor on the Republican Ticket against BROWN in 1962. Recently, Governor BROWN was critical of Sheriff PITCHESS in stating that Sheriff PITCHESS should not have been a delegate to the Republican National Convention in Chicago in 1960 and that he should administer his office (Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office) without regard to political affiliation.

PITCHESS countered in a speech before the California Sheriff's Association Convention in Monterey during the week of March 20 last by stating that he had always tried to administer his office without regard to party affiliation but felt that he had a perfect right to be a delegate to the Republican National Convention.

The Bureau is well aware of the propensity of Chief PARKER for criticizing public officials and has on many occasions, been particularly critical of Governor BROWN as well as Attorney General MOSK.

In accordance with Bureau instructions, any inquiry received will be handled on a strictly "no comment" basis.
April 19, 1961

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
The Governor of California
Sacramento, California

My dear Governor:

I sincerely regret the fact I was out of my office when you called by today. It would have indeed been a pleasure to sit down and chat with you regarding matters of mutual interest.

Assistant Director C. D. DeLoach has advised me of your commendatory statements regarding the work of the FBI in the State of California and particularly concerning Special Agent in Charge Richard D. Auerbach of our San Francisco Office. It was certainly kind of you to indicate your commendation of our work and we, of course, look forward to continued excellent cooperation with your office.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

1 - SAC, San Francisco (Personal Attention)
1 - Mr. Ingram (sent direct) EX. 105
1 - Mr. Jones (sent direct)

Memorandum

TO: Mr. Mohr
FROM: C. D. DeLoach
DATE: April 19, 1961

SUBJECT: GOVERNOR EDMUND BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By reference from the Director's Office, I talked with Governor Edmund Brown who called by at 11:50 AM this morning. He stated he had only a few minutes inasmuch as he was on his way to the White House. He mentioned he had just conferred with the Attorney General and Commissioner Anslinger of the Bureau of Narcotics. He explained the purpose of his visit was to promote a "crash program" concerning narcotics in the State of California.

Governor Brown asked if we were aware of his public charges against Chief Bill Parker of Los Angeles. I told him we were. He did not ask for our opinion of Parker. He did state, however, that Parker is no good, that Parker suffers from paranoia, that he is an egomaniac, that he is not doing a good job as a police official. Governor Brown stated he will continue to fight against Parker despite the fact when you fight with a skunk some of it is bound to rub off on you.

Governor Brown asked if statistics concerning bank robberies were not up. I told him they were, that 1959 had been the biggest year since 1934, that 1960 was a close second. He asked if these robberies were not being perpetrated by individuals who had no previous criminal record. I told him this was true in approximately 27% of the cases and then gave him a few examples such as the 72-year-old grandmother, etc.

Governor Brown indicated he was interested in stifling organized crime in the State of California as much as possible. He asked if it were true "bookies" were moving into California from the East. I told him I could not confirm this personally but felt he must have some knowledge of this situation inasmuch as he posed the question. He then stated he thought this was taking place and that he was finding it somewhat difficult to cope with the situation, particularly in view of the proximity of Las Vegas. He explained the "bookies" hit Las Vegas and later move into California.

Enclosure

Mr. Ingram
CDD: ejr

1 - Mr. Ingram
1 - C. D. DeLoach
CDD: ejr
(4)
DeLoach to Mohr Memo
Re: Governor Edmund Brown
State of California

4/19/61

I took the liberty of telling Governor Brown the Director is highly appreciative of the cooperation that the Governor has extended to the FBI in the State of California. The Governor stated there was no finer organization than the FBI and that he particularly felt that SAC Auerbach of the San Francisco Office was doing an excellent job. The Governor indicated he, of course, personally has some shortcomings and that he had learned a few lessons the hard way. He mentioned he was now a believer in capital punishment, however, seriously felt defendants receiving this sentence should be executed as soon after their sentence as possible. I told him of the Director's opinions in this regard and specifically mentioned the Chessman case as an example of an atrocious delay. The Governor agreed.

The Governor brought up the subject of parole and probation. I told him of the Director's belief in the system of rehabilitation, however, that the Director had constantly and forcefully struck out at the corruption in these fields.

Governor Brown was most cordial and asked that his best regards be extended to the Director. He stated he certainly hopes he will be able to see the Director later on in the Summer in California. He mentioned he would appreciate receiving some advice from the Director regarding a number of problems.

ACTION:

It is thought the Director may desire to send the attached letter to Governor Brown.

[Signature]

[Initials]
URGENT 3-31-61 12-46 PM GJ
TO DIRECTOR, FBI /ATTN CRIME RECORDS/ AND SACS SAN FRANCISCO
AND SAN DIEGO
FROM SAC, LOS ANGELES 2P
GOVERNOR EDWARD G. BROWN, MISC., INFO CONCERNING. MY CALL TO
BUREAU TODAY. SHERIFF PETER J. PITCHESS TELEPHONICALLY
ADvised THAT GOVERNOR BROWN MADE A RELEASE ATTACKING CITY
AND COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FOR POOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND COMMENTING
THAT DIRECTOR HOOVER AGREES WITH HIM. UPI DISPATCH QUOTES BROWN
IN EFFECT ACCORDING TO PITCHESS THAT "THE CHIEF OF POLICE HAS
SEEN FIT TO CRITICIZE J. EDGAR HOOVER. YOU WILL FIND J. EDGAR
HOOVER AGREES WITH ME ON THE QUALITY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT IN LOS ANGELES."
UNQUOTE. PITCHESS STATED THAT THIS RELEASE OF THE GOVERNOR'S IN
RECALTATION FOR CRITICISMS LEVELLED AGAINST BROWN WITHIN PAST SEVERAL
DAYS FOR COMMUTATION OF THE DEATH SENTENCE OF ERWIN F. WALKER
"UNCUT GUN WALKER, KILLER OF A CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROLMAN, WHO
ALSO WOUNDED TWO LOS ANGELES POLICE OFFICERS IN NINETEEN FORTY-SIX.
ONE OF THESE OFFICERS, C. V. FORBES, IS STILL PARTIALLY PARALYZED
WITH A BULLET IN HIS SPINE, ACCORDING TO NEWS REPORTS. GOVERNOR
BROWN WAS CRITICIZED FOR ABOVE COMMUTATION BY COP WILLIAM PARKER.
PAGE TWO

SHERIFF PITCHESS, AND CHIEF DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY PANLEY BOILER
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY. PITCHESS STATED HIS PURPOSE IN CALLING WAS
TO ADVISE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT CONCERNING THE DIRECTOR.
ANY PRESS INQUIRIES OF ANY OR OTHER INQUIRIES RECEIVED WILL BE
HANDLED ON A STRICT NO COMMENT BASIS.

CORRECTION PAGE ONE LINE 3 WORD 9 SHOULD BE ATTACKING
LINE 5 WORD 3 SHOULD BE HOOVER

SAN DIEGO AND SAN FRANCISCO ADVISED.

END AND ACK LS

3-51 PM OK FBI WA FAC

TO DISCH

Mr. Distanch
Transmit the following in

(AIRTEL)

(AIR MAIL)

(Priority or Method of Mailing)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES

SUBJECT: GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN ATTN: Crime Records

State of California
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING

Reference is made to my previous correspondence advising of Governor BROWN's attack on Chief of Police PARKER and Sheriff PETER PITCHESS of Los Angeles County.

There is enclosed herewith an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner on instant date in which the Director is quoted. The letter to Editor WARDEN WOOLARD from the Director was in connection with a previous editorial appearing in the "Examiner."

The above is submitted for the Bureau's information.
Fight Over Dope

A SLIGHT relaxing was noticeable Tuesday in the deadlock over the narcotic evil. Governor Brown has been warring with the Los Angeles County Supervisors, Chief of Police Parker, Sheriff Pitchess, and other law enforcement officials over new legislation.

Tuesday Mr. Brown retreated a little. Prominent in the controversy is whether probation should be permitted for first offense sale of hard narcotics by an adult to a minor.

Heretofore, the Governor has insisted no law should be enacted that would take away from the courts the power to grant such probation when they see fit. Now he says he would sign a bill prohibiting such probation even though it is not his bill. This is good.

Those persons who are eager to have really tough laws against narcotic peddlers want to make sure that sales to minors will carry certain punishment that cannot be set aside by lenient judges.

Governor Brown's own Special Study Commission on Narcotics recommended this. The State Senate voted 26 to 12 for it over the Governor's vigorous opposition.

Los Angeles County Supervisors stood firm and restated their recommendations which can be summarized as:

"We favor passage of a strong narcotics legislative program which upgrades penalties, makes mandatory minimum penalties, allows no probation in first offenses where adults are selling hard narcotics to minors, and calls for some modification of the law prohibiting search and seizure away from a man's residence."

The public is now witnessing the deplorable spectacle of our highest officials fighting bitterly among themselves instead of being united in an all-out war on the loathsome narcotic evil.

It must be presumed the Governor took his position because of his own sincere convictions and also with deliberation, since the active campaigning for re-election is less than a year away.
For whatever reason, a frontal assault was made on a nationally respected Chief of Police and, the equally respected Sheriff of Los Angeles County who are battling for tougher laws. This attack is no way to bring about a landslide for Brown in this area.

In Tuesday's Examiner, also, there was a letter to the editor from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. He wrote, "Ill-advised leniency for criminals of all ages continually hinders effective law enforcement and will persist in doing so as long as the perpetrators of criminal acts receive more sympathy than the victims."

Mr. Hoover seems to state the case in a single sentence.

As for The Examiner, we firmly believe protecting the public must be preferred to coddling the criminal.
Honorale P. Kenneth O'Donnell
Special Assistant to the President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mr. O'Donnell:

Reference is made to your letter dated May 12, 1961, requesting name checks concerning
and six other individuals. Reference is also
made to my letter dated May 17, 1961, which furnished
you the results of the name checks made concerning
and Judge Edwin O. Lewis.

With regard to Governor Edmund Gerald Brown,
also known as "Pat" Brown, he was the subject of an
applicant-type investigation conducted by the FBI in
1960 at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.
This investigation revealed the following information
concerning Governor Brown.

The February 13, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco
Chronicle," a San Francisco, California, newspaper published
an article which reported that Edmund Gerald Brown, then
District Attorney, opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges,
a west coast labor leader who was accused of membership in
the Communist Party.

The August 9, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco
Chronicle" published an article which announced that
Edmund Gerald Brown had been elected Vice President of the
San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild (NLG).
The NLG has been cited as a communist front organization
by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The FBI is in possession of a letterhead entitled
"Salute to Young America Committee," which was a committee
according to the letterhead, to sponsor a second anniversary

SEE NOTE ON YELLOW, PAGE 4
Honorable P. Kenneth O'Donnell

dinner of the American Youth for Democracy (AYD) at San Francisco, California. This letterhead listed Edmund Gerald Brown as a member of the Committee in Formation. A confidential informant, who has furnished reliable information in the past, advised that Edmund Gerald Brown was being considered by the Communist Party in San Francisco as a speaker for this Committee but could furnish no other details in this regard.

In March, 1946, this Bureau was furnished a copy of a letter dated January 10, 1946, written by a veterans group at the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, which criticized Mr. Brown for permitting his name to be used as a sponsor of a banquet held on November 10, 1945, at the Saint Francis Hotel, San Francisco, in honor of the AYD. In reply, Mr. Brown by letter dated February 1, 1946, stated that he knew that the Young Communist League (YCL) or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the AYD. He stated that he then called an official of the AYD to determine if the organization was either communistic in origin or intent. According to Mr. Brown, the official of the AYD informed him that the organization "was not in any manner, shape or form communistic although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged." Mr. Brown added, "I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meeting until I first investigated its background." The AYD and the YCL have been designated pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Department of the Army, advised the FBI that on June 14, 1946, the Mobilization for Democracy sponsored a meeting at the Olympic Auditorium, Los Angeles, California, at which meeting Mr. Brown was a speaker. The Mobilization for Democracy has been cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its Report 1947 as one of the "key communist fronts in California."

By letter dated July 5, 1956, Mr. Brown advised this Bureau that he was opposed to any provision giving the individual states the right to prosecute subversives. Mr. Brown stated that he felt the individual states were incapable and inadequately equipped to handle such a job. He added, "I assure you that I recognize the menace of..."
subversive activities and I desire to do all in my power to aid and assist you as well as other security agencies of our Government.

During the afore-mentioned investigation concerning Governor Brown, California, was interviewed and advised that he believed Governor Brown was lacking in character, ability, judgment, integrity, and could not keep a secret. The explanation was shown in his mishandling of the widely publicized case of the executed kidnaper, Caryl Chessman, in that he had granted Chessman a reprieve shortly before the execution. He advised that he was personally opposed to Governor Brown's stand in favor of abolishing capital punishment.

He also advised that Governor Brown had exhibited a lack of character, integrity, and his inability to keep a secret when he held a press conference in 1950 on which occasion he publicly claimed credit for the formation of the National Association of District Attorneys, which organization was in fact his idea. Furthermore, he advised that he did not believe Governor Brown to be disloyal but recalled a speech made by him on an unknown date at Santa Barbara, California, when Governor Brown expressed criticism of congressional committees and hearings. Further recalled that on this occasion, Los Angeles, California, Police Chief William Parker pointed his finger at Governor Brown and stated he talked like a communist and that he was espousing the Communist Party line.

On May 13, 1960, Governor Brown was interviewed by a representative of this Bureau at his own request. On this occasion, Governor Brown advised that he was aware of allegations of leftist tendencies against him. He explained that his opposition to the deportation of Harry Bridges had been dictated by military and civic expediency inasmuch as he feared the deportation of Bridges would result in a tie-up of the California waterfront and would impede the war effort during World War II. Governor Brown also explained that his membership in the NLG was prompted by influence from legal associates but that he had resigned from this organization after reading one of its pamphlets and becoming
aware that he "didn't like the people in it" and that he had no sympathy for the "line" which the organization was beginning to take.

Governor Brown concluded that one of the greatest problems in this country is the danger of Russian communism and that the FBI and he, as Governor of California, have a common purpose in meeting and facing this danger.

Many other persons, including prominent individuals, were interviewed during the investigation of Governor Brown during 1960 and furnished no derogatory information regarding him.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER

NOTE: No arrest record Identification Division per 6/1-17-61 on basis name check.

And on 10-6-59 a name check was also prepared for AEC (5) prior to its request for an investigation in 1960. It was stated that information, some of which could not be substantiated, related to "fringe" activity by Brown years ago which included efforts of communists to use Brown and Brown's efforts to enlist political support from the Communist Party and communist groups. Inasmuch as this information was obtained from highly confidential sources, in some cases quoting Brown and in others hearsay, it was not believed prudent to disseminate the information to AEC. In view of the nature of this information, such is not being furnished to the White House.

A confidential informant, who has furnished reliable information in the past, on January 26, 1960, advised that newspaper columnist Drew Pearson and Governor Brown were invited to lunch with Soviet Ambassador Mikhail A. Menshikov on that date at the Soviet Embassy. Special Agents of the FBI observed Drew Pearson and Governor Brown visit the Soviet Embassy on January 26, 1960, from approximately 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. Not being included as not believed pertinent to request.
EDMUND Gerald P(at) BROWN

Born: April 21, 1905, San Francisco

Education: LL.B., San Francisco Law Sch., 1927

Marital Status: Married Bernice Layne, Oct. 30, 1930; children--

Experience:
1927 Admitted to Calif. bar
1927-43 practiced San Francisco
1943-47 dist. atty. city and co. San Francisco
1947-50 dist. atty. city and co. San Francisco
1951-52 attorney general of Calif.
1959- Governor of California

Miscellaneous: Roman Catholic.

Memberships: Mem. Golden Gate Bridge and Highway Dist. since 1942.
Asm. Calif. (pres. 1950--), San Francisco, Western
Asm. Atty. General (past pres.), Nat. Asm. Attorneys
General (mem. exec. bd.), Am. bar assn., Am. Coll.
Trial Lawyers (fellow).

Political Affiliation: Democrat. Delegate from California Democratic
National Conv., 1940, 1944, 1948.

Clubs: Elk. Native Sons Golden West, Commonwealth, Comml.,
Olympic (San Francisco).

Home: 460 Magellan Av., San Francisco
Office: Capital Bldg., Sacramento

PRESENT POSITION: Governor of California

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS ACTUAL
DATE 11-25-47 SG9838284

ENVELOPE
Governor EDMUND "PAT" BROWN of California, telephoned from Sacramento, California, through operator and secretary, for the Director. He was advised of the Director's absence and referred to on Mr. DeLoach's desk.

Governor Brown was merely calling to ask the Director what he, the Governor, could do to reduce crime in California. He said he doesn't get along with Chief Parker, and is absolutely convinced that we as Americans must do something about the crime situation.

Governor Brown stated he does not expect a reply to his inquiry, he just wanted to get some advice and talk to someone discussed the situation with the Governor, and the Governor was very appreciative.
Memorandum

TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, San Francisco

DATE: 7/24/61

SUBJECT: THE HONORABLE EDMUND G. BROWN
Governor of California

INFORMATION CONCERNING

ReSFlet 1/9/61.

On 7/21/61 JAMES P. CAVANAUGH, Agent in Charge Security Office, U.S. Department of State, San Francisco, furnished a copy of the enclosed letter dated 7/18/61 from Governor EDMUND G. BROWN together with a copy of a letter dated 3/2/61 from a not otherwise identified, to the Governor, in which outlines a discussion between Governor BROWN and Soviet Ambassador MIKHAIL A. MENSNIKOV on the occasion of Governor BROWN's visit to Washington, D.C., for the Presidential inauguration in January 1961. Governor BROWN had received an invitation from the Soviet Embassy to meet and have lunch with Ambassador MENSNIKOV during this visit. CAVANAUGH received the above through the mail on 7/21/61. CAVANAUGH mentioned he is furnishing a copy of Mr. Brown's letter to Director of Security, U.S. Department of State.

A copy of this communication is being furnished WPO for information and completion of its files.
March 2, 1961

Hon. Edmund G. Brown
State of California
Governor's Office
Sacramento, California

Dear Governor,

As for your letter, regarding our visit to the Russian Ambassador, the substance of the conversation, of importance is as follows, to the best of my recollection:

You stated to the Ambassador that you are a very good friend of the President's and that he has taken your advice and valued your judgment, and, since times are changing so rapidly in this modern world, a friendly relationship should be created between the United States and Russia. The Ambassador replied, he would very much like to have friendly relations and is looking forward to the opportunity of finding out if something of that sort could be accomplished.

He stated, however, he cannot understand why the American Government and people are so anxious to invade Cuba and why the Press and all other mediums are creating an atmosphere to try to destroy the present Cuban revolution. We replied, Cuba is 90 miles away from the United States and you can well understand that we will not permit any foreign power to take over territory that close to the United States or its people and there are certain doctrines that we have that protect the integrity of Cuba and other parts of Latin America. We would not stand by and let your Government, directly or indirectly, create a position that is untenable for the United States, whether in Cuba or any other part of South America and Russia is badly mistaken if they think that we would let this go by default. We suggested, however, that he had little knowledge of the honest feeling of the American people, as they are not desirous of invading or taking over any new peoples or territories and, in fact, have been great contributors of their wealth and personnel to assist the poor Countries, financially and materially, and that a great deal of assistance was also extended to Russia.

The Ambassador retorted, if that is true, why do we advance Turkey, Laos and other allies in Europe arms and ammunition instead of giving them just the essential things of life and why do we maintain bases all around Russia.
For example, take Iran, all the monies you have spent for arms and ammunition certainly would have done a lot more good in equipment, installations, food, etc., the same situation exists with Turkey. We replied, since you have been unwilling to make us feel our position is secure, we have been more or less compelled to take the position we have.

We said, why does Russia send arms and ammunition to Cuba and create such turmoil there and elsewhere to which the Ambassador replied, they are not sending arms and ammunition now. We said it makes no difference if it comes direct from them or from Czechoslovakia, wouldn't it be nice if they stopped it altogether and he replied, we have stopped it, why don't you stop sending arms and help to Laos. We answered the Ambassador, Laos is a neutral Country and we are merely trying to assist them to protect themselves against possible overtaking by Communism.

The Governor said, we have a democracy in the United States where people are free to express their opinion and the Russians most likely misunderstand our point of view because our people are a friendly people. They are not desirous of having trouble with anyone. We then said to the Ambassador, it would be a fine gesture on Russia's part if they would take the first step and make a move to show a friendly attitude to our new President, who, by the way, is a man of great understanding and who would be desirous of making friends with Russia but is the type of man who will not be pushed around. If Russia would eliminate all assistance to Cuba, immediately, directly or indirectly, and show other friendly gestures, that would be a step towards creating an atmosphere where we would have to reciprocate. The Ambassador replied, why don't you take the first step, such as topping any assistance to Laos. We replied that, since we have a new President, and it is Russia who has caused us a lot of embarrassment by assisting Cuba to move in a communistic direction and by threatening to send guided missiles to the United States because of Cuba, it would only be proper for them to take the first step. The Ambassador replied they are contemplating making a move toward friendly relations (the move might have been to release the American fliers and now, in turn, they are awaiting a gesture of friendship from us).

The Ambassador seemed to be very friendly and desirous of continuing the conversation longer but, at this time, it was necessary that we leave.

In my opinion, all indications showed that the Ambassador had very poor knowledge of public opinion in the United States and he did not understand our psychology and our way of life. Although he has been in Washington for some time, he acts as though he just arrived as far as knowing the American people.

To sum it up the most important part of the conversation reflected that the Ambassador's feeling was that, as long as we are going to support our Allies with arms and ammunition, they will continue to support Cuba and do anything else they can to harm us in South America or anywhere else. They seem very pleased about embarrassing the United States to Cuba.
It seems to me, Governor, that we could possibly by of great service to the State Department as private citizens, not as officials of the Government, to acquaint the Ambassador with Americans and their way of life. The Ambassador seemed very friendly towards us and was very much interested in continuing this conversation and have other conversations with us to explain his views at length and to get our viewpoint. There is a possibility that we can arrange an atmosphere that the State Department can work from which might be beneficial to the United States and I, for one, would be very happy to participate, if you should desire.

Sincerely,

JIA:me
July 18, 1961

San Francisco 1, California

Dear [Redacted]

I enclose a copy of a report prepared by [Redacted] who accompanied me on my breakfast with Ambassador Menshikov.

[Redacted]'s recollection well recreates what transpired on that occasion. It may be of some interest to you.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely

[Signature]

EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor

Enclosure
When attending the California Peace Officers' Association Conference at Anaheim, California, in May, I met and conferred with Governor BROWN on matters of mutual interest. The Governor attended as one of the featured speakers at this conference.
URGENT 9-26-62 7-51 PM KH
TO DIRECTOR, FBI, AND SACS SAN FRANCISCO AND SAN DIEGO
FROM SAC, LOS ANGELES
GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN, CALIFORNIA.
RADIO STATION KABC, LOS ANGELES, CARRIED A NEWS REPORT
AT SIX FIFTEEN PM, SEPTEMBER TWENTY SIX INSTANT, THAT BROWN, IN
ANSWER TO NIXON'S CAMPAIGN CHARGE THAT BROWN HAS BEEN SOFT ON
COMMUNISM, REPLIED THAT THE BUSINESS OF COMMUNISM SHOULD BE LEFT
TO THE FBI, THE HCUA, AND THE STATE COMMITTEE PAREN(CALIFORNIA
COMMITTEE ON UNAMERICAN ACTIVITIES) UNPAREN. THE NEWS REPORT ALSO
STATED THAT BROWN ADDED THAT AN FBI AGENT HAD TOLD HIM THAT THE
FBI CAN LAY ITS HANDS ON ALL COMMUNISTS IN CALIFORNIA IN FIFTEEN
MINUTES.

GOVERNOR BROWN HAS NOT BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THIS OFFICE
AND NO AGENT IN THIS DIVISION IS KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN IN CONTACT
WITH HIM FOR ANY REASON.

SAC, SAN FRANCISCO ADVISES HE HAS NO KNOWLEDGE FOR BASIS
THIS STATEMENT BY BROWN NOR ANY CONTACT FROM BROWN ON THIS MATTER.

NO PRESS INQUIRIES HAVE BEEN RECEIVED, BUT IN THE EVENT
PRESS INQUIRIES MADE, THEY WILL BE HANDLED ON A STRICTLY NO
END PAGE ONE
COMMENT BASIS UACB. IT IS FELT THAT WE SHOULD BE MOST CIRCUMSPECT
SO AS NOT TO BECOME INVOLVED IN ANY WAY IN THE POLITICAL BATTLE
BETWEEN BROWN AND NIXON.

HOLD PLS

SET SD TO BE ADVISED

C: M. De Leach

EBT

REC: 1/12/64

RECOMMENDATION
URGENT 11-24-63 9-43 PM DRS
TO DIRECTOR AND SAC SAN FRANCISCO
FROM SAC LOS ANGELES
ANONYMOUS CALL RE ASSASSINATION OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN NOVEMBER TWENTY FOUR INSTANT.
RE LOS ANGELES PHONE CALL TO BUREAU TODAY.
ASSISTANT CHIEF OF POLICE REG COOLEY, SANTA
BARBARA POLICE DEPARTMENT ADVISED THIS AFTERNOON THAT
HIS DEPARTMENT RECEIVED A COMPLAINT FROM
SCHOOL TEACHER, SANTA BARBARA AS FOLLOWS.

RECEIVED ANONYMOUS TELEPHONE CALL AT HIS
HOME THIS AFTERNOON AND UNIDENTIFIED CALLER ASKED, "IS THIS
REPLIED YES AND CALLER
SAID "GOVERNOR BROWN IS GOING TO BE ASSASSINATED"

POLICE ADVISED COMPLAINTANT SUSPECTED ONE
SANTA BARBARA, WITH WHOM HE HAD AN ARGUMENT A FEW
END PAGE ONE

14 NOV 27 1963
POLICE ADVISED ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AT SACRAMENTO RE CALL AND FBI SAN FRANCISCO HAS ADVISED GOVERNOR BROWN'S OFFICE IN SACRAMENTO. GOVERNOR BROWN PRESENTLY IN WASHINGTON FOR PRESIDENTS FUNERAL.

INVESTIGATION OF ANONYMOUS CALL BEING CONDUCTED BY SANTA BARBARA POLICE DEPARTMENT AND NO INVESTIGATION BEING CONDUCTED BY THIS OFFICE UAGB.

END AND ACK PL S
WA 12-48 AM OK FBI WA BH
SF 9-46 PM PST OK FBI SF MLP
TU DISC

CO-MR. ROSEN
Memorandum

TO: MR. W. C. SULLIVAN
FROM: [Name Redacted]

DATE: November 25, 1963

SUBJECT: UNSUB;
THREAT AGAINST GOVERNOR BROWN
OF CALIFORNIA

At 10:25 p.m., ASAC Onsgard of Los Angeles advised
that the Assistant Chief of Police at Santa Barbara had advised
that a school teacher, [Name Redacted], received a call from an unknown person who said:
"Governor Brown is going to be assassinated." The caller then
hung up.

The local police gave this to the State Police, and
the San Francisco Office of the Bureau gave this information
to the Governor's office. Onsgard asked if Los Angeles should
locate and interview [Name Redacted] and attempt to identify the caller. [Name Redacted] was advised to take no further action unless advised to the
contrary by Bureau (UACB). Governor Brown is in Washington
to attend President Kennedy's funeral.

ACTION

[Name Redacted], Bureau of Intelligence and Research, State Department, and [Name Redacted] of Secret Service were given
this information by phone at 11:00 p.m. by Duty Agent [Name Redacted] No further action seems necessary.

ETT: hone (5)
1-Mr. Belmont
1-Mr. Sullivan
1- [Name Redacted]

b7c
December 20, 1963

62-76249

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
The Governor of California
Sacramento, California

My dear Governor Brown:

I want to express my sincere thanks to you for the many kind remarks about the FBI made to newsmen at your December 17th press conference.

I thought you might like to know the FBI received outstanding cooperation in its recent investigation, Mr. Inns, Jr., kidnapping investigation from the California agencies, including: California Highway Patrol; California State Bureau of Criminal Identification on the investigation; California state Department of Motor Vehicles; El Dorado Sheriff's Office; and Placer County Sheriff's Office. We in the FBI are certainly appreciative of the fine assistance we received from these organizations.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

1 - Los Angeles
2 - San Francisco (5-575)
3 - Reutel 12-18-63.

NOTE: Envelopes reflect prior cordial correspondence with Governor Brown.

JBS:Ich (5)
TO DIRECTOR

FROM SAC, SAN FRANCISCO 7-9419 3P

BARRY WORTHINGTON KEENAN, ET AL., FRANK SINATRA, JR. DASH

FOR INFORMATION OF BUREAU, GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, EDMUND

G. BROWN, HELD PRESS CONFERENCE, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA,

DECEMBER ONE SEVEN, LAST, AT WHICH TIME HE ASKED FOLLOWING

QUESTIONS AND BROWN RESPONDED WITH FOLLOWING ANSWERS.

Q. GOVERNOR, IN REGARD TO THE FRANK SINATRA, JR. KIDNAPPING

CASE, DO YOU FEEL THAT THE FEDERAL AUTHORITIES COULD HAVE

COOPERATED CLOSER WITH THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES THROUGHOUT

CALIFORNIA.

A. WELL, I DON'T THINK MY AGENCY COULD HAVE DONE A BETTER

JOB THAN THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION DID IN THE FRANK

SINATRA CASE. I THINK THIS WAS A MASTERY OF POLICE

WORK AND INVESTIGATION FROM TOP TO BOTTOM. THEY NOT ONLY

SAVED THE VICTIM'S LIFE, THEY HAD HIM RETURNED TO HIS PARENTS

AND TO HIS HOME, AND THEY'VE RECOVERED ALMOST ALL OF THE MONEY.

NOW, WHY THEY DIDN'T LET THE CHIEF OF POLICE OF LOS ANGELES AND

IN SOMETHING THAT I CAN'T SAY, AND UNLESS I KNEW SOMETHING.
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Page 1 of 2

A: I want to protest that I'm not going to commit myself. But I want to commend J. Edgar Hoover and the F.B.I. for the magnificent job they did in this case. It was one of the finest pieces of police work that I've ever seen.

Q: You couldn't say that the local authorities have been held in disrespect because the federal authorities hadn't cooperated closely with them.

A: No, I don't think the local authorities were held in disrespect. I think you get mixed up in a case, you know what I mean? I'm doing, and to bring in more people could delay the investigation that you had, and I think that the F.B.I. has done a splendid job in the Los Angeles area. But, but, but I know that J. Edgar Hoover and Chas. Manigault and their difficulties in the past. Now, why they didn't do it that way, I don't know. It is customary for the F.B.I., I know when I was attorney general, that they were very careful to avoid any trespass on local police authorities, but this is a case that they were moving fast on, and it looked like they had a good case, and I think they did, and I can tell you, I think it.
AND TYPED

HERE IS A MAGNIFICENT PIECE OF CHEESE TIGHT
AND IT WAS TIED TWO OR THREE CATS IN A PLASTICIZED TRAY. THIS
PEACE YOUR HANDS TO HOLD THE PET A LITTLE WHILE BECAUSE IT
ISN'T AFFECTING YOU.

COPY SENT TO LOS ANGELES AND VENT.

END AND ACK PASS

10-49 PM ON FRIDAY 8L
TO VM DISC
December 30, 1963

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
The Governor of California
Sacramento, California

My dear Governor Brown:

Mr. Paul F. C'Connell, Jr., Assistant
Special Agent in Charge of our San Francisco Office, has
informed me of his conversation with you on December 27th,
and I have also read the text of your press release on that
same date. I am sure that your statement regarding this
matter will go a long way toward correcting the erroneous
reports which appeared earlier.

All of us in the FBI appreciate this splendid
cooperation we have received from you, and I want you to
know that your support of our endeavors is a source of great
personal encouragement to me.

Sincerely yours,
J. Edgar Hoover

NOTE: See M. A. Jones to DeLoach memo of 12-30-63, entitled, "Frank
Smatra, Jr.; - Victim, Kidnaping, Criticism by Chief of Police, William
H. Parker, Los Angeles Police Department.
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Mohr

FROM: C. D. DeLoach

DATE: December 27, 1983

SUBJECT: FRANK SINATRA, JR., - VICTIM KIDNAPPING
CRITICISM BY CHIEF OF POLICE WILLIAM H. PARKER
LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

Pursuant to the Director's instructions, I placed a conference call at 7:15 PM last night, December 26, 1983, to SAC Simon in Los Angeles and SAC O'Connell in San Francisco. SAC Lynham was on annual leave in San Diego, California. Specific instructions were given regarding contacts with Governor Pat Brown at Sacramento, California, and State Attorney General Stanley Mosk. I told Simon and O'Connell that Governor Brown should be contacted first and then, depending upon the results of the meeting with Governor Brown, we should contact Attorney General Mosk.

ASAC O'Connell called from Sacramento at approximately 3:40 PM this afternoon. He had just returned from the Governor's office. Senior Resident Agent accompanied him. With the Governor was the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, Brad Crittenden, and the Governor's aide, John McInerney. The latter individual handles liaison for the Governor between the Governor's office and local law enforcement.

ASAC O'Connell told Governor Brown he was calling upon him at the Director's specific instructions. He outlined to the Governor and those present the fact we had furnished specific information regarding the identity and background of certain bank robbers who were being sought in the Lake Tahoe area. He told Governor Brown that a Special Agent had personally contacted of El Dorado, California, and had fully briefed him. This Agent had instructed to furnish the same information to the California Highway Patrol immediately. He has confirmed this fact and our Agents have noted an entry in the log at one of the Highway Patrol substations proving the transmittal of this information. ASAC O'Connell told Governor Brown that representatives had also contacted of the California Highway Patrol and at that time requested a road block. He stated he could not accommodate the Sheriff's office because the Highway Patrolmen were not paid overtime. He stated the road block could not be set up until early morning. is one of the Patrolmen who has shot off his mouth criticizing the FBI.
Memo DeLoach to Mohr  
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At this point in the conference, Commissioner Crittenden confirmed ASAC O'Connell's facts. He admitted to the Governor that there had been a breakdown in administration of the California Highway Patrol in that the officer who relieved him during early morning hours of the day in question did not brief the officer who relieved him during early morning hours of the day in question. The officer who relieved him was a Patrolman named who has also shot off his mouth criticizing the FBI and has written a report accordingly.) Commissioner Crittenden told Governor Brown that report was based entirely upon erroneous information in that it inferred a lack of cooperation on the part of the FBI. Crittenden told the Governor that excellent cooperation existed between the FBI and the California Highway Patrol. He also told the Governor that Chief Parker of Los Angeles had received a copy of erroneous report in a plain envelope and that Parker was, therefore, back of this entire controversy. Crittenden told the Governor he was checking into the breakdown in administration in his own outfit, particularly the leak of erroneous information to Parker.

ASAC O'Connell told Governor Brown that with respect to the Sinatra case, the FBI had moved very swiftly and there had been no need to notify Chief Parker in Los Angeles. He also told Governor Brown that Parker's policies, particularly with respect to nonpayment of ransom, were totally different than the FBI and we, therefore, would have found it impossible to work with Parker. The Governor was told Parker's policies might have caused the death of the victim.

Governor Brown interrupted the conference at this point and stated he wanted to call to the attention of the FBI representatives his recent press conference wherein he had criticized Chief Parker and had praised the work of the FBI in the Sinatra case. He stated he still felt this way. Governor Brown then called Attorney General Mosk who at that time was in Los Angeles. He told Mosk that Director Hoover had instructed FBI representatives to call upon him and give him the true facts in connection with the current controversy. The Governor also told Mosk he had at one time discussed with Director Hoover matters concerning law enforcement and particularly payment of ransom in kidnaping cases. The Governor told Mosk he wanted him to know he was in complete sympathy with Director Hoover in these matters.

Governor Brown additionally told Mosk "You better just hold your fire until you get all the facts. This matter should be handled coolly and calmly. Publicized controversies benefit no one except the news media. There is no lack of cooperation on the part of the FBI and both the Governor and Commissioner Crittenden confirm this fact."
Memo DeLoach to Mohr
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Governor Brown additionally told Attorney General Mosk that the FBI would contact him personally that afternoon to give him the facts. After hanging up the phone with Mosk, Governor Brown turned to Commissioner Crittenden and instructed him to prepare a report, sending copies to Mosk. He told Crittenden to put in the report the fact that the California Highway Patrol was wrong and no blame should be attached to the FBI. He also instructed Commissioner Crittenden to prepare a press release which he, Crittenden, was to give out from the Governor's office by approximately 2:30 PM (California time) this afternoon.

Governor Brown next turned to ASAC O'Connell and stated that publicity in this entire matter was highly unfortunate but he sincerely hoped his press release would set matters straight.

After briefing the Director concerning the above matter, I called SAC Simon in Los Angeles and told him to immediately contact Mosk. I had previously instructed ASAC O'Connell to call SAC Simon and inform him of the above-mentioned facts. Upon my calling SAC Simon, I told him to get in touch with Mosk right away. I told him not to insist that Mosk make a press release inasmuch as we could not count upon Mosk giving the true facts. I told him the Governor's press release, if the Governor did live up to his promise, would be far more important than any release that Mosk could give out.

I next called the Huntley-Brinkley Show in New York City, however, was informed he could not be reached at that particular time. I talked to the Huntley-Brinkley Show. We worked with them when the Director received the Criss Award. He was the producer of the network show on this occasion. He has also been very friendly. I told him of my call to last night and of the fact the record needed to be straightened. He told me he had briefed him regarding this matter. I mentioned to him in confidence there apparently would be a press release from the Executive Office of the Governor in Sacramento, California, this afternoon. I told him he might desire to have his local people in Sacramento get on this right away. He stated he would do this and that undoubtedly it would be carried on the Huntley-Brinkley Show tonight. I told him also we could not talk about attribution, however, he might desire to put a few words into mouth which would indicate that Parker had once again stuck his big foot in his mouth. He stated he would have to be a little careful on this score but would attempt to do this.

SAC Simon was instructed to call back after his conference with Mosk.
MEMO DELOACH TO MOHR
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SAC Simon called at approximately 6:30 PM, 12/27/63, to report the
results of his conference with Attorney General Mosk. He stated in the outset
that Mosk had been receptive. Simon was accompanied by SA 67C

At the beginning of the conference, Mosk told Simon he wanted to
clarify his position. He stated he had made no prejudgment of this controversy,
however, he had a complaint from three different sources, state, county and city
agencies, and he, therefore, in his capacity as State Attorney General, must proceed
to look into this matter. Mosk told Simon that if the facts of the complaint were wrong,
he would be the first one to admit it.

Mosk told Simon that he was surprised at the widespread news coverage
this controversy had been given wherein Simon replied that he had seen Mosk on
TV last night.

Mosk next referred to a complaint received from Officer 67C
of the California Highway Patrol. SAC Simon had received information immediately indicating
that had received information at approximately 10:15 AM from 67C of El Dorado
At the particular morning in which the FBI had disseminated information to local
authorities. SAC Simon told Mosk that Commissioner Crittenden of the California
Highway Patrol had admitted fault in his agency and that both Officers were obviously responsible for this breakdown in administration. Simon stated that
Mosk seemed satisfied.

Simon next brought up the fact that he personally knew why this
controversy had arisen. By making this statement, Simon sought to make Mosk
admit that Parker had caused this matter. Mosk appeared somewhat sheepish
in telling Simon he had attended a banquet with Parker a few nights before. At the
banquet Parker had made some very strong derogatory remarks against the FBI. Parker
specifically asked Mosk to look into the matter of FBI noncooperation. Mosk explained
that his inquiry would proceed rapidly and as a matter of fact, his investigator in
charge, 67C was with Chief Parker that very moment.

SAC Simon told Mosk that in view of the fact he knew the original
reports by the California Highway Patrol were all wrong, and that Parker's facts
were erroneous, if it was not correct that Mosk's man was obviously on a "fishing
expedition." Mosk admitted this could be correct but stated "there may be room
for improvement in law enforcement relations."
Memo DeLoach to Mohr
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Simon told Mosk with respect to the Sinatra case, this case moved so fast there was very little time to notify any one. Simon told Mosk that Parker had publicly indicated his policies of nonpayment of ransom and, therefore, it would have been virtually impossible for the FBI to have worked with Parker. Simon asked Mosk how he would have felt if the victim had been his own child. Mosk admitted that Parker's policies raise grave problems. There was little else of pertinence stated at the conference.

Simon stated that Mosk would undoubtedly go on with his inquiry. I told Simon we should not infer to Mosk or anyone else that the FBI wanted the inquiry stopped, that we shouldn't place ourselves in that position inasmuch as we have nothing to fear. Simon pointed out Mosk's investigator might possibly contact him, Simon. I told Simon if [redacted] did contact him, he should feel free to tell him the same facts that ASAC O'Connell had told Governor Brown and that Simon had told Mosk.

The Kuntley-Brinkley investigation might did carry the fact that Commissioner Crittenden had publicly indicated there was absolutely no criticism whatsoever or lack of cooperation against the FBI on the part of the FBI. This was concluded by stating apparently the report that had been carried last night indicating a lack of cooperation on the part of the FBI had now been denied.

Both SACs Simon and O'Connell have been instructed to send in summary teletypes regarding their participation in this matter. Both men have been instructed to get in touch with their trusted sources of information among the news media and see to it that the press release by Governor Brown and Commissioner Crittenden is played up to the fullest in the State of California.

ACTION:

We will follow this matter closely.
January 6, 1964

The Attorney General

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DIRECTOR, #1

RE: L.A. POLICE DEPARTMENT'S FIGHTING ON STREET FIGHTING CAR

I have been furnished a copy of Stanley DeLoach's letter to you of December 20, 1963, wherein he requests an appointment with you on January 30th.

I have been informed that a FBI official has been in touch with the Los Angeles Police Department regarding this matter, and that the FBI official is interested in the investigation of the incident described in your letter dated December 20, 1963.

We have received information from the Los Angeles Police Department that a complaint has been filed against the Los Angeles Police Department in connection with the incident described in the letter of December 20, 1963.

The Los Angeles Police Department has denied the charges made by the FBI and has stated that it will cooperate with the FBI in its investigation.

We have been informed that the Los Angeles Police Department will make a full and complete report of the incident to the FBI as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
The Attorney General

- BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In spite of this, he often questioned certain aspects of the
investigation. In fact, the comfort of the
investigation. He also apparently instructed members of his department to keep
watch on the Los Angeles FBI office from a parked car nearby. On December 30,
1963, we issued an official request for records of telephone calls made from 8146
W. Slauson Avenue, Compton, California. This is the place where Young Minta
was held by the kidnappers, and the records of those calls were under subpoena
to the Federal Court. They were not released to the local authorities until January 2, 1964.
(Newsprint clipping containing some of Chief Parker's statements and some
editorial comments are enclosed as exhibits 1 through 4.)

One of Chief Parker's complaints was that local law enforcement
had been held in suspense because they were not brought into the investigation.
A question regarding this complaint was put to California Governor Edmund G.
Brown at a press conference on December 18, 1963. He stated he did not think
local authorities "were held in suspense." He said that, "I think you get nervous
in a case, you know when you're alone, and to bring in more people could delay
the operation that you're doing... I think it was a mistake not to do that. I think
the Chief might have written two or three days before he dealt with them. This
is one where you hold your fire for a little while because it can backfire on you."

A local law enforcement officer in the Los Angeles area on
December 22, 1963, a commentator on Television
Station KNX in Los Angeles, alleged that the FBI had endangered the life of a
California man by their actions because it was not clear local officers in theSAME
area when officers were in the vicinity. The late local officer
accepting officers was a traffic violation and gave the driver a citation. He
said it might not be clear when the local officer was trying to arrest the man who
had killed themselves, while the driver actually was one of the registration.

The commentator later added a parody to write an angry reply: "I've
heard of how long 'sounding the 8146' with a local citizen's "I'm
leaving in balance" would go on. (A copy of roman is enclosed..."
The Attorney General

The December 24, 1969, issue of the "Los Angeles Times" contains an article indicating the California Highway Patrol had begun an investigation of charges made by Lieutenant [redacted] and Officer [redacted] to the effect that the FBI had endangered patrolmen by not keeping them informed of the presence of dangerous criminals in their area during the Sinatra kidnapping investigation. This article reported how Officer [redacted] stopped Joseph J. Horo, one of the alleged bank robbers, and gave him a citation, not knowing that he was a dangerous and wanted man. (A clipping of this article is enclosed as exhibit 4.)

Bradford Quintana, Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol, on December 26, 1969, told the agency that he had received a call on the preceding day from a reporter of the "Los Angeles Times" who read to him the complete report made by [redacted] concerning the incident involving the alleged bank robbers. The said the quotes in the "Times" article were taken directly from the report. He had no idea how the report had reached the newspaper and said he was making an inquiry to find out. He said he certainly had no complaint against the FBI and on the same date told an agent that he was surprised to see the quotes from his report in the newspaper. He said he realized he had been "carried away" in his statements.

On December 23, 1969, Mr. Black announced that he had ordered an investigation into complaints that the FBI had not kept other law enforcement agencies informed during the search for the kidnappers in the Sinatra case and had endangered officers as a result. (A clipping regarding this announcement is enclosed as exhibit 5.)

Chief Barker reached the height in his campaign against the FBI on the evening of December 24, 1969, when he appeared on the National Broadcasting Company's " Tonight Show" with a taped statement of about three minutes. He declared that in spite of the favorable publicity and apparent success of the FBI in the Sinatra case, there were serious problems involved which would not reflect so favorably on the FBI. He could not understand why his Department was not brought into the investigation since his personnel are just as expert as those of the FBI. He said the kidnappers were "hemmed in" in the Lake Tahoe area, implying they were allowed to escape with the victim to Los Angeles because officers on roadblocks did not have proper information. He questioned whether or not the FBI really solved the case, noting that until federal authorities released information to the others. He declared the FBI's response to the complaints involved the lives of law enforcement officers and continued that "no investigation". He closed the incident regarding the bank robbers at a meeting of Strawberry Lodge and asserted his Department actually told the FBI
The Attorney General
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These then were in that area. Chief Parker claimed he was speaking for "all law enforcement" in bringing to light these serious oversights of local departments by the FBI.

Chief Parker's charges are totally false or deliberate distortions of fact. The intruders passed through the Los Angeles area with the victim long before FBI agents reached the scene. Headquarters at that time had been set up by local officers. His implication that the speedy solution of the case resulted from the surrender of John J. Irwin to a total distortion of fact.

Actually, the information furnished to Chief Parker was of little value in solving the case. We already had positively identified one of the other suspects when Irwin was arrested, and we located both of them through independent investigation. The allegation that the county prosecuting was of little value is completely false as the study of facts relating to the arrest of the bank robbers which follows will show. Actually, the information we furnished to Chief Parker was of little value in solving the case. The information we furnished to Chief Parker was of little value in solving the case.

EDWIN G.

December 21, 1939, an officer of our San Francisco office
called on Governor
Concerning the allegations made by
and Collier
Chairman
Commissioner

They were advised
as follows:

Mountain to the residence. We have stopped at the office of
the L. H. Berman, Sheriff, Mountain View, California, between 11 and 12 a.m.,
and the chairman, who

that

the

suspects in the case, were in the area.

The sheriff was requested to relay this information to the California Highway
Patrol and other officers engaged in searches. Actually, if these two men
as well as possible associates were apprehended. Radio logs of the sheriff's office
reveal this information was relayed to the California Highway Patrol which
acknowledged receipt. Patrol Headquarters relayed this information to all units
about 3 a.m. In addition, a member of the sheriff's force had telephoned

a very reliable assistant who
generally told him about the two suspects.

The FBI surveillance at Mountain View which led to the arrest of

the suspect was initiated by two agents about 11 a.m., not by 20 agents at 9 a.m.

she arrested by Officer
in his patrol car. Officer
who

was

about 12:15 a.m. and chased a similar to him. He was later he later

learned that he filed his report criticizing the FBI.

Commissioner Crittenden confirmed the above information to the
Governing and stated
had failed to notify Officer
about the two
suspects when [redacted] came on duty at 9 a.m. on December 5th. He told the Governor there had never been any lack of cooperation or prompt notification on matters of mutual interest by the FBI and that [redacted] and Officer [redacted] were wrong in making their charges. Mr. Crittenden related he had learned that Chief Parker had obtained copies of a report which were mailed to him in a plain envelope. He said he had not determined the source of these copies but his inquiry was continuing.

The Governor was told there had been no lack of cooperation among the FBI and other agencies and that no officers' lives had been placed in jeopardy by lack of information. He was informed that [redacted] had stated he felt there had been full cooperation on the case. He was told it was not possible to brief all agencies on the fast-moving developments.

At this point the Governor told [redacted] Mr. Mock, identified those present in his office, and discussed the situation case with him. He suggested to Mr. Mock that "you had better hold your fire until you get all facts" and handle this matter as "coolly and calmly as possible." He told Mr. Mock that Mr. Crittenden had just informed him that Chief Parker and [redacted] were wrong, and that there had been no lack of cooperation by the FBI. He told Mr. Mock to take no action until he discussed the matter with the FBI.

Governor Brown then instructed Mr. Crittenden to prepare a report for him on the matter and to send a copy to Mr. Mock. (A copy of this report is enclosed as exhibit 8.) Also enclosed as exhibit 9 is a press release dated December 27, 1933, made by Governor Brown relating earlier charges in the press attributed to [redacted] and Officer [redacted].

Mr. Mock was contacted by an official of our Los Angeles Office on December 27, 1933. He said he had received complaints from the Los Angeles Police Department, the California Highway Patrol and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, hence, he felt it was his duty to inquire into the alleged lack of cooperation. Challenged, he admitted there had been no complaints from [redacted] or Mr. Crittenden, but derogatory statements about the FBI had come to his attention through the press from members of the sheriff's staff and personnel of the Highway Patrol.

The facts regarding the notification of local and state officers about [redacted] and the later arrest of them were carefully outlined for [redacted] and [redacted] who told him in effect somewhere that [redacted] had told him he had set up a run on [redacted] and did not know why he had done it. The ridiculousness of this alleged statement was pointed out to him along with the fact that the Sheriff had no complaint to make against the FBI. He was told that the FBI had requested...
The Attorney General

and received excellent cooperation from various local and state law enforcement agencies along the inland highway investigation. It was explained that it was impossible and impractical to attempt to brief all agencies due to the fact that which the investigation was moving. He was reminded that the investigation took place in two states and in several parts of California. Only Joseph C. Amsler was arrested within Los Angeles, Harry W. Keenan being arrested in La Canada and John W. Irwin being picked up in Imperial Beach, California.

Mr. Mosk, during the conversation, admitted that Chief Parker had suggested that he (Mosk) investigate the allegations against the FBI. He said he had seen the Chief "a few nights ago," that he had made a number of comments about the FBI and suggested the Attorney General undertake an investigation.

Governor Brown was reconnected on December 30, 1968, and advised regarding the conversation with Mr. Mosk. He was told also that both Mr. Justice and the Governor had obtained statements on December 29, 1968, to the effect that they had nothing further authorized a subordinate to make any complaint against the FBI. (A copy of each of these statements is enclosed as exhibits 10 and 11.)

The Governor stated that Chief Parker had been making statements which were not true and by facts. He said his inquiry had been started with his knowledge of events. He stated there were two possible explanations for Mosk's having become involved in this matter—that he was trying to carry favor with local law enforcement agencies or that Chief Parker has "something on Ranier." He said he planned to go to Los Angeles on December 31, 1968, to talk with Mr. Mosk personally and confidentially.

Governor Brown was contacted in Los Angeles on December 31, 1968. He stated that Mr. Mosk had gotten himself into a bad situation and opined that Chief Parker had something on Mr. Brown. He said the Chief had information concerning a dual affair of Mr. Mosk in Beverly Hills, California. The Governor related that Chief Parker carries letters with known people by giving them raw information on other people, adding that the letters contain disqualifying data regarding Mr. Mosk and his dual identity to a number of jurists. The Governor related he considers Chief Parker the most dangerous man in law enforcement in America and would like to see him out of the job as Chief of the largest city in California but he had no control over this.

Governor Brown related that Mr. Mosk has been a good personal friend, but that he has gotten angry with him in the past month or so. He said Mr. Mosk wants to run for Senator from California and does not want to be official in this presents a political problem. He inquired as to "what Attorney General
Robert Kennedy thinks about this situation. He said he supposed the best thing for J. J. Mock to do is to come out with a strong statement that the complaints against the FBI were entirely unfounded and that the FBI had done a very commendable job.

On January 2, 1964, Governor Brown advised our Los Angeles Office that he had talked with Mr. Mock and that he felt "the FBI is going to be very very satisfied with the report Mock is going to give." He said Mr. Mock understands why the FBI did not tell Chief Parker anything about the case. He said Mr. Mock had not prejudged the situation but had been laying the foundation "to see Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Hoover." The Governor reported that Mr. Mock's concern is with the controversy between Mr. Hoover and Chief Parker. Governor Brown was reminded that no one in the FBI had criticized any law enforcement agency or official in this matter and that all the attacks are coming from the same source.

On January 5, 1964, J. J. Mock was contacted by an official of our Los Angeles Office. He was shown the statements by Mr. Crittenden and Mr. Fyfe. The official of the FBI asked him to pass the statements to the press and over various television programs was joined out to him. He admitted that he had been the all-aroundalist for the FBI which he made over a nationwide television program and to other news media on what he had read in newspapers and that he had made no effort to check the validity of the charges before he hired them. Mr. Mock went on that there had been some pressure on the FBI to answer the charges. He indicated that he might be able to release this pressure by making a report which he said might be very commendable to the FBI. He indicated this report probably would be released around the middle of the month. He said he still planned to come to Washington to discuss the matter.

Stanley Mosk has been Attorney General of California since January 1959. Information in several files reveals that in 1948 he was listed as a sponsor of a dinner held by the John Anti-Nazi Refugee Committee in Los Angeles; as a sponsor of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom; as an advisor and supporter of the American Youth for Democracy; and as chairman of the winter clothing drive of the American Civil Liberties for the Relief of Southern California. He also has been identified as a sign of a political and art movement by the National Lawyers' Group. Mr. Mosk has identified as a member of the National Lawyers' Group in 1940 and 1942.

Our Los Angeles Office has reported that in August, 1963, Chief Parker brought at a social party that he knew the identity of the present girl friend of Stanley Mock and that Mr. Mosk was considering divorce his wife to marry his paramour. Chief Parker claimed this girl accompanied Mr. Mock....
on a trip to Mexico City where they stayed at the same hotel.

I am enclosing as exhibits 12, 13 and 14 copies of letters received from [Redacted], Sr., of Los Angeles.

Enclosures (14)
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January 15, 1964

Honorable J. Edgar Hoover
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

Thank you for your kind letter of December 30, 1963. I am pleased that you feel my efforts have contributed toward clearing up any possible misunderstanding.

I have always held you and the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the highest regard, and nothing has occurred in recent weeks to lessen that high regard in any way.

Please be assured of my continued cooperation in this and all other matters.

Sincerely

EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor
Memorandum

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

ATTN: CRIME RECORDS

FROM: SAC, SAN FRANCISCO (80-449)

SUBJECT: EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN
GOVERNOR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PREFERRED MAILING LIST

DATE: 2/3/64

On 1/31/64, while in Sacramento on other matters, I stopped by the Governor's Office and, although he was out of town, I had a visit with Governor Brown, as well as other members of the Governor's staff.

occupies a position of considerable importance, since he passes on all of the Governor's appointments, makes final approval on all of the speeches and screens all visitors to the Governor. He is a great admirer of the Director and an excellent friend of the Bureau.

requested that the Governor's Office receive two copies of any bureau publications, reprints of the Director's speeches, and Uniform Crime Reports, one of which should be addressed directly to Office of the Governor, State Capitol, Sacramento, California.

It is recommended that the Bureau include the Governor's Office and on the bureau's preferred mailing list, as requested by

2 - Bureau
1 - SF 80-449
COL:hko
(3)
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Evans
FROM: W. V. Cleveland
DATE: 3/6/64
SUBJECT: SPECIAL INQUIRIES WHITE HOUSE

White House has requested investigation of the following persons who are members of the National Civil Defense Advisory Council:

Edmund G. Brown
Governor of California

William Haydon Burns
Mayor of Jacksonville, Fla.

Richard J. Hughes
Governor of New Jersey

Paul J. Fannin
Governor of Arizona

John F. Collins
Mayor of Boston, Mass.

Dan Gray
Anniston, Alabama

E. J. Evans, Mayor
Durham, North Carolina

Francis S. Levien
attorney, New York City

Marceline W. Yohn
Manchester, New Hampshire

Margaret C. Goebel
Grand Rapids, Michigan

We conducted an Atomic Energy Act investigation concerning Governor Brown of California in 1960, and a summary of the results of that investigation was furnished to the White House on 5/18/61. The files contain no additional pertinent information concerning Governor Brown since that time.

We conducted a Registration Act case concerning [redacted] from March, 1963, to October, 1963, based on [redacted] by letters dated 3/13/63 and 3/28/63 the White House was [redacted] including information up to that time developed during the Registration Act case. The complete results of that case were furnished the Department in October, 1963, and the Department
Memorandum to Mr. Evans
Re: Special Inquiries - White House

The files are also replete with information being received on a continuing basis from our sources in protection money being paid by gamblers to enable them to operate unmolested. In November, 1962, the protection payments totaled $9,000 per month, of which $3,000

Since investigations have previously been conducted concerning them, we are not opening investigations on Governor Brown. Attached is a letter to at the White House furnishing him a summary of the 1960 investigation of Governor Brown and the fact that our files contain no additional pertinent information concerning him. The letter also contains a summary of the results of the Registration Act investigation, as well as information concerning protection money from the hoodlum element. The letter states we are conducting no investigation of individuals in the absence of a further request.

We conducted an applicant-type investigation of in 1939 when he was an attorney. The investigation was favorable.

ACTION:

Concerning the cases are being ordered separately to the Field today for immediate attention. The appropriate SACs are being instructed to personally contact to advise them we are conducting investigations of them at the request of the White House. The Field is also being instructed to conduct no neighborhood investigations in these three cases without Bureau approval. Investigations on the other persons on the list, except Governor Brown, are also being separately ordered to the Field today.

The attached letter should be transmitted to furnishing him the results of investigations conducted concerning Governor Brown advising him we are conducting no investigations concerning them in the absence of a further request.
**NUMEROUS REFERENCE SEARCH SLIP**

**Subject:**

**Supervisor:**

**Home Date:**

**Initials:**

**Prod.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>SERIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FILE NUMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prod.</th>
<th>FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>SERIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Search Requested:**

- [ ] Regular Request (Analytical Search)
- [ ] All References (Subversive & Nonsubversive)
- [ ] Subversive References Only
- [ ] Nonsubversive References Only
- [ ] Main References Only

**Type of References Requested:**

- [ ] Restricted to Locality of
- [ ] Exact Name Only (On the Nose)
- [ ] Buildup
- [ ] Variations

**Subject:**

**Birthdate & Place:**

**Address:**

**Locality:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prod.</th>
<th>FILE NUMBER</th>
<th>SERIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Copy Available**
| Subj: | Edmund Herald Brown |
| Supervisor | | Room | |
| Res. | Date | Initial | |
| Prod. | |
| **FILE NUMBER** | **SERIAL** |
| Pat | | SE |
| 54 94.3013.376 | 3269 05 | |
| NP 94.4.2439 | 1684, 1047 | |
| LT 96.46.13-2 | | |
| NP 94.18343.2 | | |
| NP 94.140620.7 | | |
| NE 100.437598-3 | exp. P | |
| NP 94.4.4761-68 | | |
| NP 137.8862-104 | | |
| NP 61.1537.476 exp.5 | | |
| NP 61.1.611-A | Cooper, Toledo, Green, and 569/07 | |
| NP 62.9.46-221 exp.7 | | |
| NP 62.9.65-213 | | |
| NP 92.3871.28 | | |
Honorable Walter W. Jenkins
Special Assistant to the President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

Reference is made to your request on March 4, 1964, for investigation of ten members of the National Civil Defense Advisory Council, which includes Governor Edmund G. Brown of California and

An applicant-type investigation was conducted by this Bureau concerning Governor Brown in 1960, and enclosed herewith is a memorandum dated March 6, 1964, containing the results of that investigation. The files of this Bureau contain no additional information concerning Governor Brown. It is noted that a summary of that investigation was furnished to the

by letter dated May 18, 1961.

That investigation developed information indicating that

and there was possibly a close personal relationship during that investigation

the Internal Revenue Service advised that on his 1955 income tax return fees in the amount of

See cover memo Cleveland to Evans, 3/6/64, captioned, "Special Inquiry, White House," DHY:sab.

DHY:sab
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Honorale Walter W. Jenkins,

The results of the Registration Act investigation were furnished to the Department of Justice in October, 1963, and by letter dated October 24, 1963, the Department of Justice advised the evidence was insufficient to proceed further in that matter. The status of the by the Internal Revenue Service is not known by this Bureau.

In connection with our investigations of various matters in the this Bureau has received allegations from reliable sources of gamblers to enable them to operate unmolested. For example, a source in November, 1962, alleged that payments totaled $9,000 per month, $3,000 and the remainder of which was divided among the officials who handled the collections.

In view of the above, no investigation is being conducted concerning either Governor Brown the absence of a further request from you. Investigations concerning the eight other individuals mentioned in your request have been initiated, the results of which will be furnished you as quickly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover

Enclosure
March 8, 1964

EDMUND GERALD BROWN
also known as Pat Brown

An applicant-type investigation was conducted concerning Governor Brown in 1960, at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission. That investigation revealed the following information concerning Governor Brown.

The February 13, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle," a San Francisco, California, newspaper contained an article which reported that Edmund Gerald Brown, then District Attorney, opposed the deportation of Harry Bridges, a west coast labor leader who was accused of membership in the Communist Party.

The August 9, 1945, issue of the "San Francisco Chronicle" contained an article which announced that Edmund Gerald Brown had been elected Vice President of the San Francisco Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild (NLG). The NLG has been cited as a communist front organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The FBI is in possession of a letterhead entitled "Salute to Young America Committee," which was a committee, according to the letterhead, to sponsor a second anniversary dinner of the American Youth for Democracy (AYD) at San Francisco, California. This letterhead listed Edmund Gerald Brown as a member of the Committee in Formation. A confidential informant, who has furnished reliable information in the past, advised that Edmund Gerald Brown was being considered by the Communist Party in San Francisco as a speaker for this Committee but could furnish no other details in this regard.

In March, 1946, this Bureau was furnished a copy of a letter dated January 10, 1946, written by a veterans group at the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, which criticized Mr. Brown for permitting his name to be used as a sponsor of a banquet held on November 10, 1945, at the
Edmund Gerald Brown

Saint Francis Hotel, San Francisco, in honor of the AYD. In reply, Mr. Brown by letter dated February 1, 1946, stated that he knew that the Young Communist League (YCL) or some similar organization had participated in the formation of the AYD. He stated that he then called an official of the AYD to determine if the organization was either communist in origin or intent. According to Mr. Brown, the official of the AYD informed him that that organization "was not in any manner, shape or form communist although some members of the Young Communist League had at one time belonged." Mr. Brown added, "I have refused at all times to become a sponsor of any organization or any meetings until I first investigated its background." The AYD and the YCL have been designated pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Department of the Army, advised the FBI that on June 14, 1946, the Mobilization for Democracy sponsored a meeting at the Olympic Auditorium, Los Angeles, California, at which meeting Mr. Brown was a speaker. The Mobilization for Democracy has been cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its Report 1947 as one of the "key communist fronts in California."

By letter dated July 5, 1956, Mr. Brown advised this Bureau that he was opposed to any provision giving the individual states the right to prosecute subversives. Mr. Brown stated that he felt the individual states were incapable and inadequately equipped to handle such a job. He added, "I assure you that I recognize the menace of subversive activities and I desire to do all in my power to aid and assist you as well as other security agencies of our Government."

During the afore-mentioned investigation concerning Governor Brown, California, was interviewed and advised that he believed Governor Brown was lacking in character, ability, judgment, integrity, and could not keep a secret. Explained that Governor Brown's lack of ability and judgment
Edmund Gerald Brown

was shown in his mishandling of the widely publicized case of the executed kidnaper, Caryl Chessman, in that he had granted Chessman a reprieve shortly before the execution. He advised that he was personally opposed to Governor Brown's stand in favor of abolishing capital punishment.

also advised that Governor Brown had exhibited a lack of character, integrity, and his inability to keep a secret when he held a press conference in 1950 on which occasion he publicly claimed credit for the formation of the National Association of District Attorneys, which organization was in fact his, further advised that he did not believe Governor Brown to be disloyal but recalled a speech made by him on an unknown date at Santa Barbara, California, when Governor Brown expressed criticism of congressional committees and hearings. further recalled that on this occasion, Los Angeles, California, Police Chief William Parker pointed his finger at Governor Brown and stated he talked like a communist and that he was espousing the Communist Party line.

On May 13, 1960, Governor Brown was interviewed by a representative of this Bureau at his own request. On this occasion, Governor Brown advised that he was aware of allegations of leftist tendencies against him. He explained that his opposition to the deportation of Harry Bridges had been dictated by military and civic expediency inasmuch as he feared the deportation of Bridges would result in a tie-up of the California water front and would impede the war effort during World War II. Governor Brown also explained that his membership in the NLG was prompted by influence from legal associates but that he had resigned from this organization after reading one of its pamphlets and becoming aware that he "didn't like the people in it" and that he had no sympathy for the "line" which the organization was beginning to take.

Governor Brown concluded that one of the greatest problems in this country is the danger of Russian communism and that the FBI and he, as Governor of California, have a common purpose in meeting and facing this danger.
Edmund Gerald Brown

Many other persons, including prominent individuals, were interviewed during the investigation of Governor Brown during 1960 and furnished no derogatory information regarding him.
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Belmont

FROM: C. A. Evans

DATE: October 16, 1964

SUBJECT: CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE MATTER

Our San Diego Office has advised of information received from a State ABC who was assigned in the Los Angeles area prior to the State Senatorial primary in California, which indicated that Stanley Mosk, former California Attorney General, was compromised in his desire to be the Democratic nominee for the Senate.

... recalled the incident of a very attractive dark-skinned woman coming to his Los Angeles Office and seeking a liquor license. The application was refused since the fingerprints of the woman's husband were not also submitted. The woman reappeared, however, with a Negro individual as her husband, the necessary fingerprints were submitted, and having located a record of prior convictions, the application for a liquor license was denied. The woman, however, reappeared at the office claiming she had divorced her husband and sought a license under her own name. She was on this occasion denied the license until such time as she could produce documentary evidence with respect to her marital status.

... said within a few days of this incident he received a personal telephone call from State Attorney General Stanley Mosk who for thirty minutes berated... for rejecting the license application and charged... with discriminating against the colored race. Subsequent pressure from his superiors caused... to issue the desired liquor license and investigation was initiated to trace the $10,000 used by the woman in the purchase of a bar. Though bank officials declined to furnish account information.

The Intelligence Unit of the Los Angeles Police Department became interested in the matter and conducted surveillance of the female on several occasions.
Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
Re: CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE MATTER

It was generally rumored in California at this time that Mosk desired to run for Senator. Governor Brown agreed and thus cleared the way for Governor Brown's desire to have Allan Cranston run for Democratic Senator in the primary. Mosk, it is to be noted, was thereafter appointed to a vacancy in the California Supreme Court.

Our investigations have shown that [redacted] and other hoodlums in the San Diego area are presently planning to seek favors from Governor Brown and Senator Salinger in exchange for substantial campaign contributions. According to an informant, [redacted] is concerned with the close supervision being afforded local bars by the Alcoholic Beverage Control of California, which has resulted in revocation of licenses. [redacted] plans to make an approach to Brown through an unidentified politician, who is believed to be one of the eight persons to have accompanied Pierre Salinger to Washington, D. C., when the latter was sworn in as United States Senator. [redacted] is also planning a testimonial dinner for Salinger in the San Diego area and it is his hope that through such assistance to Governor Brown and to Senator Salinger he will be able to reduce the "heat" being generated by local authorities in the supervision of San Diego bars and nightclubs.

ACTION:

This is for your information.
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPRAISED BY UNKNOWN FOUR NEGRO AND THREE WHITE VICTIMS OF FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS BY PUT POISON IN FOOD TO KILL GOVERNOR BROWN. ALSO INSTRUCTED TO GO TO WASHINGTON, D.C. WHERE HE AND ONE WHITE AND ONE NEGRO MALE WOULD KILL SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY AND PRESIDENT JOHNSON WITH GUNS. CLAIMS TRAVELED VIA BUS TO WASHINGTON, D.C. WHERE FURNISHED THIS INFO TO FBI AND SECRET SERVICE AGENT, WHOSE CARD HE DISPLAYED. CLAIMS AS INSTRUCTED HE IS RETURNING TO LOS ANGELES WHERE WILL CONTACT FBI AND SECRET SERVICE AND WILL RESIDE WITH FRIEND

VINCENT P. Mroz, SAC, Secret Service, Kansas City, Missouri Advised Nine Forty AM This Date Of Above, And Availability Of For Interview. Mroz Thereafter Advised Had Contacted Detective Research Section Of Secret Service, Washington D.C. And Was Informed And Had Been Thoroughly Interviewed, Etc., And Reinterview Not Desired.

LHM Being Submitted For Dissemination By Bureau And Interested Offices.

End Page Two
THREAT AGAINST THE PRESIDENT
SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY AND
GOVERNOR BROWN

On March 13, 1965, at Leavenworth, Kansas, a man who identified himself to the
authorities as (name withheld) stated that he has no permanent residence, but that he last
resided at (name withheld) California, while employed as a chef at the
West Covina, California, prior to January 16, 1965. He stated that he entered this country as a Hungarian refugee
January 11, 1957, was registered as an alien under Alien
Registration number (name withheld) and he last reported to the
Immigration and Naturalization Service in Washington, D.C.,

(name withheld) explained that on January 16, 1965, he
was contacted by a number of unknown white and Negro males
immediately outside of his place of employment in San
Francisco, California, and offered $50,000.00 to kill Governor Brown,
by placing poison in the club food and then to go to Washington,
D.C., and with one Negro male and one white male, kill
President Johnson and Senator Robert Kenned with guns. (name withheld) stated that as he speaks very poor English and it is difficult
to make himself understood, he had had a letter typed for him
on this date, which contains the information regarding this
matter and which he intends to mail to President Johnson.
(name withheld) furnished a copy of this letter, which is as follows:

"Leavenworth Kansas
18 March 1965
5:00 AM"

"President Lyndon B Johnson
Senator Robert Kennedy
Governor Brown"
"I came to this country as a Hungarian Refugee, but before I start to write a whole story you must take my advice to not try and face the people like John F. Kennedy did. A person I was friendly with and his friends wanted me to kill President Johnson, Governor Brown, and other government heads. These were three (3) white men, five (5) negroes; these people wanted me to do this so they could start a revolution in the United States. In this case I am doing my best to help, I can't do anymore. But I need his help, the President, at this particular time as it means my life and also his; therefore I must find and meet his head man in person. On 16 January 1965, I was approached by four (4) negroes and three (3) white men to put poison in the food so it would take the life of Governor Brown, at this time it would get rid of President Johnson & Senator Kennedy. These people want to use me, but I just can't do it as this country has done a lot of things for me. They wanted to pay me fifty (50) thousand dollars to get rid of these people; but I can't accept blood money. This occurred in California; my nerves were broken down, I had a good job at the time but I had to quit it to go to Washington, D. C. to inform the FBI. At this time I might of overdrawn my personal check, but if this has happened I do it because I want to save the country and the Presidents' life. At this time I need help but not like the help I had in Washington, D.C. when I hit in Washington my first stop is the FBI; at the Travel Bureau FBI wouldn't give me even twenty-five (25) cents so I could go down town to look for job. It was raining this day, I had to walk at least ten (10) miles to town, and I came up with a fever of 104. As of this day I found job as a but it only pays forty (40) dollars a week. I met a girl at the Greyhound Bus Depot, Kansas; I told her I loved her and wanted to marry her, on 8 Feb 65 she came to Washington D. C., before I was able to support us as money was short, the landlady has put something in her head as I can't
"Tell them what I am doing and why I am here. But maybe she left for some other reason; or maybe she got some information and was fronted by this people. In this case I ask the President to search for her and bring her face to face and see what is the reason she left. As soon as possible before my nerves are all shot, as I love this person very much. This case I must have a clear head to face the whole story to help save the President's life. I don't want to make big money or harm myself I just want to save the country & President. This case I need money to move about to find these people and later I will pay it back; I need about three (3) or four (4) hundred dollars. I need his help to pay these people before I get into any trouble. I must go to California to work with these people so I might find his head man. With any info I pick up I will go to the Secret Service or FBI.

"I need his authority to make an arrest or hold the man that threatens the President's life or take them to the nearest police authorities. The whole story about these people I will tell the FBI. I do the best to help him and the country. I hope this case can be closed soon, so I may have a clear head. The two (2) people are in Washington now; maybe more.

"Sincerely yours,

[Redacted]

Calif

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
displayed a card of [Redacted] Special Agent, Secret Service, Washington, D. C. and advised that he had furnished all of the information in his
Kansas. Howard advised that he contacted a person at this address who informed him that the person was a white female, age about 20 years, who had recently stayed at her residence during a short period of time while employed at the company in Leavenworth. He stated that he had recently returned to Leavenworth and that the two had departed and their whereabouts are now not known.

Vincent P. Mroz, Special Agent in Charge, Secret Service, Kansas City, Missouri, at 9:40 a.m., March 18, 1965, was advised of the information furnished by Howard and of his availability at Leavenworth, Kansas, for interview. Mr. Mroz at 10:20 a.m., March 18, 1965, advised that it had been ascertained from the Protective Research Section of Secret Service, Washington, D. C. that Howard had been thoroughly interviewed at Washington, D. C., regarding this matter, and that a reinterview of Howard at this time was not desired.
The following was obtained during the interview of on March 18, 1965:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>5'8&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>130 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyes</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexion</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>Slender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Widower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alien Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addresses
- New Orleans, Louisiana, 1957-1960;
- El Monte, California, 1960-1963;
- California, 1963 - 1/16/65

Future mailing address
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: F.B.I., KANSAS CITY (300-3-11B12)

SUBJECT: TREATY AGAINST THE PEOPLES REICH

FBI, Kansas City to: Kansas City, Los Angeles.

I have been furnished a memorandum containing information on an individual named 'K. H.' who may be a mental case.

Los Angeles should disseminate this information to Secret Service and to the Office of Governor Brown.

Los Angeles has indicated that he will be residing in that area and will contact the F.B.I. and Secret Service.

The Kansas City and Washington F.B.I. have been furnished a memorandum containing information on a person named 'K. H.' who was interviewed at Lowworth. It was apparent during this interview that he may be a mental case.

Los Angeles should disseminate a copy of this memorandum to the FBI, Kansas City.

Approved:

Special Agent in Charge
Kansas City has disseminated to the Secret Service at Kansas City, Missouri.
Gov. Brown Rates the Students

No student demonstrations have received more publicity in recent years than those on the University of California's Berkeley campus. They touched off a special report of the state Board of Regents, criticizing university President Clark Kerr. And last week, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, declared that the Berkeley demonstrations "while not Communist originated or controlled," were exploited by a "few Communists." In an article written exclusively for the Herald Tribune, California's Gov. Brown for the first time publicly analyzes the troubles at Berkeley and comments on Mr. Hoover's remarks. His analysis is on Page 37.

I do not think we should furnish any information in the future.

The Washington Post and
Times Herald
The Washington Daily News
The Evening Star
New York Herald Tribune
New York Journal-American
New York Daily News
New York Post
The New York Times
The Baltimore Sun
The Worker
The New Leader
The Wall Street Journal
The National Observer
People's World

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE (6-1-79 BY SEP16P/165)
No one can accuse the current crop of college students of being a "silent generation." Where apathy seemed to be the dominant note on campuses in the 1950s, activism—in behalf of civil rights, educational reform, one foreign policy or another—'s clearly the dominant note today.

No student demonstrations in recent years have received more publicity, or more serious attention, than the series of disturbances on the Berkeley campus of the University of California during the past year.

It started last September when the university abruptly banned on-campus recruitment for off-campus political activities. When one student was arrested for violating the ban, a mob of several thousand students surrounded the police car and could not be dispersed for more than 24 hours. Weeks later Berkeley students in support of the campus "Free Speech Movement" staged a sit-in that was broken up only when nearly 800 of the siters were arrested. A student strike followed. Repercussions kept the campus in turmoil through the remainder of the year.

Less than two weeks ago a special committee headed by Jerome Byrne, a California lawyer, made a report to the state board of regents sharply criticizing university president Clark Kerr and other administrators for their handling of the students protests, and recommending basic changes in the structure of the university. And just last week President Kerr made recommendations of his own.

Last week, too, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told a Congressional subcommittee that the demonstrations at Berkeley, "while not Communist-originated or controlled," were nevertheless "exploited by a few Communists for their own ends."

Notably silent through the Berkeley affair was Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Governor of California. Here, for the first time, Gov. Brown makes known his views on the Berkeley disorders, and he also comments on FBI Director Hoover's testimony.
The University of California right now is facing the most critical period in its history.

We live in an era of change. The rate of technological change keeps accelerating each year. And the university is the mother of technology and the home of this change.

It is ironic, therefore, that the university itself has not been able to keep up with the very change which it has created. It is strange, indeed, that the university has been among the institutions slowest to change. This is particularly strange, not only because of the technological revolution, but because of the education revolution as well.

The student entering the university today is of a different breed than the students of the '50s. First of all, he is better prepared. Former Chancellor Herman T. Spieth of the Riverside campus was one of the first to remark this change. He said that in the last few years the freshmen at Riverside are as well prepared as sophomores—and in some cases, juniors—used to be.

This, of course, has implications for the university curriculum. But the student change is more than just in his achievement and ability. It is also a change in attitude.

We must all realize that the student of today thinks differently than the students of the '50s. And his new and clearly defined attitudes and approaches to public issues are not confined to Berkeley or to California. They may be found nationwide.

Just 10 years ago, college students were called—and rightly so—the Silent Generation. During the McCarthy era and throughout the '50s, many people were afraid to say what they felt in their hearts was right. And college students merely reflected the society around them.

That era is gone. The student of today is vitally interested in society around him. He should be. He is no longer content with society's apathy—or its wrongs. He is idealistic enough to think that society should be perfect, or more nearly approach perfection. And he has committed himself to the effort to make it as perfect as he can during his lifetime.

Because of this, society should stand up and applaud. But it does not.

Have we made our society safe for students with ideas? We have not. Yes, students have changed. But the structure of the university and its attitude towards its students have not kept pace with that change.
DOWN WITH DUE PROCESS

Because the university's change has not kept pace with the change in student attitude, some students felt they had the right to go outside the law to force change. In doing so, they displayed the height of idealistic hypocrisy. For in their haste to bring about change, they cast aside the very principles in order to gain recognition of others. On the one hand, they held up the Federal Constitution demanding their rights of political advocacy and free expression, which it guarantees. But at the same time, they threw away the principle of due process—set forth in the same Constitution—in favor of direct action.

And in doing so, they were as wrong as the university. In doing so, they became inconsistent with their own ideals.

Because of their tactics they brought a swarm of criticism down upon themselves. Unfortunately, in some cases this criticism has been as extreme as the tactics of the demonstrators. Some people—even some in high places—have charged that the Free Speech Movement was all a Communist plot. This is a nice easy explanation for a very complicated situation. But it just isn't true.

The student demonstrations at Berkeley grew because there were real grievances on the part of the students which need rectifying by the university. Before the trouble was over, the goals of the Free Speech Movement had the support of a majority of the students on the campus even though its tactics did not.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation turned over to me their confidential file on the Berkeley situation with respect to subversive activities. Unquestionably, there were some Communists involved, but the FBI's file shows the Free Speech Movement was not instigated by the Communist party or any of its front organizations.

There are undoubtedly a few Communists in almost every political and social movement involved in any size and stature today. But we must be careful not to condemn an entire movement because Communists involved themselves in it or we would be condemning even the civil rights movement.

One of the most successful tactics the Communist party has is to attach itself to a social or political movement—which—in itself—has a great deal of merit. The Communists make themselves well known in it so that concerned Americans will brand the entire movement as evil, thereby causing the confusions, suspicion, and controversy the party desires on.

The independent investigator hired by the regents confirmed the findings of this investigation. And J. Edgar Hoover told a Congressional committee on March 4 that although "subversives" were involved, they neither "originated nor controlled" the Free Speech Movement.

PRESCRIPTIONS FOR CHANGE

There have been many suggestions of how to bring about the changes needed in the structure of the university and its attitudes toward its students.

One of these suggestions is from attorney Jerome Byrne. He was hired by a committee of the regents to identify the cause of the unrest on the Berkeley campus. He and his staff studied the matter for three months and then came up with a report. It not only identifies the main causes of the problem. It also suggests some answers.

The report was issued last week. Unfortunately, opinion about the report has already polarized in some circles. Some look upon it as the Gospel. Others look upon it as the word of the devil himself. In both cases the reactions are emotional—not reasonable. The Byrne report is neither all bad nor all good. It is the opinion of one careful team of observers. And it should be respected as such.

Other opinions about how to accomplish this needed change should be treated with equal respect. Clark Kerr has outlined his program for reorganization to the regents. It must also have full consideration.

The issue, then, is clear. The issue is not the Byrne report or Jerry Byrne. It is not the Kerr report or Clark Kerr. The issue is the university. And all of these suggestions must be given consideration on their merits alone for the good of the university.

The regents have a long history of coming up with the right answers. The university itself is the best proof of this. The regents' decisions of the past have made the University of California the best public university in the entire nation. I am sure their future decisions will insure no less.

I sincerely hope that the Legislature will allow the regents to come up with these vital decisions on their own. Our forefathers who drew up the constitution of California carefully created the regents and separated them and the university from direct involvement in the political process. They made the regents the legislature of the university. Our state Legislature must give the university's legislative time to solve its own problems.

RULE OF LAW

Meanwhile, we must remember that student interest and concern in the problems of the community, the state, and the world is a healthy—not an unhealthy—social or political movement of any size and stature.

But we must also encourage our students to remember that the citizen's right—and even duty—to dissent must be expressed within the rule of law.

This nation has grown and prospered, in part, because of far-sighted individuals who were willing to fight for change. And we have prospered because this is a nation of law. People who respect the rule of law—people who fight by legal means for needed change within the law. Violations of law cannot and will not be condoned.

If we allow a few to violate the rights of many we would also have to allow the many to violate the rights of a few.

We need not allow either. We will not allow either as long as I am governor.

But neither will we staunchly defend the status quo. A rapidly growing society must be a rapidly changing society.

Knowing this, we must also realize that our students' social and public and political interests must be encouraged and even exploited.

There are those who say, "I am a taxpayer and I don't want any political activity on a campus which I support." Let us refer them to the Constitution of the United States, for the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every student the right to actively participate in political activity on or off his campus.

There are those who say "yes, I broke the law. But for a good cause and that makes it all right."

Let us refer them also to the Constitution of the United States. It shows how change may be brought about, using due process within the law.

There are those who say "a university is a place where you go to learn, not get a lot of ideas." To them I say that a university is ideas, all kinds of ideas. It is a place where students can and must be exposed to an infinite variety of ideas. It is by weighing these conflicting ideas and choosing the correct ones that they learn.

Today, the university is faced with preserving both academic freedom—the freedom to explore all ideas—and the rule of law.

There are military schools where students have one rule of law—without the other. There are Latin American universities where students have one—academic freedom—without the other. But neither will ever become truly great.

The University of California has built its greatness on a delicate balance of both. It will continue to be
the greatest public university in the world because it will continue to offer that balance.

In order to maintain that balance, there will have to be confident and genuine trust on the part of every member of the university team, the students, the faculty, the administration, the regents, the Legislature and the taxpayer.

Rebuilding this confidence and trust at this particular time in the university's history will not be easy. Right now, each member of the university team has his own fears and doubts about what motivates the other.

But this must not stop—or even delay—the inevitable reconciliation. Man's progress is always more a triumph over his own fears than over the hazards of the world. And a university's progress is little different.

I am positive that out of this crisis will come an even greater University of California—a university ready for the 21st century. A university ready in structure, ready in freedom, ready in respect for law, and more worthy than ever of the prestige which is the University of California.
SAC, San Francisco

Director, FBI

EDMUND G. BROWN
GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

In a recent article written by Governor Brown for the "New York Herald Tribune" concerning the student demonstrations at the University of California, he stated, "The Federal Bureau of Investigation turned over to me their confidential file on the Berkeley situation with respect to subversive activities. Unquestionably, there were some Communists involved, but the FBI's file shows the Free Speech Movement was not instigated by the Communist party or any of its front organizations.

In view of Governor Brown's remarks, he should be furnished no information by your offices in the future.

NOTES: Governor Brown's article in the "New York Herald Tribune" discusses the demonstrations and mentions the FBI's turning over files on the Berkeley situation. He also mentions Mr. Hoover's Appropriation Testimony indicating that while subversives were involved they did not originate or control the demonstrations.
Memorandum

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, WFO
SUBJECT: EDMUND GERALD BROWN, GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, INFORMATION CONCERNING

Enclosed are five copies to the Bureau and one copy each to Los Angeles and San Francisco of a LHM setting out information furnished by [redacted]. The enclosed LHM is classified "Confidential" as it [redacted].
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ENCLOSURE
THREAT AGAINST GOVERNOR
EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

On December 24, 1965, the Ventura District Attorney's Office, Ventura, California, made available to a Special Agent of the FBI a Xeroxed copy of a letter written by General Delivery, San Francisco, California, to Governor Edmund G. Brown, State of California, Sacramento, California. The letter also furnished Xeroxed copies of three newspaper articles which had been enclosed with the above letter. The Special Agent further advised that he had received a copy of this letter from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, San Francisco, California.

Attached hereto is a Xeroxed copy of the above letter and the three newspaper articles.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.
Mr. Bowers:

Again, I am writing to you—though it
probably won't reach you through your
P. R. K. secretaries and official
contacts—and, even if it doesn't, one
of these days I'll be able to send you a
much more personalized message through
the mails.

Once again, in regard to your collaboration with
the reactionary forces attempting to suppress
and stifle the people's right of protest and dissent against the Johnson
administration's policy of brutality and Nazi-Style type
tactics (in Viet Nam as well as here at home)
against the Negroes—once again you have
proved yourself to be a crook, a swindler,
a craven, calculating, ambitious,
crawling,Night Creature, a moral and ethical
coward and a crass betrayer of many of those
who voted for you in 1962, among them
myself. Neither Democrat nor Republican
now because both are a sham and a
bitter fraud—and I vote for neither.
But I say this; I hope that in 1966 this state
does get. Reagen as Governor, to complete the
integration of the State, begun by you, for
California needs and deserves a Reagan. Only
that he could be no worse than you,

Yes, Mr. Deon, you took refuge and hide behind
Abel's and legality, yet you all your career I.B.S.
practice the most blatant illegality imaginable.
Against peaceful protesters here at home,
and against the other peoples of the world. But
any wonder that America has become the most
hated nation on earth, a hate in which I
fully join. But, never fear, times are changing,
violence enough to dwarf the Watts riot is
fully on the way, and you, your Coastsy I.B.S.
and this whole stinking rotten murderous, corrupt,
system we live under are on the way out and
this, I can now see, will be accomplished only by
a prolonged bloody revolution. For I have clearly
seen that "peaceful protests", "parades" and
"demonstrations" are just a year of law enforcement.
Carrots or secret instruction from you have been
to that, and that the only thing that you people
will respect and treat as equal is afflinked as
up with force, which is what the future foretold.
Enforced if some very telling information for you to
worry over - as though you didn't know it already,
Good & welfare

300: The power structure of the United States is in a position that it has been on all the markings of a national holiday whose little boy sneaks up behind and yells "Fire" very loudly. It seems to happen every week. Often, the fire is tragically funny, but luckily, not dangerous. One little boy of "breathe" and the legs stiff, the eyes dilate, the pulse runs rampant, and months later, everything happens again.

Take Castro's offer to let everybody who wanted to leave Cuba leave. That announcement caught a whole lot of people with their striped pants down. Anti-Castro Cuban refugees are as good to the State Department when they're in the United States, quite the contrary, here they just miss things up. If they're not fighting amongst themselves over who's going to be the king when they return the island, they're trying to blow up the United Nations. The Castro announcement even caught President Johnson off guard. He couldn't refuse to allow Cuban refugees entrance into the home of the brave. So he stretched out his arms, and gave the arriving travelers something a little less than a welcome.

It was all as we expected when things happen everywhere. From members of the Washington press corps, Jerry and the big morning start flipping.

Oakland, California, is the home of one of the biggest unions in the country—19L. Pinochle and his Oak-
land Tribune.

"There is a specter haunting the 'Trib'—the recast horde. It's causing some consternation in other communities as well. Whatever writing Knowland's editorial is worried about is an exodus of unemployed refugees, speaking a foreign language, anyone of an employed refugee!"

The Tribune, editorial that begins a nightmare as it begins to worry about the possibility of the poor unemployed refugees, speaking a foreign language, anyone of an employed refugee! The Tribune editorial was probably inspired by a letter from a "Mrs. Hawkins" who had appeared on the same page.

That one is moved to tears when thinking of what must be going on in Mrs. Hawkins' world because of this new move. Despite is the only way to describe her question: "What in Heaven's name is our President thinking of to allow these thousands of Cubans to enter our country?" But Knowland has a plan. He thinks that many of the Cuban refugees might prefer to be located in some other Latin American country with a language and customs more familiar to them. What a joke! Any Cuban refugee would be a fool to take him up on the offer. The person leaving Cuba knows full well that the standard of living in the United States is higher than it is in Cuba. Before Castro he had a relatively higher standard of living than he has now, but certainly there are advantages to staying here. But if the other starving Latin American countries are the only alternative to Cuba, most of the people now moving out would choose to stay and make the sacrifices needed to build socialism.

—C. W. BLOCHER
There's this monster, you see, named INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM. It's out there somewhere, lurking in the dark shadows of Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, etc., and every time dear sweet bumbling old Uncle Sam tries to do something for the poor and downtrodden of the world, the monster takes a bite and gobbles up the people of Russia, Cuba, China, Indonesia, and the central and Eastern European countries. Now it's after the democracies and it knows that it can't get at them until it does away with Uncle Sam.

Meanwhile, Uncle Sam, pure of heart, thinking only of the good of mankind, dreaming of when all men can live in peace, prosperity and brotherhood, staggered on under his inherited "white man's burden," trying to bring the slaving monster to the conference table where the two can "sit down and reason together." But, of course, Uncle Sam, like all the boy scouts, must be prepared. He must recognize that maybe the monster will not be reasonable. If that's to be the case, then Uncle Sam will sigh, raise his brow, assume an expression which tells everyone that it costs him more than it does them, give the ol' boy scout salute and then bomb, burn, rape, pillage and exterminate the poor and downtrodden. He has to, you see. If he didn't the monster would get them.

[Reprinted from "Life with Lyndon in the Great Society," Vol. 1, No. 32, a newsletter circulated in Southern civil rights circles, written by Jack Minnis.]
Johnson and the Miss. Crisis

The defeat of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's challenge of the literally elected Mississippi congressmen was a triumph for the racial rulers of this country, or in a word, the Johnson administration. It proves beyond any doubt the incapacity of the Democratic Party to enforce the constitutional right of American citizens to vote for their representatives in government.

The Sept. 17 vote against the challenge in the House of Representatives was 223 to 142. In order to pass, the challenge required 218 votes — but there were 233 Democrats in the House, and the Johnson administration has been able to pass every simple piece of major legislation it has pushed this year.

The fact of the matter is that the Johnson administration has openly lobbied against the MFDP challenge in order to assure that the Mississippi Dixiecrats remain in power. Hiding behind the "legal" argument that no one ran against the Mississippi "wreckers" in 1944, Johnson's cohorts cynically ignore that before the 1965 Voting Rights Act only a handful of black Mississippians were allowed to vote in any election.

After the overwhelming support that Negro voters gave Johnson in 1964, including the support of the MFDP, Johnson apparently felt he had the Negro vote in his back pocket. The Dixiecrats vote is less secure. In 1964, many of them voted for Goldwater. Others still threaten to bolt the Democratic Party.

In order to ensure that the Dixiecrats remain within the Democratic Party, Johnson placed defeat of the MFDP challenge high on his priority list. There is an important lesson here for the MFDP. Pressure can be brought on the ruling parties to that degree that political groups have strength outside of and in opposition to these parties, and violent action of that doesn't succeed!
FBI
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Transmit the following in

(Type in plain text or code)

Via AIRTEL AIRMAIL - REGISTERED
(Priority or Method of Mailing)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (62-109276)
FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (100-65106)
RE: THREAT AGAINST GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Re Los Angeles letter to Bureau dated 12/31/63,
captioned "[redacted] aka.; INFORMATION
CONCERNING."

Transmitted herewith to the Bureau are two copies
of a letterhead memorandum (EHM) concerning a letter written
to Governor BROWN by [redacted]

In view of the identity of the source who furnished
a copy of instant letter to the Los Angeles Office, the date
of the letter and previous correspondence with the Bureau and
Secret Service, Los Angeles, concerning [redacted], Secret
Service, Los Angeles, was not telephonically advised of this
matter; however, a copy of the attached EHM is being
disseminated to Secret Service, Los Angeles, for their
information.

A copy of the EHM is also being disseminated for
San Francisco inasmuch as [redacted] is apparently now residing
in San Francisco. [redacted] is identical to San
Francisco file 100-9-96277.

ENVELOPES
3 - Bureau (Enc.-2)(AIRMAIL-REGISTERED)
1 - San Francisco (Enc.-1)(AIRMAIL-REGISTERED)
2 - Los Angeles
   (1 - 62-5739)
RHB:nlb

1 Copy

[Signature]

[Redacted] 16 JAN 3 1966

Approved by

[Redacted]

Sent M Per

Special Agent in Charge
In Reply, Please Refer To

File No.

Bureau 62-103276
Los Angeles 100-65106

December 28, 1965

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535

Dear Sir:

The information furnished herewith concerns an individual who is believed to be covered by the agreement between the FBI and Secret Service concerning Presidential protection, and to fall within the category or categories checked.

1. ☐ Has attempted or threatened bodily harm to any government official or employee, including foreign government officials residing in or planning an imminent visit to the U.S., because of his official status.

2. ☐ Has attempted or threatened to redress a grievance against any public official by other than legal means.

3. ☐ Because of background is potentially dangerous; or has been identified as member or participant in communist movement; or has been under active investigation as member of other group or organization inimical to U.S.

4. ☐ U.S. citizens or residents who defect from the U.S. to countries in the Soviet or Chinese Communist blocs and return.

5. ☐ Subversives, ultrarightists, racists and fascists who meet one or more of the following criteria:
   (a) ☐ Evidence of emotional instability (including unstable residence and employment record) or irrational or suicidal behavior;
   (b) ☐ Expressions of strong or violent anti-U.S. sentiment;
   (c) ☐ Prior acts (including arrests or convictions) or conduct or statements indicating a propensity for violence and antipathy toward good order and government.

6. ☐ Individuals involved in illegal bombing or illegal bomb-making.

Photograph ☐ has been furnished ☐ enclosed ☐ is not available
☐ may be available through ______

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

1 - Special Agent in Charge (Enclosure(s))
U.S. Secret Service - Los Angeles (AIRMAIL-REGISTERED)

Enclosure(s)

(Upon removal of classified enclosures, if any, this transmittal form becomes UNCLASSIFIED.)
THREAT AGAINST GOVERNOR
EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

On January 4, 1966, [redacted] Glendale, California Police Department, furnished the following information:

Shortly after 8:00 AM on January 1, 1966, Glendale Police Department Officers had gone to the apartment of [redacted] California, in response to complaints of neighbors that a gun shot had been heard at [redacted] apartment.

Upon arrival of officers, [redacted] was holding a Winchester Model 94, 30-30 caliber rifle, and was shouting about "God damn Governor Brown". When asked what he was doing he said he was just shooting in the hills and "I wish Governor Brown were here". After the weapon was taken from him he continued to talk about the faults of Governor Brown, faults of the national government, and about Vietnam. He also said "you have to be careful because of the communist, those damn Commiss are coming sooner then you think!"

Officers detected the odor of alcohol on [redacted] Five spent shell casings were found at the scene. Officers observed numerous brochures concerning religious, governmental, and anti-communist matters.

[redacted] was profane, obscene, resisted arrest, and was combative when booked in the Glendale Police Department Jail.

ENCLOSURE
THREAT AGAINST GOVERNOR
EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

officers that approximately every two weeks has carried on in a boisterous manner, that he appears to be a fanatic on religion and government, is always talking about war and communists, has many times made open threats to use his gun, and has said he would like to kill communists and certain officials.

advised that on January 1, 1966, he had heard deliver a lecture on communism to at which time he talked of faults of the American government and of Governor Brown. had also heard seven gun shots on that day and heard make threats to take "six of them with me".

advised that appeared in local court on January 3, 1966, plead guilty to violation of Section 417, California Penal Code (display of weapon), and received a sentence of 180 days in the Los Angeles County Jail, ten days suspended.

Files of the Los Angeles Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation contain no information identifiable with.

Following is a description of the above individual as shown in files of the Glendale Police Department:

Name                           
Race                           Caucasian
Born                           
Height                         5'11"
Weight                         175
Hair                           Blond
Eyes                           Brown
Complexion                    Medium
Build                          Medium
On January 4, 1966, Special Agent [redacted], Secret Service, Los Angeles, was advised of the foregoing.

No further investigation in this matter is being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Los Angeles.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.
Transmit the following in

AIRTEL AIR MAIL - REGISTERED
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DIRECTOR, FBI (62-109276)

FROM
SAC, LOS ANGELES (175-0)

RE
THREAT AGAINST GOVERNOR
EDMUND G. BROWN
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Enclosed herewith to the Bureau are four copies of a letterhead memorandum (LHM), and two copies of FD-376 pertaining to captioned matter.

One copy of the LHM is furnished to San Francisco so that Governor EDMUND G. BROWN, Sacramento, California can through usual sources be advised of this individual.

The above information was received by SA on 1/4/66 and was disseminated on the same date to Secret Service, Los Angeles, as indicated in the LHM.

3 - Bureau (Encls. X∂E1XCTR)
1 - San Francisco (Encl. 1)(RM)
1 - Los Angeles

JM/Jlm
(5)

3 JAN 6 1966

Approved: Special Agent in Charge
Director
United States Secret Service
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D. C. 20220

Dear Sir:

The information furnished herewith concerns an individual who is believed to be covered by the agreement between the FBI and Secret Service concerning Presidential protection, and to fall within the category or categories checked.

1. [X] Has attempted or threatened bodily harm to any government official or employee, including foreign government officials residing in or planning an imminent visit to the U. S., because of his official status.

2. □ Has attempted or threatened to redress a grievance against any public official by other than legal means.

3. □ Because of background is potentially dangerous; or has been identified as member or participant in communist movement; or has been under active investigation as member of other group or organization inimical to U. S.

4. □ U. S. citizens or residents who defect from the U. S. to countries in the Soviet or Chinese Communist blocs and return.

5. □ Subversives, ultrarightists, racists and fascists who meet one or more of the following criteria:
   (a) □ Evidence of emotional instability (including unstable residence and employment record) or irrational or suicidal behavior;
   (b) □ Expressions of strong or violent anti-U. S. sentiment;
   (c) □ Prior acts (including arrests or convictions) or conduct or statements indicating a propensity for violence and antipathy toward good order and government.

6. □ Individuals involved in illegal bombing or illegal bomb-making.

Photograph □ has been furnished □ enclosed □ is not available □ may be available through Glendale, California Police Department

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

1 - Special Agent in Charge (Enclosure(s))
U. S. Secret Service - Los Angeles

Enclosure(s) (Upon removal of classified enclosures, if any, this transmittal form becomes UNCLASSIFIED.)
PROPOSED CONFERENCE WITH GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN FEBRUARY 11 NEXT.

TELEGRAM RECEIVED TODAY FROM GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN STATING HE IS SPENDING DAY OF FEBRUARY 11 NEXT IN LONG BEACH, CALIF. AREA AND PLANS TO MEET WITH COMMUNITY LEADERS TO EXPLORE MATTERS OF COMMON INTEREST. HE REQUESTED A CONFERENCE AT 11:45 A.M. WITH THE SAG AND OTHER LEADERS VITALLY CONCERNED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT TO JOIN IN INFORMAL DISCUSSION DURING A LUNCHEON AT PACIFIC COAST CLUB, LONG BEACH.

TODAY'S LOS ANGELES TIMES NEWSPAPER CARRIES ARTICLE QUOTING ASSEMBLYMAN GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, REPUBLICAN FROM LONG BEACH, WHICH URGES BROWN TO PUT THE SUBJECT OF CRIME ON A SPECIAL CALL FOR ACTION AT THE 1966 LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

FEB 14 1966

If the intelligence contained in the above message is to be disseminated outside the Bureau, it is suggested that it be suitably paraphrased in order to protect the Bureau's cryptographic systems.
THE ASSEMBLYMAN ACCUSED BROWN OF TRYING TO MINIMIZE THE CRIME
PROBLEM IN CALIF. BY STATING THAT THE CALIFORNIA CRIME REPORTING
METHODS WERE MORE PRECISE AND THE DATA MORE MEANINGFUL. HE
POINTED OUT THAT GOVERNOR BROWN POCKET VETOED THREE BILLS
APPROVED FROM THE 1965 LEGISLATIVE SESSION WHICH WOULD HAVE
INCREASED THE MINIMUM PENALTIES FOR ARMED BODILY INJURY CRIMES.

IT APPEARS GOVERNOR BROWN'S MOVE WAS PROBABLY INSPIRED BY
THE CRITICISM OF THE REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLYMAN, AND THE GOVERNOR
PLANS TO HOLD THE CONFERENCE TOMORROW IN THE ASSEMBLYMAN'S
HOME AREA OF LONG BEACH TO DISCUSS MATTERS OF CONCERN TO LAW
ENFORCEMENT. IT APPEARS TO BE PURELY A POLITICAL MOVE TO TAKE
GOV. BROWN OFF THE HOOK WITH REGARD TO HIS ACTIONS CONCERNING
LEGISLATION IN THE FIELD OF LAW ENFORCEMENT.

IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT FBI WOULD BENEFIT IN ANY WAY BY
ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE.

If the intelligence contained in the above message is to be disseminated outside the Bureau, it is suggested that it be suitably paraphrased in order to protect the Bureau's cryptographic systems.
PAGE 3 FROM LOS ANGELES 102355

SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE

ADVISED THAT SAG GRAPP IS IN SAN FRANCISCO ATTENDING THE CALIFORNIA PEACE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION MEETING AND WILL BE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

RECEIVED: 3:33 AM RJB

If the intelligence contained in the above message is to be disseminated outside the Bureau, it is suggested that it be suitably paraphrased in order to protect the Bureau's cryptographic systems.
August 30, 1966

The attached news release was sent to "Editor, FBI Law Enforcement Bull," from Committee to Re-elect Governor Brown, 391 Sutter Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Reference is made to the Director in paragraph four and five.

mjm
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Governor Edmund G. Brown said today that Ronald Reagan's "campaign gimmicks" on crime "only serve to illustrate how little he understands the needs of local law enforcement."

Brown, speaking at a Fullerton Aerospace plant, said Reagan's notions on crime were like those on other major subjects--"thoughtless affronts to those who really understand the problems involved."

Brown said additional state funds should be used "to help our excellent local police academies, not channeled into the unneeded and unwanted new State Police training facilities proposed by Reagan."

"Reagan says he wants J. Edgar Hoover to come out and help us set
A confidential source, who has furnished reliable information in the past, advised on September 7, 1966, that [redacted], Whittier, California, was paroled from the Southern California Conservation Center, Chino, California, on or about June 28, 1966.

Source stated that on numerous occasions that he is going to shoot Governor Pat Brown, United States Senator Robert Kennedy and any police officer he feels like shooting. These threats, he becomes irrational and excited.

Source described a white male, age 43 years, six feet tall, 180 to 190 pounds, medium build, gray-brown hair, ruddy complexion.

The files of the Los Angeles Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation contained no information which is identifiable.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.
Memorandum

TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Los Angeles (175-26)(C)

DATE: 9/13/66

SUBJECT: PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Enclosed herewith are seven (7) copies of a letterhead memorandum (LHM) containing information concerning captioned individual. FD-376 is being furnished to the Bureau for use in transmitting the LHM to Secret Service, Washington, D. C. A copy of the LHM is being disseminated to Secret Service locally. A copy is being furnished to the San Francisco Office in view of the threat to Governor PAT BROWN.

Special Agent Secret Service, Los Angeles, was advised at 3:35 P.M. on 9/9/66 of the information concerning. The Los Angeles Police Department and California State Department of Justice, Los Angeles, were also advised.

The confidential source mentioned in the LHM is Whittier, California, U. S. Post Office and who has requested that his identity be kept confidential.

2 - Bureau (Encs. - 7)(RM)
1 - San Francisco (Enc. - 1)(RM)
1 - Los Angeles
LWS: CM

RECIPE COPY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT RECEIVED
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20535
September 13, 1966

Dear Sir:

The information furnished herewith concerns an individual who is believed to be covered by the agreement between the FBI and Secret Service concerning Presidential protection, and to fall within the category or categories checked.

1. ☑ Has attempted or threatened bodily harm to any government official or employee, including foreign government officials residing in or planning an imminent visit to the U.S., because of his official status.

2. ☐ Has attempted or threatened to redress a grievance against any public official by other than legal means.

3. ☐ Because of background is potentially dangerous; or has been identified as member or participant in communist movement; or has been under active investigation as member of other group or organization inimical to U.S.

4. ☐ U.S. citizens or residents who defect from the U.S. to countries in the Soviet or Chinese Communist blocs and return.

5. ☐ Subversives, ultrarightists, racists and fascists who meet one or more of the following criteria:
   (a) ☐ Evidence of emotional instability (including unstable residence and employment record) or irrational or suicidal behavior;
   (b) ☐ Expressions of strong or violent anti-U.S. sentiment;
   (c) ☐ Prior acts (including arrests or convictions) or conduct or statements indicating a propensity for violence and antipathy toward good order and government.

6. ☐ Individuals involved in illegal bombing or illegal bomb-making.

Photograph ☐ has been furnished ☑ enclosed ☐ is not available
☐ may be available through

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

1 - Special Agent in Charge (Enclosure(s))
U. S. Secret Service, Los Angeles (RM)

Enclosure(s) (Upon removal of classified enclosures, if any, this transmittal form becomes UNCLASSIFIED.)
THE HON J EDGAR HOOVER

DIR FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION DEPT OF JUSTICE CONSTITUTION

AVE BETWEEN NINTH AND TENTH STS WASHDC 20530

FOR A TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING GOVERNOR EDMUND G. "PAT"

BROWN THIS MONTH, WE WOULD APPRECIATE A LETTER OR TELEGRAM

FROM YOU WITH APPROPRIATE COMMENTS ON THE GOVERNOR'S LEADERSHIP,

RECORD IN OFFICE OR PERSONAL QUALITIES. NEED BY MONDAY, DEC.

12 FOR APPROPRIATE MOUNTING AND PRESENTATION TO GOVERNOR. PLEASE

ADDRESS TO GOVERNOR BROWN AND SEND CARE OF PRESS SECRETARY,

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, STATE CAPITOL, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812

ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS C. DYNCH AND SAMUEL LEASK, CO-CHAIRMEN.

MR. ALLRED FOR THE DIRECTOR
September 2, 1970

MR. AND MRS. EDMUND G. BROWN

Mr. Brown, who you advised is associated with the firm of Ball, Hunt, Hart and Brown, 9418 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California, may be identical with Edmund Gerald Brown, the former Governor of California, who was the subject of an applicant-type investigation conducted by the FBI during 1960. The results of that inquiry were summarized in a communication dated March 6, 1964, a copy of which is attached. (62-76249-88) (116-442786)

The central files of the FBI contain no additional pertinent information regarding captioned individuals.

The fingerprint files of the Identification Division of the FBI contain no arrest data identifiable with captioned individuals based upon background information submitted in connection with this name check request.

Enclosure

NOTE: Per request of to the President.

LMG:clkl

19/26
December 8, 1966

AIRMAIL

Honorable Thomas C. Lynch
Attorney General
State of California
Sacramento, California 95800

My dear Mr. Attorney General:

The telegram of December 7th from you and Mr. Samuel Leask was received while Mr. Hoover is in a travel status; therefore, it will not be possible for him to comply with your request.

Sincerely yours,

Helen W. Gandy
Secretary

1 - Los Angeles - Enclosure
1 - San Diego - Enclosure
1 - San Francisco - Enclosure

NOTE: Attorney General Lynch is on the mailing list to receive the UCR bulletin. We have had cordial correspondence with him, last outgoing 11-23-66 in connection with the President's Crime Commission. Samuel Leask in 1960 was employed in the Administrative Division of the City of Los Angeles. In 1962 he was California State Director of Health and Welfare and our Los Angeles Office received information that the "Nixon people" intended to file a civil rights complaint against Leask and others alleging that they were participating in a democratic council meeting in Los Angeles in 1962. This information was disseminated to the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Rights Division of the Department. Governor Brown has
Honorable Thomas C. Lynch

NOTE continued:

been a controversial Governor of California and as recently as 1965 the Director noted "I do not think we should furnish Brown any information in the future." This was with reference to a statement by Brown wherein he said the Director declared that the Berkeley demonstrations "while not communist-originated or controlled were exploited by a few communists."
**SEARCH SLIP**

**NUMEROUS REFERENCE**

| Subj: | _____ |
| Supervisor | _____ |
| Room | _____ |
| Searcher | _____ |
| R# | _____ |
| Date | _____ |
| Initial | _____ |
| Prod. | _____ |
| FILE NUMBER | _____ |
| SERIAL | _____ |

**File Number**

| Name Searching Unit - Room 5527 |
| Service Unit - Room 6524 |
| Forward to File Review |
| Attention |
| Return to |
| Supervisor | Room | Ext. |

**Type of References Requested:**
- Regular Request (Analytical Search)
- All References (Subversive & Nonsubversive)
- Subversive References Only
- Nonsubversive References Only
- Main References Only

**Type of Search Requested:**
- Restricted to Locality of
- Exact Name Only (On the Nose)
- Buildup

Subject

| Birthdate & Place |
| Address |
| _____ | _____ |
| Localities |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

| R# | _____ |
| Date | _____ |
| Initials | _____ |
| Prod. | _____ |
| FILE NUMBER | _____ |
| SERIAL | _____ |
Federal Bureau of Investigation
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[ ] All References (Subversive & Nonsubversive)
[ ] Subversive References Only
[ ] Nonsubversive References Only
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[ ] Exact Name Only
[ ] Buildup
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Birthdate & Place
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Localities

Searcher
Initials

FILE NUMBER
SERIAL
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[Handwritten notes]
September 3, 1970

BY LIAISON

Honorable Alexander P. Butterfield
Deputy Assistant to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Butterfield:

Reference is made to your name check request concerning [redacted] and some other individuals.

Attached are separate memoranda concerning the following individuals:

Mr. and Mrs. Edmund G. Brown

ST-121

Enclosures: 1 - Enclosures (sent direct)

Sincerely yours,

[Redacted]

Enclosures (9)
MESSAGE RELAY VIA TELTYPE

Date

CLASSIFICATION:

☐ TOP SECRET
☐ SECRET
☐ CONFIDENTIAL
☐ UNCLASSIFIED

PRECEDENCE:

☐ IMMEDIATE
☐ PRIORITY
☐ ROUTINE

FIELD AND LEGAL MESSAGES

ONLY ☐ CLEAR ☐ EFTO

FM: DIRECTOR

TO:

☐ Attorney General
☐ Deputy Attorney General
☐ Attn: Emergency Programs Center
☐ Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Div.
☐ Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Div.
☐ Attn: Internal Security Section
☐ Attn: General Crimes Section
☐ Immigration and Naturalization Service
☐ U.S. Marshal's Service
☐ By: U.S. Secret Service (PID)
☐ Director, CIA
☐ Secretary of State
☐ Department of Treasury
☐ Attn: U.S. Customs
☐ Department of Treasury
☐ Attn: Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco & Firearms
☐ Drug Enforcement Administration
☐ Energy Research and Development Administration
☐ U.S. Postal Service
☐ National Aeronautics & Space Admin.
☐ Department of Transportation
☐ Attn: Director of Security
☐ Federal Aviation Administration
☐ Department of the Air Force (AFOSI)
☐ Department of the Army
☐ Naval Investigative Service
☐ National Security Agency (DIRNSA/NSOC (Attn: SOO))
☐ Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard
☐ Director, Defense Intelligence Agency

SUBJECT (TEXT BEGINS NEXT PAGE):

See Attached.
UNSUB: THREAT TO ASSASSINATE CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR BROWN ON JUNE 28, 1977; POLICE COOPERATION MATTER.

RE-BUREAU TELEPHONE CALL TO NEW YORK-JUNE 27, 1977.


NEW YORK OFFICE NIGHT SUPERVISOR TELEPHONICALLY CONTACTED AT ABOVE NUMBER AND OBTAINED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

CLAIMED THAT SHE RECEIVED LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALL LATE AFTERNOON JUNE 27, 1977 FROM UNKNOWN WHITE MALE WHO SAID HE WAS CALLING FROM CALIFORNIA. WHITE MALE ADVISED HER THAT HE WAS CALLING AT REQUEST AND THAT HE WOULD "MAKE A HIT"
IN SAN FRANCISCO TONIGHT. WHITE MALE TOLD HER TO "KEEP YOUR MOUTH SHUT OR YOU'LL GET IT, TOO." WHITE MALE THEN HUNG UP.

[REDACTED] ADVISED SHE BELIEVES [REDACTED], MENTIONED ABOVE, IS [REDACTED], SPECIFIC ADDRESS UNKNOWN, SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA, TELEPHONE NUMBER [REDACTED] SHE DESCRIBED [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] ADMITTED TO BEING DRUNK THROUGHOUT THE DAY OF JUNE 27, 1977 AND ADVISED SHE HAD BEEN "DRINKING HEAVILY LATELY." AT TIMES DURING TELEPHONE CONVERSATION SHE BEGAN CRYING HYSTERICALLY AND HER THOUGHT PROCESSES DRIFTED CONSTANTLY. SHE WAS UNABLE TO RELATE HOW SHE ACQUIRED INFORMATION THAT GOVERNOR BROWN WOULD BE SPECIFIC ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT TARGET OR TIME OF ATTEMPT WOULD BE BETWEEN 12:00 MIDNIGHT AND 1:30 A.M. (CALIFORNIA TIME), JUNE 28, 1977.

RECEIVING OFFICES SHOULD IMMEDIATELY DISSEminate ABOVE INFORMATION TO APPROPRIATE LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

ADMINISTRATIVE
The Attorney General

Director, FBI

February 1, 1972

1 - Mr. Felt
1 - Mr. Rosen
1 - Mr. Bates
1 - 

MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING
(Accounting and Fraud Section)

The following information was received from an
informant of this Bureau who has furnished reliable information
in the past. Because of the informant's sensitive position in
organized crime, our Los Angeles, California, Office requests
the information be dealt with in strict confidence.

On January 10, 1972, while in Los Angeles, California,
No investigation in this matter is being conducted by this Bureau in the absence of a specific request from the U. S. Department of Justice.

1 - The Deputy Attorney General

1 - Assistant Attorney General

Criminal Division

NOTE: Above information furnished by [REDACTED] who has furnished extremely reliable information in the past concerning organized crime matters. Because of the vague nature of the information attributed to subject [REDACTED], this information is being brought to the attention of the Department and no further action is indicated at this time.