Subject: Julius Rosenberg
File Number: 65-15348
Section: 38
NOTICE

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

NEW YORK FILE

SUBJECT: Julius Rosenberg

FILE NO.: 65-15348

VOLUME NO.: 38

SERIALS: 1560

THROUGH

1626
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Pages</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Exemptions used or, to whom referred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>CG Teletype to NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>Bureau Teletype to NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>SA Memo to file</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>NY Letter to Ao'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>NY Teletype to Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>NY Letter to Bureau</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>3/26/51</td>
<td>SA Memo to file</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>3/27/51</td>
<td>PA Letter to Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>3/27/51</td>
<td>SA Memo to file</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>Copy of same</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>Letter from Director, FBI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>3/31/51</td>
<td>NY Letter to Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated to or from Bureau and/or Albuquerque*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Pages</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Exemptions used or, to whom referred (identify statute, if (b)(3) cited)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>MM TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>LETTER FROM DIRECTOR, FBI TO USA SAYPOL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>3/26/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>ASAC MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>3/26/51</td>
<td>PX REPORT TO BUREAU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>4/4/51</td>
<td>UFO REPORT TO BUREAU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>4/4/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>SAC MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated to or from Bureau and/or Albuquerque
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Pages</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPETO BUREAU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPETO BUREAU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>LETTER FROM SAC, NY TO USDC JUDGE KAUFMAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>LA LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>BUREAU LETTER TO NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-95-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590A</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPETO BUREAU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPETO BUREAU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>LETTER FROM DIRECTOR, FBI TO USDC JUDGE KAUFMAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-1156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated to or from Bureau and/or Albuquerque*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description (Type of communication, to, from)</th>
<th>No. of Pages</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Exemptions used or, to whom referred (Identify statute if (b)(3) cited)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>AL Teletype To Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>SA Memo To File</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>4/15/51</td>
<td>CG Report To Bureau</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>8/7/50</td>
<td>SE Report To Bureau, Captioned Alfred Sarant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Process - file never prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>AL Letter To NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>NY Teletype To Bureau</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>ASAC Memo To File</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>SAC Memo To File</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602A</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>SA Memo To File</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>NY Teletype To Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Bufile 65-58236-987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>NY Teletype To Bureau, Captioned Gausa, Internation-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Process - could not match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>SA Memo To File</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated to or from Bureau and/or Albuquerque*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Pages</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Exemptions used or, to whom referred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>DE TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>NY LETTER TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated to or from Bureau and/or Albuquerque*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No. of Pages</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>SAC, NY LETTER TO POSTAL INSPECTOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>SA MEMO TO FILE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>BUREAU TELETYPE TO NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>AX TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>SAC, NY LETTER TO POSTMASTER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>SAC, NY LETTER TO POSTMASTER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>NY TELETYPE TO BUREAU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Designated to or from Bureau and/or Albuquerque
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Date of Serial</th>
<th>DELETION (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>3/26/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>3/27/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>3/27/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>3/31/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>4/1/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>3/30/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>3/26/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Date of Serial</td>
<td>DELETION (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>4/2/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>3/26/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>4/4/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>4/4/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>4/2/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>4/3/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Date of Serial</td>
<td>DELETION (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590a</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>4/6/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>4/5/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>8/7/50</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>4/7/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Date of Serial</td>
<td>DELETION (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602a</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>4/9/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>4/10/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Date of Serial</td>
<td>DELETION (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>4/11/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>4/12/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>4/13/51</td>
<td>No exemptions were cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>4/13/51</td>
<td>This serial was previously processed as shown on the Inventory Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JULIUS ROSENBERG, ET AL, ESPIONAGE DASH R. REURTIAL TWENTY SIXTH INST.
ROSENBERG AND WIFE PURCHASED JOINTLY SERIES E BONDS TOTALING SIXTEEN
HUNDRED DOLLARS FROM APRIL NINETEEN FORTY TWO THROUGH NOV. NINETEEN FORTY
FIVE. ALL WERE TWENTY FIVE DOLLAR DENOMINATION EXCEPT ONE FIFTY DOLLAR
AND ONE TWO HUNDRED DOLLAR PURCHASED JUNE AND NOV. NINETEEN FORTY FIVE
RESPECTIVELY. WITH THESE EXCEPTIONS MAJORITY APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN PURCHASED THROUGH PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS. EXCEPTIONS PURCHASED CORN EXCHANGE BANK
TRUST CO., ONE NINE FOUR DASH SIX PARK ROW, NYC. ALL REDEEMED BUT
DATES OF REDEMPTION NOT FURNISHED BY TREASURY AS HAS BEEN PRACTICE. WIL
SUREP.

MC SWAIN!
ACK AND HOLD PLZ.
CCO R-2  4-39 PH NYC ECJM
Memo:

To: Julius Rosenberg,

Re: D.N. Vandersom 11/1/50, p. 45 reflecting Pitt machine Products Co., Inc. made sales to Fill-N-Cap Machine Co., 71 Sheriff St., N.Y.C.

Four personal calls at the above address in 3/13/51 and 4/30/51 reflected that during regular business hours reflected that although the sign Fill-N-Cap is still on the door, it was locked and no one was on the premises. The N.Y. Telephone Co. advised that Fill-N-Cap's phone GR 3-1020 has been disconnected.

David Greenglass advised that Fill-N-Cap was operated by (fmr) Brodsky since about 1947 or 1948. Greenglass said Brodsky was a showroom decorator. He has no information concerning Brodsky's address or present whereabouts.

J. H. Lewis 5-17
SAC, Albuquerque

SAC, New York

JULIUS ROSENBERG, et al
ESP-R
Urfile 65-145

Enclosed are original photographs of 209 North High Street which were furnished your office by Mr. & Mrs. W. B. Freeman.

Also enclosed is roll of film belonging to Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, containing the personnel file of RUTH GREENOLASS which was furnished to your office.

These items are being forwarded to your office for return to their owners.

Enc-3
65-15348
REGISTERED AIRMAIL
JPL:IM

March 30, 1951
March 30, 1951

Director, FBI

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESP-R

Dear Sir:

In view of the successful prosecution and conviction of JULIUS ROSENBERG, ETHEL ROSENBERG and MORTON SOBEK on the charge of conspiracy to commit espionage, it is believed that the Bureau should be advised of the work of the special agents of this office who were responsible for the thorough, detailed and intelligent investigation of this matter which was so essential to the successful prosecution of the case.

These names are being submitted with the recommendation that the Bureau direct letters of commendation to the individual agents and there is being set forth by each agent's name a brief statement as to his participation in the investigation:

Bauckham, Frederick C.
The individual cases of JOEL BARK and MARK PAGE are assigned to this agent. He conducted many interviews and covered numerous leads in connection with the over-all case of JULIUS ROSENBERG and handled all of his assignments in an expeditious and thorough manner.

Blasco, Paul J.
This agent has the cases of RUSSELL McNUTT and AARON COLEMAN assigned to him. He likewise participated in the search of the ROSENBERG apartment and has covered a great number of leads arising out of this investigation. He likewise handled his assignments with dispatch, thoroughly, and exercised intelligence and good judgment during his investigations.

Cammarota, Armand A.
This agent developed and handled EUGENE TARTAKOW, a cell-mate of ROSENBERG at the Federal House of Detention. TARTAKOW has furnished valuable information valuable information in connection with this case and SA Cammarota has done an excellent job in the manner in which he handled it.

Cahill, Edward J.
This agent has covered numerous accounting leads in connection with the instant case and has done a major portion of the accounting work in the investigation of WILLIAM FELL. SA Cahill performed all of his assignments in a diligent and thorough fashion.
Letter to Director
NY 65-15348

Cahill, Vincent J.

The Investigation of MAX ELITCHER has been assigned to Agent Cahill. He, together with SA James T. O'Brien, was responsible for the successful interviews of ELITCHER and with soliciting his cooperation as a Government witness in this case. These agents also interviewed and handled Mrs. ELITCHER. It is believed the work of Agents Cahill and O'Brien in connection with this phase of the investigation was particularly outstanding and was important to the successful prosecution of this case. Agents Cahill and O'Brien both exercised keen imagination, good judgment and aggressiveness in the part which they played in the over-all investigation of this case.

Corcoran, Maurice W.

This agent has assigned to him the case of WILLIAM PERL. He has also handled numerous leads in connection with both the PERL and ROSENBERG cases. His investigations in connection with this matter have been thorough, concise, performed with dispatch and handled in an intelligent fashion.

Frutkin, Leo H.

Agent Frutkin has covered many of the important leads in connection with this case. He actively assisted in the preparation of the prosecutive summary in instant case for trial, interviewed the SIDOROVICHES and PERL in Cleveland, RICH in New Haven and prepared the daily summary teletypes of the trial to the Bureau. His assignments have always been performed with dispatch and in a thorough, intelligent fashion.

Gallaher, Lester O.

This agent has handled many of the individual leads in connection with this and related cases. He has performed all of his assignments in an enthusiastic thorough manner.

Gavin, Walter P.

Investigation of CARLA JAVES, one of the subjects in this group, has been assigned to SA Gavin. He also covered many of the leads in this case. His investigations and interviews were conducted with intelligence and dispatch.

Good, Harold F.

This agent performed the accounting work on the ROSENBERGS. He has also handled a number of leads in connection with this case. His investigations were complete and performed with dispatch.
Letter to Director

Harrington, John A.
This agent was one of the agents who sat at the counsel table during the entire trial, assisting the U.S. Attorneys in connection with the trial. He is also one of the agents working actively as liaison with the U.S. Attorney's Office and assisted the U.S. Attorney in preparing many of the witnesses for trial. It is felt that SA Harrington's work in connection with this case, the long hours put in, are worthy of special mention. His investigations were performed in an intelligent, thorough fashion. He came up with a number of beneficial ideas in connection with the over-all preparation of this case and at all times has exercised tact and good judgment.

Bradsky, Richard T.
The case of VIVIAN CLASSMAN is assigned to this agent. He has handled interviews with CLASSMAN and has covered numerous leads in this and related cases. He has handled all of his assignments competently and thoroughly.

Lee, James P.
This agent has handled the lead cards, reviewed incoming mail for leads and did much of the paper work in instant case. He participated in the search of ROSENBERG'S apartment, has handled leads in connection with this investigation and over-all has performed his assignments with excellence. He has exercised diligence and good judgment in doing all the phases of his work on this case.

Lewis, John W.
The case of DAVID GREENGLASS is assigned to Agent Lewis. He has covered numerous leads in connection with this and related cases. He participated in the arrest and interview of MORGEN SORELL in Texas. It is felt that his work in connection with this and related cases has been excellent. He has performed his assignments with mature judgment, and conducted all of his investigations in a thorough, diligent fashion.

Littlejohn, Herman G.
This agent has covered numerous leads in this case. His investigations and interviews have been conducted with intelligence and good judgment.

McDonough, Michael J.
This agent participated in the search of ROSENBERG'S apartment and has covered numerous leads in connection with this case. He has exercised good judgment and has been diligent in the manner in which he handled his assignments.

Minnihan, Richard A.
The case of MICHAEL and ANNE SIDOROVICH and FRED KITTY are assigned to SA Minnihan. He has covered numerous leads in connection with this and related cases. He handled his assignments with dispatch, thoroughly and competently. He has had an intelligent and mature approach to his investigations.
Letter to Director

Mitchell, Thomas F.
This agent has been assigned numerous leads in this case which he has covered promptly and efficiently. He has exercised tact, good judgment in all of his assignments.

Norton, William F.
The case on JULIUS ROSENBERG and ETHEL ROSENBERG has been assigned to this agent. He, together with SA Harrington, participated in the interview and arrest of ROSENBERG. He worked closely with the U.S. Attorney's Office all during the preparation of this case and remained at the counsel table throughout the trial to assist the U.S. Attorneys with the presentation of this case. He has performed his assignments in excellent fashion, exhibited sound, mature judgment and has a most intelligent approach to the problems arising in connection with this case. He put in long, arduous hours and handled all of his assignments with dispatch and is worthy of special mention.

O'Brien, James T.
Attention is directed here to my comments concerning SA V. J. Cahill, inasmuch as SA O'Brien and SA Cahill were primarily responsible for the successful interview and development of MAX KLEITNER as a Government witness in connection with this case. He also covered numerous leads and it is felt that his over-all performance has been excellent.

Palguta, John J.
This agent participated in the search of the ROSENBERG apartment and has covered many leads in this case. He has been a tireless worker, has conducted his investigation with intelligence and good judgment.

Plants, Robert S.
Agent Plants participated in the search of the ROSENBERG apartment and covered many leads in connection with this case. He has been a tireless worker and conducted his investigation with intelligence and good judgment.

Royal, Robert F.
The investigation of ALFRED E. SARAME is assigned to Agent Royal. In addition, he has conducted numerous leads with regard to instant case. This agent has also put in long hours, has used imagination and sound, mature judgment in the way he handled his assignments and his work is most certainly worthy of commendation by the Bureau.

Sherod, Rex Y.
The case of MORTON SORELL is assigned to SA Sherod. He participated in the interview and arrest of SORCELL in Texas, has written all of the reports in the SORCELL case, handled the Mexican witnesses during the trial and prepared them for testifying as witnesses. This agent has exercised sound, mature judgment, enthusiasm and tact in the manner in which he carried out his assignments and it is believed his over-all performance is worthy of special mention to the Bureau.
Letter to Director

Silverthorn, Charles P.

The investigation of WILLIAM DANTZER and STANLEY RICH is assigned to this agent. In addition to this, he has handled many leads in connection with this and related cases. All of his assignments were handled in a thorough, competent, and intelligent fashion.

Stevenson, Robert L.

This agent has covered thoroughly and promptly a great many leads in connection with the ROSENBERG and related cases. He has intelligently handled each assignment and successfully interviewed Dr. George Bernhardt, who was utilized as a Government witness during the trial.

Taylor, Bert S.

The investigation of NATHAN SUSEL is assigned to this agent and he has been successful in obtaining valuable information as a result of his investigation and interview of SUSEL. He likewise handled numerous leads in this case. His investigations have been thorough and complete and performed in an intelligent fashion.

Tully, Edwin R.

This agent coordinated the jury panel checks and investigation in connection with this case. He also handled a number of other leads. His assignments were performed thoroughly and competently and at all times he utilized sound, mature judgment.

Walsh, Joseph C.

This agent has handled HARRY GOLD during this trial and has also covered numerous leads in connection with this investigation. He handled each of his assignments in a competent, thorough fashion and exercised good judgment throughout.

Van Dorn, Gerald J.

This agent prepared the financial reports on the Pitt Machine Products Company and assisted the U.S. Attorney during the trial in accounting testimony. His investigations were thorough and complete. He exercised tact and diligence in the manner in which he handled these assignments.

It should be noted that Special Agents Edwin L. Sweet, John J. Creedon, and John M. Speakes conducted investigation in Mexico re MORTON SOREL. It is felt that this investigation was handled in a most thorough and intelligent fashion and it is believed that in addition to the above the Bureau will desire to direct letters of commendation to the SIS agents.

It can be stated for all of the agents heretofore mentioned that each and every one of them devoted a tremendous amount of overtime for which no compensatory leave was requested in carrying out their assignments.

Very truly yours,

Edward Schleidt, SAC
NEW YORK, NEW YORK
MARCH 26, 1951

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESPIONAGE - R

Confidential Informant T-1, of unknown reliability, furnished the writer with a written memorandum on this date. This memorandum reflects conversations between T-1 and JULIUS ROSENBERG and sets out the ideas being considered by ROSENBERG with reference to the present trial.

Information as furnished by T-1 is set forth below:

"Other than lengthy, detailed conversations between BROTHMAN and ROSENBERG concerning the structure of the organization, the manner of and reasons for its crumbling since the FUCHS' arrest and its future potential, nothing relevant has been mentioned since my last communication. Except perhaps that:

"The 'Herald Tribune' is being subpoenaed in order to contradict the contentions of the GREENGLASSES that their recollection of HARRY GOLD was vague.

"They have been notified by Macy's that unless they produce a receipt number it will be impossible to locate the sales slip for the console table. Incidentally, I'm convinced, personally, that he bought the table as he claims, and unless the government is certain he did not I wouldn't press this matter. As a last resort they will ask the court to order the department store to locate the receipt regardless of the difficulty involved.

"He claims that they continue to toy with the

Enc. (1)
MEMO
NY 65-15348

"possibility of returning BERNHARDT and his records to the stand, but nothing definite has been decided.

"His attitude continues to be one of confidence. If nothing more concrete and damaging can be produced than has to date he believes there is a possibility of an acquittal. Especially against his wife and SOBEL."

ARMAND A. CAMMAROTA, SA
MEMO

Re: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESPIONAGE - R

JEROME TARTAKOW was interviewed at the Federal House of Detention on March 27, 1951 and furnished the writer with a written memorandum concerning ROSENBERG's comments with the results of the trial on the preceding day. This memorandum is attached hereto.

A. A. CAMMORATA, SA

AAC:MRW 65-15348

see exhibit 1B 4/27
March 31, 1951

JULIUS ROSENBERG, et al.

It is suggested that at this time offices receiving copies of this letter might wish to submit to the Bureau the names of those agents in their offices who, in their opinion, should receive letters of commendation for the work performed in the investigation of this case.

cc - Albany
- Albuquerque
- Cleveland
- Newark
- Philadelphia
- San Antonio
- WFO

JPL1M
65-15348

65-15348-1571
March 30, 1951

Honorable Irving H. Saypol  
United States Attorney  
Court House Building  
New York, New York

Dear Irving,

May I take this occasion to congratulate your associates and you on the efficient manner in which you conducted the prosecution of the case involving Julius Rosenberg, Ethel Rosenberg and Morton Sobell. You are indeed to be commended for the diligent preparation and excellent presentation of the evidence.

This case is truly a sterling example of our democratic processes in action and a distinctive achievement to be enrolled in the annals of our American courts' history.

I know that Mr. Edward Scheidt, Special Agent in Charge of our New York Office, joins me in these sentiments and is looking forward to those opportunities when he can again cooperate with you in all matters of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc - New York
New York, New York
March 26, 1951

MEMO:

Re: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESPIONAGE - R

The writer called at the Federal House of Detention on March 23, 1951, and found that it would not be possible to discreetly interview Confidential Informant T-1 at that time. By previous arrangements, T-1 had prepared a typewritten memorandum which he gave to the writer, and which is set out below:

"He returned from Court yesterday evening unusually elated. Was congratulated for his demeanor and resourcefulness on the witness stand. This is the most confident and hopeful I have known him since his arrest. We paced the cell block until after 11 P.M. discussing the days events from which the following emerged:

"* He is slightly concerned that ARTHUR BARR, JOEL's brother, may testify that he, JULIUS, gave him money to send to BARR. This would also indicate that possibly now and surely at one time ARTHUR knew of JOEL's whereabouts. But at the same time he admits that ARTHUR BARR is (what he describes as) a solid person.

"* Coincidentally, he reiterated his experiences in the Tombs during the Orbach strike. He was a member of the American Youth Congress then. Was fined $25 or two days for disturbing the peace. Two of the men also imprisoned for the same offense were called CHARLIE and MOE. Both of them were members of the floor boys local of the Furrier's Union.

cc: 100-37158
    65-15392
    65-15380

AAC: KDD
65-15348
MEMO:
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"* Mentioned an apartment rented by a student, ostensibly used for studying, on Morton Street, where he, JOEL BARR, and 'BILL' used to meet in secret to discuss their plans. Rent for this apartment was $55.00 per month.

"* Is slightly concerned over whether or not the FBI can locate the passport pictures he had taken of himself and the family when he was contemplating flight. Asked me, as a photographer, if it were possible for them to canvass all the studios in New York. The pictures were not arranged for in his name. They were photographed at approximately the same time as was GREENGLASS.

"* Witness from the Tombs did not return to the elder BLOCH's office.

"* Claims that the SODORAVICH woman cannot possibly confess since it would involve her 'entire family.' I repeat that this husband and wife combination enjoyed the same position as did the ROSENBERGS.

"* SOBELL will definitely not testify (big secret) thus preventing the government from introducing witnesses in rebuttal. KUNTZ claims SOBELL - at the very worst guilty at this time of association only, and may possibly be acquitted."

"* His lawyers are pleased with all attempts to label him a communist, claiming this detracts from the original issue and is grounds for a reversal."

T-1 was advised that he would be contacted on Monday, March 26, 1951.

ARMAND A. CAMMAROTA, SA.
New York, New York
April 2, 1951
Call, 2:40 pm

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESPIONAGE - R

USA Irving Saypol called and requested a list of the agents who worked on the ROSENBERG case as he wanted to send a letter to the Bureau.

I said I would get such a list and forward it to him today.

E. E. HARGETT
ASAC

EEH: CTC
On 4/3/51, I called Mr. Branigan, Bureau, and advised him that we had received information from AUSA Roy Cohn, SDNY, as follows:

On 4/2/51, Mr. Cohn was in contact with Judge Irving R. Kaufman and learned from Judge Kaufman that the latter had been discussing with Circuit Court Judge Jerome Frank, the question of the sentencing of the ROSENBERGS and SOBEL. Judge Frank told Judge Kaufman that he, personally, would not recommend giving the death penalty to the ROSENBERGS and SOBEL. He (Judge Frank) suggested that Judge Kaufman discuss the question of sentencing also with Judge Weinfeld of the Southern District of New York. Judge Kaufman did this and Judge Weinfeld was of the opinion that the ROSENBERGS and SOBEL should be given the death penalty. Judge Kaufman told Mr. Cohn that he had considered giving the death penalty to Mr. and Mrs. ROSENBERG, but he was not certain whether or not he should do the same with SOBEL.

Mr. Cohn told Judge Kaufman that he would recommend the death penalty for all three, but he also thought it might be a good idea if JULIUS ROSENBERG and SOBEL were given the death penalty while Mrs. ROSENBERG was given a sentence of, say, 30 years, with the thought in mind that she might decide to inform the government authorities concerning espionage activities so that other individuals involved in such activities may also be prosecuted.

Judge Kaufman indicated to AUSA Cohn that he had been considering sentencing GREENGlass to 30 years. COHN told Judge Kaufman that he would recommend fifteen years for GREENGlass and Judge Kaufman stated that whatever the government did recommend, he would add five years to that.

SA William F. Norton overheard a telephone conversation between AUSA Roy Cohn and USA Irving Saypol in which conversation it was indicated COHN intended to go to Washington on 4/4/51 to confer with the Attorney General concerning the sentencing in the ROSENBERG case and COHN suggested to Mr. Saypol that it might be a good idea to also discuss the matter with the Director of the FBI.
Memos

4-4-51

Re: Julius Rosenberg
Ethel Rosenberg, was
Esquire of.

Re: Memo of SA Charles P. Silverthorn dated 1-31-51

Reference memo set forth the information that E.E. Fostel Inc. 32 East 4th St began doing business with Pitt Machine Products Corp. when Ed Robbins of E.E. Fostel Inc needed some work done which Pitt Machine could do. According to Robbins Mr. Don Knoch of Metro Heat Treat Corp. recommended Pitt Machine.

Donald M. Knoch, President of Metro Heat Treat Corp., 460 Broome St. advised that Pitt Machine, in connection with making a sewing machine shaft, had subjected some work consisting of a heat treatment process to the new heat of Treatment Corp in Long Island City. The work

F.B.I.

N.Y.C.

65-15-348
was not too successful so came Heat Treatment Corp. recommended Metro Heat Treatment Corp. to do the works. Rosenberg came convinced and gave work to Metro Heat Treatment. From October 1947 until October 1948, Metro Heat Treatment Corp. 466 Broome St did $1,100 worth of work for Pitt Machine. From Oct 1948 until May 1950, Metro Heat Treatment performed only $100 worth of work for Pitt Machine.

Knoch advised Rosenberg came into his shop infrequently and would pass the time of day however Rosenberg never mentioned anything about comments Mr. Russia. Rosenberg did not make any controversial remarks to him.

Knoch recognized photographs of David Greenglass as having visited his shop once or twice.

Knoch was shown photographs of all of the other subjects in this case however he failed to recognize any of them.

Knoch mentioned that his wife
may have talked to Rosenberg since
Mrs. Koch takes care of the books.

"Metron Heat Treat"

Mrs. Dan Koch was subsequently
interviewed, however, she could
not add any information to that
given by her husband.

Charles P. Silvestrom
SA.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

**SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:**

Records of security clearance investigation of PERL and ETHEL GREENBERG not located. By letter May 21, 1948, from New York City, PERL advised ANDREW MALEY, who had power of attorney for Dr. VON KARMAN, of his desire to obtain 1948 license for VON KARMAN's car. ADDISON ROTHROCK, NACA, denies subject had access to classified information regarding nuclear energy propelled aircraft project, although may have known generally of existence of such work. No connection between PERL and ROSENBERG or SOBEL known to former superior at Langley Field. February 21, 1951, subject applied for passport for pleasure trip to Europe beginning May, 1951. No additional information regarding JULIUS ROSENBURG, CSC.

PROPERTY OF FBI - This confidential report and its contents are loaned to you by the FBI and are not to be distributed outside of agency to which loaned.
WFO 65-5543

Copies of this Report

5 - Bureau (65-59312)
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1 - Los Angeles (65-5075)(info.)
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3 - Washington Field (one - 65-5521)
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DETAILS: AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

The following investigation was conducted by Special Agent JOHN F. BUSCHER.

Mrs. MARIE D. RODDENBERY, Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, Room 4C340, Pentagon, has attempted to trace the results of any security investigation conducted at the request of the Advisory Board by the Air Force Provost Marshal's Office concerning WILLIAM PERL and ETHEL GREENBERG. She indicated that in 1947, when the request for this security clearance investigation was made, the Office of Special Investigations (OSI) of the Air Force did not exist; and that during that period, such investigations were conducted by the Army through the Counterintelligence Corps, the files of which were subsequently turned over to the office of Colonel GILLETTE, Bolling Field. It has been previously noted that advice has been received from Colonel GILLETTE that his office, the Air Provost Marshal's Office, has no records relating to PERL or GREENBERG.

Mrs. RODDENBERY recalled that several months after the original request for security clearance for PERL and GREENBERG, those two individuals ceased to be of interest to the Air Force Scientific Group in that they terminated their services from the staff of Dr. VON KARMAN at Columbia University in New York.

Mrs. RODDENBERY concluded that the possibility exists that before the requested investigation could be started it had been rendered unnecessary by such termination of employment, and that no investigation in fact might have been conducted.

The office of Captain HALLAHAN, Air Provost Marshal's Office, United States Air Force, contained no reference in the central files relating to PERL or GREENBERG.

Captain PAUL C. WILEY, Executive Officer, Security Section, Military District of Washington, advised that there are no references to PERL or GREENBERG in the central files of that organization.
Miss ETHNA WHITE, Secretary to ANDREW HALEY, advised that in 1948 she was Mr. HALEY's secretary and personally recalled having been in correspondence with WILLIAM PERL of New York or Cleveland. She examined her files which produced a hand-written letter dated May 21, 1948, bearing the return address of Box 59, Pupin Laboratory, Columbia University, New York 27, New York, signed WILLIAM PERL. This letter generally dealt with the fact that Dr. VON KARMAN had given PERL the use of his sister's car, and that the subject was desirous of procuring 1948 license tags for this car. PERL indicated that he had been advised by LILLIAN FRICKER, also of VON KARMAN's staff in New York, that HALEY had power of attorney on behalf of VON KARMAN and his sister. In the letter PERL indicated he was leaving New York for Cleveland the weekend of May 29, 1948. Miss WHITE advised that she had no additional information or correspondence concerning PERL, and that she was confident that Mr. HALEY was not personally acquainted with the latter.

The following investigation was conducted by the writer.

Miss ETHNA WHITE noted that in her reply to the aforementioned letter of PERL's she had indicated that Mr. HALEY would be unable to assist him due to the fact that he did not have a power of attorney for JOSEPHINE de KARMAN, in whose name the car was registered.

Mr. ANDREW HALEY, 1010 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., advised that he had no personal knowledge of WILLIAM PERL, and was not acquainted with the extent of his relationship with Dr. VON KARMAN.

Mr. ADDISON ROTHROCK, Assistant Director for Research, (Aircraft Propulsion), National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, advised that he had been generally acquainted with PERL as a member of the staff at Langley Field Laboratory, but that he later, at Cleveland, became somewhat better acquainted with PERL and his work. Mr. ROTHROCK advised that the NACA did not have access to Atomic Energy Commission data until 1946; and that subsequent to such data being made available, a rule was put into effect that all classified information and material from the Commission should be treated in the utmost confidence and "hand-travelled".
To the best of ROTHROCK's knowledge, PERL did not have access to classified information concerning the application of nuclear energy to aircraft, although he quite possibly did have general knowledge of the fact that there was work being conducted in this field as it was rather widely known that the successful application of nuclear energy to aircraft was of great importance. PERL's actual duties did not require that he be shown or advised of any information of a highly classified nature, and any such classified material as might have come to PERL's attention was strictly without the knowledge of Mr. ROTHROCK. Mr. ROTHROCK had no personal knowledge of PERL's having visited the Oak Ridge Laboratory.

Mr. CLINTON H. DEARBORN, Technical Consultant, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, advised that PERL had worked under his general though not direct supervision from around 1939 or 1940 at Langley Field, and that he had also subsequently known of PERL during the latter's tenure of employment at Cleveland. He advised, however, that he was not well acquainted personally or socially with PERL; and that even during the period of the latter's work at Langley Field, DEARBORN had only periodically been his superior. He described PERL as a good technical aerodynamicist who had originally been engaged in maintenance work on the experimental tunnels at Langley Field; later working on the full scale tunnel. PERL was described as a hard-working, quiet individual who appeared to wish to work by himself, and he had never given any indication of any questionable conduct or activity.

Mr. DEARBORN stated that he had never been approached in behalf of JULIUS ROSENBERG or MORTON SOBELL by PERL or any other individual; and that he, DEARBORN, had no knowledge of ROSENBERG's or SOBELL's ever desiring or attempting to obtain employment at the Langley Field Laboratory, and that he himself had never seen ROSENBERG or SOBELL and knew nothing concerning them.

Mr. ROBERT L. BELL, Security Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 1724 F Street, N.W., advised that he had available a copy of correspondence from the Civil Service Commission captioned Civil Service
Commission Register, Fourth District, Junior Engineer (Aero) Register #K-10236A-2 dated October 28, 1940, wherein among the listed eligibles for employment was noted the name JULIUS ROSENBERG, 1935 Biltmore Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. A reply dated November 13, 1940, from Langley Field Laboratory to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics Headquarters had a statement beside the name of ROSENBERG "did not communicate with this eligible. This office is in agreement with Mr. ULMER's recommendation." Mr. BELL advised that this apparently referred to RALPH ULMER, Budget Officer of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, who was, in 1940, assistant to the Executive Secretary. Mr. BELL stated that ULMER had been questioned concerning this matter but was unable to recall anything concerning it or having been acquainted with JULIUS ROSENBERG or having given any favorable or adverse recommendation concerning prospective employment of him by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. BELL also made available a subsequent Civil Service Commission Register, Fourth District, dated February 18, 1941, #50864-53 whereupon appeared the name JULIUS ROSENBERG, 142 Goereck Street, New York City. Mr. BELL had no additional information in his file concerning this latter register, but stated that the Langley Field Laboratory had advised him that ROSENBERG had been contacted pursuant thereto and questioned as to his availability for employment. However, due to ROSENBERG's status as an employee with the Signal Corps, he was not subsequently hired by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The files of the Passport Division, Department of State, revealed that WILLIAM PERL, born October 1, 1918, New York City, filed application February 21, 1951, at the New York Passport Agency, Department of State, for renewal of Passport #179423, originally issued March 29, 1948. This application reflected that PERL intended to depart New York City May 29, 1951, on the SS Volendam for a proposed four months' travel for pleasure to France, Switzerland, Italy, and possibly England. He requested that his Passport be mailed to 104 East 38th Street, New York City.
Mr. JOSEPH CHANDLER, Civil Service Commission, 8th and F Streets, N.W., advised that his records reflect no additional information concerning JULIUS ROSENBERG.

-PENDING-
WFO 65-5543

ADMINISTRATIVE PAGE

The Norfolk Office, by teletype dated March 21, 1951, directed Civil Service Commission records be checked concerning application of ROSENBERG for employment at NACA.

It is noted that by report of Special Agent C. EDWARD NICHOLSON, JR., July 18, 1950, at Washington, D. C., entitled JULIUS ROSENBERG, Espionage - R, and WFO letter dated February 21, 1951, in the same case, all information available from the Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., was made available to the New York Office.
WASHINGTON FIELD OFFICE:

AT WASHINGTON, D. C.:

Will interview Mr. RALPH ULMER, Budget Officer, NACA, concerning his ostensible recommendation of ROSENBERG in 1940.

Will interview JOHN W. CROWLEY, JR., NACA, concerning any knowledge he might have of PERL's connection with JULIUS ROSENBERG or the fact of PERL's having attempted to secure employment for the latter at Langley Field Laboratory.

Copies of this report are being furnished for the information of the designated offices due to their interest in instant and allied investigations.

New York, New York
April 1, 1951

MEMO

RE: JEROME EUGENE TARTAKOW

On 4/2/51 Mr. EHRENPRICE, New York State Parole Officer, telephonically contacted the writer and stated that LARRY SCHERE and WILLIAM GOLDERG, who are New York State parolees under his supervision and who were subjects, together with TARTAKOW and others in the case entitled "JEROME EUGENE TARTAKOW, et al; ITSMH (NY 26-3646) have recently expressed fear to him that in view of the fact that they assisted in locating TARTAKOW that he may take action against them and/or their families upon his release from Federal custody.

EHRENPRICE questioned the writer as to the name and location of the institution in which TARTAKOW is presently incarcerated; the exact date of his release and the status of the New York City detainer charging third degree burglary which was placed against him following his apprehension by Bureau Agents.

I advised Mr. EHRENPRICE that I had absolutely no information on any of the above questions and would be unable to assist him in any way in obtaining the information relative to TARTAKOW. I explained that following his conviction our office had no jurisdiction over him whatsoever.

EHRENPRICE stated that he would contact the Federal Probation Office in NYC and attempt to obtain information relative to TARTAKOW's present status through this source.

MILTON T. GUMMINGS
Special Agent

2cc: NY 65-15348

MTC: KML
26-3646
New York, N.Y.
April 5, 1951.

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG was, et al
ESPIONAGE - R

Judge Irving Kaufman called me this afternoon and said he just wanted to have me - now that the trial is all over - tell the Director that he thinks the FBI did a fabulous job here - an outstanding job; that he cannot find the proper adjectives; that the agents in the courtroom were as gentlemanly and delightful as anyone could be; that the Agents who worked on this case were a real credit to the Bureau; that he feels very secure knowing we have an FBI.

I thanked Judge Kaufman for his comments and told him I would give his message to the Director. I also told him that I felt there was a great deal of food for thought in his remarks at the time he passed sentence and that I feel that such remarks will go a long way toward discouraging that type of thing.

I called Mr. A. H. Belmont of the Bureau and gave him Judge Kaufman's message for the Director.

EDWARD SCHOEDT
SAG

ES :GU
65-15348
607 United States Court House
Foley Square
New York 7, N. Y.

April 6, 1951

Judge Irving R. Kaufman
United States District Court
New York 7, N. Y.

Dear Judge Kaufman:

I am in receipt of postcard addressed to you by Mrs. Anna Cline, which you forwarded for the attention of this office. You may be sure that same will receive appropriate consideration. Your courtesy in this matter is appreciated.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD SCHEIDT
Special Agent in Charge.

ES:MT

Better advise office covering place of postmark.
New York, N.Y.
4/6/51

MEMO

Re: DAVID GREENGLASS
    ESP. R.

I called Inspector Carl Henrich, Bureau, at 2:55 P.M. today and advised him DAVID GREENGLASS had just been sentenced by Judge Irving Kaufman and he had been sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment, no fine. I told him the Judge had mentioned this was a loathsome crime but he thanked him for his cooperation with the government.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA

RRG:MFB
65-15336

CC: 65-15348
April 7, 1951

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESP-R

Call To? Mr. Henrich, Bureau, 5:30 P.M., 4/6/51.

Advised Mr. Henrich the Director of Bureau of Prisons had called USA Saypol and informed him he was taking immediate steps to transfer JULIUS and ETHEL ROSENBERG to Sing Sing Prison and that probably on Tuesday of next week MORTON SOBEL would be transferred to Atlanta to the Federal Penitentiary there.

I advised that tentative arrangements were made to defer the transfer of GOLD and GREENGLASS to any prison and there was some indication that GOLD and GREENGLASS might be transferred to the Danbury Penitentiary.

I pointed out to Mr. Henrich that none of this was definite.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA

RRG:IM
65-153h8
cc - 65-15321 (Gold)
 - 65-15336 (Greenglass)
 - 100-37158 (Sobell)
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Dr. Hans A. Bethe, 4723 East 36th Street, Seattle, Washington, advised first met Victor A. D. Ross in December, 1945, when Ross recommended him as attorney. Ross performed legal services for Bethe in connection with house purchase. Ross initiated social acquaintance by inviting Bethe to his home, which invitation was returned by Bethe, however, no close relationship developed. Bethe stills maintains friendly but not close relationship with Ross. Claims Ross' opinions very close to Communist Party line. In February, 1946, Ross told Bethe that Sarnait was working for Bell Telephone Laboratories, N. Y. C., and was very interested in studying physics. Ross solicited Bethe help to enable Sarnait to enter Cornell as graduate student. Bethe did not commit himself to any sponsorship, but agreed to talk with Sarnait to ascertain if qualified. Bethe first met Sarnait, May, 1946, with Ross to Sarnait's qualifications to enter graduate school. Sarnait not qualified and was so advised by Bethe. Bethe recommended Sarnait study to further qualify himself before application could be considered. Bethe claims he told head of Physics Department, Cornell, that he saw no reason to recommend Sarnait and subsequently Sarnait's application refused. Sarnait went to Ithaca, New York, fall 1946, which Bethe considered strange because Sarnait had no job or assurance of acceptance at Cornell. In late fall of 1946, Physics Laboratory, Cornell, began construction of synchrotron and because electrical engineers needed, Sarnait applied for and received job. Bethe claims synchrotron not confidential work and Sarnait had no access to any confidential.
data at Cornell. Only confidential information at Cornell at time SARRAT there was on BETHE's personal consultant contract with AEC, which information maintained in two safes in BETHE's office at Cornell. BETHE claims SARRAT close friend of BRUCE DAYTON, graduate student in physics, Cornell, who BETHE describes as "close to the left". DAYTON described as close friend of a Professor MORRISON of Physics Department, Cornell, and that both DAYTON and MORRISON active in Progressive Party, Ithaca, New York. Professor MORRISON, prior to January, 1950, had access to combination of a safe containing confidential information relating to BETHE's consultant contract with AEC. BETHE denies close relationship with SARRAT, stating has not talked to SARRAT for over one hour during entire time he has known him. Explains BETHE gave present to SARRAT baby because of feeling of obligation for free legal service rendered by ROSS and because of acquaintance of BETHE's wife with Mrs. BRUCE DAYTON, who resided next door to SARRAT. BETHE denies ever knowing or contacting JULIUS ROSENBERG, WILLIAM PERL, JOEL BARR, NIX ELITCHER, NORTON SOEBELL or HARRY GOLD. Denies that any approach in any manner ever made to him on part of any person to furnish information to an apparent espionage agent. Possibility that BETHE may have been target of Russian espionage and given to SARRAT as an assignment in espionage ring presented to BETHE, and he stated that SARRAT did not pursue the development of his friendship and BETHE never got impression that SARRAT wanted technical data nor did SARRAT ever ask for such. BETHE states his impression of SARRAT is that SARRAT is "leftist in his ideology".

- RJC -

DETAILS: AT SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

The following investigation was conducted by Special Agent ROBERT L. LECHWITANA and the writer.
Dr. HANS A. BETHE, 4723 East 36th Street, Seattle, Washington, was interviewed on July 28, 1950. Dr. BETHE has been employed as a summer faculty member of the Physics Department, University of Washington at Seattle. Dr. BETHE advised that he first met VICTOR A. D. ROSS in December, 1945, when ROSS was recommended to him as an attorney by a fellow professor at Cornell, GEORGE WINTNER. ROSS was engaged by BETHE to perform legal services in connection with a purchase of a home in Ithaca. Dr. BETHE states that ROSS did considerable legal work in connection with this matter. BETHE stated that ROSS refused to accept a fee for his legal services in connection with this house purchase and when asked why, ROSS stated that it would be necessary for him to charge Dr. BETHE approximately $1,000.00 if he were adequately paid for his services, and he knew that Dr. BETHE did not desire to pay that large a fee. BETHE stated that it was his impression that ROSS desired his friendship and that this may have been the major reason for refusing a fee. ROSS impressed BETHE as being an individual who sought the friendship of college professors and may have desired BETHE's social acquaintanceship because of BETHE's reputation as a nuclear physicist.

ROSS initiated a social acquaintanceship with Dr. BETHE by inviting the BETHEES to his home, which invitation was returned on one occasion by the BETHEES; however, no close social relationship developed. BETHE stated that ROSS since has drawn up a will for BETHE and performed legal service for BETHE's wife in drawing up a charter for a club to aid an Ithaca hospital in which Mrs. BETHE is interested. BETHE stated that he still maintains a friendly, but definitely not a close relationship with ROSS, stating he has nothing in common with ROSS on which to base a close friendship. BETHE stated that he has paid ROSS for his legal service in connection with this will and charter.

ROSS and BETHE, during the few times they met socially, had violent political discussions, according to BETHE. He stated that he and ROSS thoroughly disagreed on politics and the heated arguments he had with ROSS left BETHE with the impression that ROSS's opinions were very close to the Communist Party line. He further stated it was his impression that ROSS was politically naive. BETHE stated that he has no information to indicate that ROSS is a Communist Party member, but does know that ROSS has been an active supporter of the Progressive Party.
In February, 1946, ROSS told BETHE about his son-in-law, ALFRED SARANT, who at that time was working for Bell Telephone Laboratories at New York City and who was very interested in studying physics. BETHE states that ROSS asked him if he could help SARANT enter Cornell University as a graduate student. BETHE claims he told ROSS that he was not in a position to commit himself to sponsor anybody, but would be glad to talk to SARANT to ascertain if SARANT were sufficiently qualified to enter the graduate school at Cornell. BETHE states that it was not his impression at the time that ROSS was attempting to push him into sponsoring SARANT and that the discussion regarding ROSS' son-in-law was entirely normal and brought up during normal conversations. During approximately May, 1946, BETHE first met SARANT when SARANT was brought to BETHE's office at the University of Cornell by his father-in-law, ROSS. BETHE states that he talked with SARANT at this time for a short time concerning SARANT's qualifications. BETHE claimed that from his discussion with SARANT, it was apparent that SARANT was not qualified to enter the graduate school in physics and that he so advised SARANT. Dr. BETHE advised that he told SARANT it would be necessary for him to further qualify himself before his application could be considered inasmuch as there were many better qualified students who were seeking admission to the graduate school at Cornell and that many students better qualified than he were being refused admittance because of the large number desiring acceptance in this field. BETHE recommended several general physics texts for SARANT to study, but told him that his chances for admission were not good.

Later, BETHE told the head of the Physics Department at Cornell that in regard to SARANT's application, he, BETHE, saw no reason to recommend SARANT and that subsequently SARANT's application was refused. Also concerning SARANT's application, BETHE states that he received a letter from Bell Telephone Laboratories in New York City in which the Bell Telephone Company advised that SARANT had been an agitator in union activities while employed at Bell Telephone Laboratories.

In view of BETHE's refusal to sponsor SARANT's acceptance by the Physics Department at Cornell as a graduate student, he said that he was very surprised when SARANT decided to go to Ithaca anyway in the fall of 1946. He said that he considered it very strange that SARANT
should give up a position with Bell Telephone Laboratories because he
definitely gave SABANT no encouragement and SABANT had no assurance what-
soever of acceptance at Cornell. Further, Dr. BETHE states to his knowledge
SABANT had no promise of any job in Ithaca when he first went there. Several
months later, which Dr. BETHE placed as approximately late fall in November
or December, 1946, the Physics Laboratory at Cornell University began
construction of a synchrotron. He explained that this machine is used
to generate electrons and is in no respect confidential. Electrical
engineers were required for this construction and SABANT applied and
received a position as an electrical engineer. BETHE states that he does
not know how SABANT knew of this position, but states that SABANT used
the Physics Library at Cornell from time to time for individual study
and also was acquainted closely with one GROCE DAYTON, a graduate student
in physics at the University. It was Dr. BETHE's guess that SABANT
probably heard of a possible position on this construction through DAYTON.
DAYTON was described by Dr. BETHE as "close to the left and active in the
Progressive Party".

Dr. BETHE stated that during the time that SABANT was
employed at Cornell, the University had no confidential contracts and
that SABANT had no access to confidential data in his work on the
synchrotron. BETHE stated that the only confidential information of
which he was aware at Cornell University at this time was contained in
various documents relating to a confidential consultant contract which
BETHE has had with the Atomic Energy Commission since the termination
of his duties at Los Alamos, New Mexico, but claims that SABANT had no
access to this information. BETHE stated that DAYTON formerly was
employed at California Technical Institute and may have had access to
classified information at that time which possibly could have been avail-
able to SABANT.

Concerning the confidential information in the possession
of BETHE, he stated that all documents relating to his consultant contract
are now maintained in two safes in his office at Cornell University. The
combination to one safe is known only to himself and the combination to
the other safe is known only to himself and to his secretary, DOROTHY
Snyder. The last mentioned combination was changed by order of the
Atomic Energy Commission in January, 1950, but the previous combination
to this safe was known to Professor FETHIAN and Professor MORRISON.
both of the Physics Department at Cornell. BETHE stated that BETHE probably did not know SARANT and was not close to BRUCE DAYTON, knowing DAYTON only as a graduate student. DOROTHY SHIDER, BETHE's secretary, also did not probably know SARANT and was acquainted with DAYTON only as a graduate student at the University. Dr. BETHE advised, however, that Professor HARRISON was close to BRUCE DAYTON and both were active in the Progressive Party in Ithaca. He stated that this Professor HARRISON was Chairman of the County Progressive Party at Ithaca at that time.

Concerning BETHE's relationship with SARANT, BETHE categorically denied that he had ever maintained any close relationship with ALFRED SARANT, stating that he had probably not talked to SARANT for over a total of an hour in all the time he had known him and that the longest conversation he ever held with SARANT was during the first meeting with him. BETHE denied ever discussing any confidential data with SARANT and further denied that he ever entertained SARANT in his home or was ever in SARANT's home. He stated he could describe his relationship with SARANT as being distantly acquainted with him. He stated, however, that his wife, Mrs. BETHE, was a close friend of Mrs. BRUCE DAYTON, which resulted because Mrs. DAYTON had taught at a nursery school where the BETHE children had attended and that CAROL DAYTON was very much loved by the BETHE children. Mrs. BETHE and Mrs. DAYTON visited back and forth quite a bit and because of the fact that ALFRED SARANT and his wife were next-door neighbors of the DAYTONS, Mrs. BETHE had been in the SARANT home on several occasions, probably with Mrs. DAYTON. BETHE stated that his wife pitied SARANT's wife because Mrs. SARANT was the type of woman who had extreme difficulty in managing her household and was constantly beset with little problems. Dr. BETHE explained that he and his wife had given a present to the SARANTS on the birth of their child because of the feeling of obligation for the free legal service which had been rendered by VICTOR ROSS, SARANT's father-in-law. BETHE stated that he had no idea what the gift had been and is sure that the value was definitely not in any respect equal to the legal service rendered. He stated that his wife took care of this matter.

Dr. BETHE denied ever knowing or contacting JULIUS ROSENBERG, WILLIAM PELL, JOEL BARK, IAA BLITZER, MORTON SOBRICK or HARRY GOLD.
BETHE denied that any approach in any manner has ever been made to him on the part of any person to furnish information to an apparent espionage agent. The possibility that Dr. BETHE may have been a target of Russian espionage and that his development may have been given to SARANT as an assignment in an espionage ring was presented to Dr. BETHE. He stated that SARANT did not pursue the development of his friendship and BETHE never got the impression that SARANT wanted technical data nor did SARANT ever ask for such. He reiterated that he has had hardly any actual contact with SARANT. BETHE states that his impression of SARANT is that SARANT is "leftist in his ideology", which impression he received because of SARANT's association with BRUCE DAYTON and also because of ROSS' views. He further stated that he had no evidence to indicate that SARANT was a Communist and actually had no personal information to indicate that SARANT even sympathized with the Communist Party and that BETHE's impression that SARANT was a "leftist" is based on no actual knowledge on his part. SARANT, according to BETHE, is a frustrated type who gives the impression that he feels that he has never had a chance to perform adequate with his ability; however, according to BETHE, SARANT's technical ability is strictly average.

Dr. BETHE advised that he had no knowledge of any espionage activities on the part of any person except what has appeared recently in the public press and stated that he had no further information concerning ALFRED SARANT.
TO : SAC, New York
FROM : SAC, Albany

SUBJECT: JULIUS ROSENBERG, ET AL
         ESPIONAGE - R

Reurtel this date, enclosed is report of SA WILLIAM C. TOWER,
dated 8-7-50 at Seattle, Washington.

PRB: PAK
65-1659

Enclosure.
MEMO


Mr. Henrich instructed NYO to ask Mr. Saypol just what he is talking about. I told him Mr. Saypol would be contacted and that we would call the Bureau of the results of conversation with him.

WILLIAM M. WHELAN, ASAC

WMW:MFB
MEMO

New York, N.Y.
April 9, 1951.
9:40 a.m.

Mr. L. B. Nichols of the Bureau called and made reference to the publicity in the Washington papers this morning to the effect that U.S. Attorney Irving Saypol is going to launch a big series of arrests, is going to crack down on spies, etc. I advised that I had seen only a little paragraph in the Daily Mirror that Saypol had been interviewed on a radio station last night and had indicated there was going to be more arrests and prosecutions.

Mr. Nichols suggested that I familiarize myself with the situation and that while the Director does not want us to be quoted, if we receive any inquiries we should get across the idea that Mr. Saypol knows more about these things than we do; that they should ask him.

EDWARD SCHEIDT
SAC

ES: GU

For Robert filing 5-1574-8-1602
See my call to him today re:
Saying said Mr.
Saypol was misses.
New York, New York
April 9, 1951

MEMO

Re: SIDNEY KANT
ESPIONAGE - R

At 2 PM on 3/26/51 Mr. WILLIAM DOBBIN, a free lance reporter, who resides in and works in Rockland County, New York, telephoned to advise that at 5 AM on the same date following a complaint that someone was screaming in the Hudson River off a private estate at South Nyack, New York, the South Nyack Police Department had rescued from the river a man whom they had identified as SIDNEY KANT, 34 years old, of 32 Monroe Street in New York City.

Mr. DOBBIN said that he had information which led him to believe that KANT was an attorney; that he had notified the "New York Times" newspaper and that they had sent a reporter around to 32 Monroe Street and it was determined that SIDNEY KANT was a good friend of JULIUS ROSENBERG.

Mr. DOBBIN said that he had spoken to SIDNEY KANT'S wife but that she had not given him any information, except to say that her husband had a friend who started to drown himself in the river, but that when he tried to rescue him KANT, himself, fell in.

Mr. DOBBIN indicated that he had questioned Mrs. KANT regarding the family's friendship with ROSENBERG but that she had insisted that while they knew of ROSENBERG, they did not actually know him.

Chief GEORGE WEKLS, South Nyack Police Department, stated that it had been he who had removed KANT from the river.
that he was in 2 feet of water 10 feet from shore, and in his shirt sleeves. It was obvious that he was very drunk. Chief WEEKS said that KANT is a bill collector, that his father, JULIUS KANT, has a saloon on Main Street in nearby Piermont, and that he has a brother living in Nyack.

Chief WEEKS added that Mr. KANT had been heard wandering around the porch of a home near where he went into the river at about 3:15 AM. He said that his investigation had revealed nothing of a suspicious nature concerning the subject's activities and that it is his theory that the subject was drunk and fell into the river.

JOHN J. McMANUS
Special Agent
CP, USA, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, IS DASH C. DAYLET. "DAILY WORKER", INSTANT DATE IN FRONT PAGE EDITORIAL AGAIN ATTACKS THE IMPOSING OF DEATH SENTENCES FOR THE CONVICTED SPIES, ROSENBERG AND WIFE. EDITORIAL CAPTIONED "THE MEANING OF THE ROSENBERG DEATH SENTENCE", ATTEMPTS TO PLAY UP REPORTED DISAPPROVAL OF SENTENCES BY THE "JEWISH DAILY FORWARD" AND THE JEWISH COMMUNITY. EDITORIAL ATTACKS SENTENCING AS AN ATTEMPT TO LINK OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY WITH ESPIONAGE AND SABOTAGE. EDITORIAL STATES THE NOTION THAT THE ROSENBERGS TURNED THE A BOMB OVER TO RUSSIA IS BASED ON IGNORANCE OF FACT THAT SOVIET SCIENTISTS MADE EARLY ACHIEVEMENTS IN ATOMIC ENERGY FIELD AND IS AIMED AT MANUFACTURING A MYTH THAT THE SOVIET UNION PLANS ATOMIC WAR ON THE UNITED STATES. EDITORIAL ACCUSES JUDGE KAUPMAN OF USING THE ALLEGED ESPIONAGE OF TWO JEWISH CITIZENS TO TURN THE HATRED OF THE FAMILIES OF THE CASUALTIES IN KOREA AWAY FROM THE WAR MAKERS IN WASHINGTON TOWARD THE "JEWS AND COMMUNISTS". IT COMPARES THE SENTENCES WITH THE PARDONING OF GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS. THE EDITORIAL REITERATES DENIAL THAT THE CP ADVOCATES OR ENCOURAGES ESPIONAGE AMONG ITS MEMBERS AND POINTS TO THE PARTY'S CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT OF EXPULSION FOR ENGAGING IN SUCH ACTS. IT DENIED THAT MARXISM AND SOCIALISM ARE MOTIVES FOR DISLOYALTY.
AND ASSERTS THAT MARXIAN SOCIALISM TEACHES THE HIGHEST LOYALTY TO THE NATION THROUGH LOYALTY TO PEACE, LOYALTY TO THE WORKING CLASS, THE NEGRO PEOPLE, AND THE WELFARE OF THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE. IT ASSERTS THE SAVAGERY OF THE ROSENBERG SENTENCES WILL NOT CRUSH THE WILL FOR PEACE OR THE ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE IT FOR OUR NATION. FOR INFORMATION.

SCHIEDT

cc: 65-15348
FPC: ESV (#7)
100-86624
April 10, 1951

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG

ESP-R

(JEROME EUGENE TARTAKOW)

Mr. Henrich contacted ASAC Whelan this morning and made reference to our teletype of 4/9/51 re TARTAKOW. He stated he desired facts on the Bronx charge against TARTAKOW, whether he was sentenced on this charge and whether he was eligible for parole.

I called Mr. Henrich back at 11:30 and advised him this information was all set forth in New York letter to the Bureau dated 4/3/51. He asked me specifically about the charge against him in the Bronx as to whether or not it was a valid charge and would stand up in court. I explained to Mr. Henrich that while we made no specific inquiries of the Bronx District Attorney's Office re this matter, from our general discussions with them it is believed the charge is purely one for the record and would not stand up in court; that it is concerned with an invitation by an individual who signed a complaint for TARTAKOW to visit him in his home. TARTAKOW visited this individual and when he left there were some items of value missing. TARTAKOW was not seen to take these items and it is primarily a circumstantial case involving one witness.

I explained it was our opinion a telephone call by the U.S. Attorney to the Bronx District Attorney would be sufficient to dismiss this indictment and the resultant detainer.

I pointed out to Mr. Henrich that TARTAKOW in 1949 had published and mimeographed a newsletter or pamphlet captioned "Convicts Anonymous" and from a review of this it appears that he is a capable writer and one who would be sufficiently qualified to put out such a publication as "Retort". I stated this brought to our mind whether or not TARTAKOW had sold this idea of "Retort" to BROTHMAN and ROSENBERG or whether they had brought the matter up independently to him.

I pointed out to Mr. Henrich there was a definite recommendation that no payments be made to TARTAKOW while in prison; that he would be too difficult to handle.

Mr. Henrich desirous out comments relative to having the detainer dismissed and I explained to him we were not making any definite recommendations along this line, that it was felt the Bureau would desire to take this matter up with the Department and weigh all the facts and thereby reach a decision.
Memo
NY 65-15318

I said if TARTAKOW is giving us correct information it would be a definite advantage to have him in the Federal House of Detention at a period of time ROSENBERG is there and then to have him lined up to work with the Bureau after his release. I explained further we could not guarantee that he is giving us complete factual information in view of his unsavory background. Mr. Henrich stated he realized this.

I pointed out to Mr. Henrich that TARTAKOW is on two years probation and that this would be a definite lever for control which we would have over him if he were released and were working with us. He asked me if I thought TARTAKOW might write a series of articles that he was working with the FBI after his release and I explained to Mr. Henrich there was no way of telling if he would do this but there again we have the factor of his probation in our favor.

Mr. Henrich stated he believed the Bureau's position in this matter would be passed on to the Department for their consideration in having the U.S. Attorney in New York discuss the removal of the detainer with the Bronx District Attorney and TARTAKOW'S subsequent release from the Federal House of Detention and thereafter being placed on the payroll as a confidential informant at the New York Office, at a recommended rate of $100.00 for a short trial period of time. He said all the facts in this matter would be discussed with the Department so that they could give appropriate consideration to it.

Mr. Henrich will advise us later of definite decision in this matter.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA
April 10, 1951

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESP-R

Call From: Mr. Hennrich to ASAC Whelan, 4/9/51

Mr. Hennrich called with respect to the publicity appearing in New York papers relative to remarks of USA Irving Saypol that there are imminent other arrests in connection with espionage matter. Mr. Hennrich desired to know to what Mr. Saypol referred.

I called Mr. Hennrich back at 11:15 A.M. and advised him Mr. Saypol stated he had been misquoted and that he had referred to prosecutions instead of arrests and specifically referred to the OSCAR JOHN VAGO case and the WILLIAM PERL case which he had been discussing.

Mr. Saypol also advised he meant by his statement to refer to the 30 pending cases being considered by his office under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. Hennrich stated this was all the Bureau needed re this matter.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA

REG:IN
65-15368

cc - 65-15387 (Perl)
-100-55212 (Vago)
New York, N.Y.
April 11, 1951

Memo:

Re: JULIUS ROSENBERG, Et Al;
ESPIONAGE (R)

Concerning the news item which appeared in the
NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR for 4/10/51 quoting a statement
of USA SAYPOL that "We are investigating some espionage
activity which occurred even before the war back to the
late twenties and early thirties and some as recently
as 1948. The ROSENBERG trial is only a part of the
picture."

Mr. SAYPOL said on the afternoon of April 9,
1951, he held a press conference in his office, at which
time he made this statement.

He said that he had in mind the intimidation of
the ROSENBERGS by this type of statement. Also, that he
was speaking of the 30 Internal Security Act of 1950
cases, the ARTHUR ADAMS case and the WILLIAM PERL case.

William F. Norton, SA

WPN: KW
65-15348
April 11, 1951

MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESP-R

O (JEROME TARTAKOW)

Call To: Mr. Brannigan, Bureau, 5:15 P.M., 4/10/51

Advised Mr. Brannigan that I had been contacted by Mr. Henrich earlier in the day at which time Mr. Henrich referred to the report of SA Cummings, dated 9/7/49, page 10, which indicated a warrant was outstanding for TARTAKOW for breaking and entering a camera store. I said Mr. Henrich had the question as to whether this was a separate offense from the case in which the detainer was filed against TARTAKOW and that when I originally talked to Mr. Henrich I pointed out that we were not certain but that it possibly was a separate case.

I said that we had not checked with the Bronx District Attorney's Office on this matter or with the Police Department as we desired to keep it confidential. I said, however, that as long as the question was raised I felt it advisable to check the Bronx Police Department and they had advised us that the warrant which was outstanding for breaking and entering the camera store was the same as the indictment on which the detainer was based.

I told Mr. Brannigan that TARTAKOW had advised us that the detainer filed against him was based on an incident where TARTAKOW had been invited to a friend's home and had left there following which some silverware or other items of value had been missing. However, in checking this matter with the Bronx Police Department we found that TARTAKOW was mistaken and that actually the facts were as follows:

On 10/30/47, Rocco Aufeiro who resides at 2111 Hughes Avenue, Bronx, and owns a photo shop at 2007 Southern Boulevard, Bronx, had reported missing from his store one Graphic, one Cine, one plate holder, one flash unit, one-film holder; that Aufeiro had gone to TARTAKOW'S residence to borrow a camera on 11/2/47 and at that time Aufeiro had spoken to TARTAKOW'S mother and she had loaned him a camera which Aufeiro identified as being one stolen from his camera shop. He thereupon got hold of a policeman and they searched the TARTAKOW residence and found nothing and turned the matter over to two detectives who worked on the case up to 2/13/48 and had been unable to locate TARTAKOW and the camera was then presented to the Bronx District Attorney who in turn presented it to the Grand Jury in the Bronx and obtained an indictment and warrant classes as a cold warrant had been issued. This type of warrant was issued
primarily in order to locate TARAKOW and question him re this matter.
According to the Police Department, the Bronx District Attorney's Office
did not feel they had a good case against TARAKOW.

It should be noted that Auferio and TARAKOW were personal friends
and this was pointed out to Mr. Brannigan.

I explained to Mr. Brannigan that Mr. Henrich had also raised
the question as to a statement in the report of SA William E. Miller,
dated 10/13/49, Phoenix, indicating the sheriff's office in Phoenix was
interested in filing a detainer against TARAKOW. I advised him that
this office had directed a letter to Phoenix Division dated 7/11/50
in which we called attention to the fact that no detainer had been
lodged against TARAKOW by the Phoenix sheriff's office. I said we
had not followed through with Phoenix to see whether they had advised
the sheriff's office of this fact but assumed they had.

I also advised Mr. Brannigan we had discussed the question of
the release of TARAKOW with Mr. Kenton, Parole Officer at the Federal
House of Detention. I pointed out that Mr. Kenton stated he felt that
TARAKOW would have to be released on parole and that the Warden, Mr.
Thompson would not have authority to release him in his own right. I
stated that I had originally told Mr. Henrich that the Warden had
advised us that he could release him himself without going through
regular parole. I said it now appears the Warden was possibly speaking
figuratively indicating that TARAKOW could be released immediately.

Mr. Brannigan advised that this information would be appropriate
for the information the Bureau was preparing with respect to its recom-
mandations concerning this matter.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA
MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESP-R

Call To: Mr. Brannigan, Bureau, 5:00 P.M. 4/10/51

I advised that the U.S. Marshal, SDNY, Mr. Carroll, had informed us a representative of the Bureau of Prisons in Washington had advised him the Department of Correction of New York had reported ETHEL ROSENBERG attempted to commit suicide and that they were anxious to get her out of the Women's House of Detention.

Upon receiving this information we checked with Mrs. Collins of the Women's House of Detention and she said this was not true; that ETHEL had not eaten her dinner last evening and apparently was becoming concerned with respect to her sentence. Mrs. Collins said it had been reported to her that ETHEL had stated she would rather commit suicide than face her sentence but that she had taken no action with respect to this. She said, however, that the Women's House of Detention was anxious to get rid of ETHEL and transfer her to Sing Sing Prison.

I told Mr. Brannigan that Mrs. Collins had emphasized that there had been no actual attempt on the part of ETHEL to commit suicide and also told him that Mr. Carroll stated ETHEL would be transported to Sing Sing Prison on April 11, 1951.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA
MEMO

RE: JULIUS ROSENBERG
ESP-R

(JEROME EUGENE TARTAKOW)

Call To: Mr. Henrich, Bureau, 4/11/51

Called Mr. Henrich's attention to our teletype captioned as above sent to the Bureau last night.

I advised him it was believed advisable for this office to check with the Bronx District Attorney and also for the Phoenix Division to check with the Sheriff's Office at Phoenix to determine the status of the warrants and indictments outstanding against TARTAKOW in order that further consideration may be given to what recommendations could be made with respect to possibly having TARTAKOW released on parole.

Mr. Henrich said this information appeared important and it is possible the Bureau might desire to make a recommendation and for this office to ask Phoenix to cover this lead and suitel as soon as possible. I told him we would handle the investigation immediately.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA
New York, N. Y.
April 11, 1951

Memo:

Re: JULIUS ROSENBERG, Et Al;
ESPIONAGE (R)

Mr. O. JOHN ROGGE, attorney for DAVID GREENGLASS, telephonically advised the writer that on the morning of April 10, 1951, he held a conference with MRS. TESSIE GREENGLASS and EMANUEL BLOCH, attorney for the ROSENBERGS.

The purpose of the conference was to ascertain if BLOCH could arrange a visit for MRS. GREENGLASS with her daughter ETHEL ROSENBERG.

MR. BLOCH advised MR. ROGGE that his clients, the ROSENBERGS, have always protested their innocence, and that he abides by what they say, and that he cannot disbelieve them when they protest their innocence.

MR. ROGGE requested that MR. BLOCH approach ETHEL ROSENBERG to ascertain if she would be willing to accept a visit from her mother. MR. BLOCH told MR. ROGGE he would present the request to his client and would advise MR. ROGGE.

MR. BLOCH was to advise MR. ROGGE on the afternoon of April 10, 1951 as to the desire of MRS. ROSENBERG.

MR. ROGGE had not heard from BLOCH by six o'clock, April 10, 1951.

William F. Norton, 65-15348
April 11, 1951

Mr. Richard E. Eggleton,
Post Office Inspector in Charge
General Post Office
8th Avenue and 33rd Street
New York 1, New York

Dear Sir:

This office is in receipt of a postcard addressed to Judge Irving R. Kaufman, U. S. District Court, Southern District of New York, by Mrs. ANNA CLINE, Fargo, North Dakota, which was forwarded to this office by Judge Kaufman.

In view of the fact that this communication contains no threats, it has been suggested by United States Attorney Irving H. Saypol that this card be forwarded to you for your examination as to the possibility of the violation of postal regulations.

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Scheidt,
Special Agent in Charge

Enc.

WPN: KW
65-15348
April 11, 1951

HELO:

Re: JULIUS ROSENBERG; ET AL
ESPIONAGE - R

U.S. Marshal CARROLL advised the writer that he had received a telephone call from the Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C., that they had been advised by the Department of Correction, New York City, that ETHEL ROSENBERG, who is presently incarcerated in the Women's House of Detention, New York City, was causing a great deal of disturbance in that penal institution, and also, that she had attempted to commit suicide. In view of the fact that she is a Federal prisoner and not a State or City prisoner, it would cause embarrassment to the Department of Correction if she did commit suicide. It was therefore, suggested to the Bureau of Prisons that she be removed to Sing Sing as soon as possible.

Mr. CARROLL stated that he would remove ETHEL ROSENBERG to Sing Sing on the afternoon of April 11, 1951.

The writer telephonically contacted Miss RUTH COLLINS, Warden of the Women's House of Detention, New York City, to ascertain the circumstances surrounding the alleged attempt at suicide by ETHEL ROSENBERG. Miss COLLINS advised that ETHEL ROSENBERG, in the confines of her cell, cries quite frequently and on the evening of April 9, 1951 she refused to eat her supper. Also, on that evening, ETHEL ROSENBERG was overheard to say to another inmate that she would rather kill herself than face the electric chair, and that she dreaded each day because it brought her that closer to her punishment. ETHEL ROSENBERG further stated that she "must help her husband."

Miss COLLINS was unable to explain this last statement. Miss COLLINS advised that ETHEL ROSENBERG has made no attempt to take her life.
This information was also furnished to United States Attorney IRVING H. SAYPOL, Southern District of New York.

ROBERT R. GRANVILLE, SA
Honorable Albert Goldman

Postmaster
U.S. Post Office
33rd St. & 8th Ave.
New York, I, N.Y.

April 12, 1951

Dear Sir:

In connection with an investigation being conducted by this Bureau, it is requested that a cover be placed on all mail, including special delivery and registered mail, of the following for a period of thirty days:

JULIUS ROSENBERG & ETHEL ROSENBERG
10 Monroe Street
New York 2, N.Y.

☐ return cards
☐ tracings

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Special Charge

WPN: JM 2
607 U.S. Court House
Foley Square
New York 7, New York

65-15348

April 13, 1951

Honorable Albert Goldman

Postmaster
U.S. Post Office
33rd St. & 8th Ave.
New York 1, N.Y.

Dear Sir:

In connection with an investigation being conducted by this Bureau, it is requested that a cover be posted on all mail, including special delivery and registered mail, of the following for a period of thirty days:

JULIUS COHEN
LENA COHEN
140 Baruch Place
New York City, 2, NY

☐ return cards
☐ tracings

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Special Agent in Charge

WN: JM

65-15348-1625