A complete review of the files of our New York Office and of those at the Seat of Government has now been completed to establish what basis Bernstein had for stating that he had carried on certain activities in association with the FBI.

At the SGC the Appellate Court and Supreme Court decisions in the cases of U.S. vs. Goldstein, U.S. vs. Weiss, and U.S. vs. Nardone were reviewed for this purpose.

It has been ascertained that in the case of U.S. vs. Weiss, Bernstein, as attorney for a group of insurance companies, developed sufficient information to warrant the prosecution of some 75 subjects under the mail fraud statutes. He presented the evidence which he had developed including evidence secured through the operation of wire taps at the office of the U.S. Attorney in the Southern District Court of New York. The U.S. Attorney turned
the evidence over to Post Office Inspectors who without further investigation recommended prosecution. In connection with the prosecution the FBI was called into the case for two specific reasons: (1) to perform all accounting work, (2) to conduct an intimidation of witnesses investigation. In the latter instance agents of our New York Office conferred on January 7, 1938, with an Assistant U.S. Attorney and Nahum Bernstein. Subsequently, through Bernstein an informant was introduced to an agent of our New York Office and arrangements were made for the informant to meet a New York Agent at Bernstein's home. Thereafter on one occasion the informant arranged to have a telephone conversation which he conducted with a subject recorded in Bernstein's office. After the recording was made the informant turned the record over to our New York Office. No other information was developed showing any association between Bernstein and the FBI either in the Weiss case or any other matter.

It is presumed that Bernstein's statement regarding his having associated with the FBI was based on the above facts. It should be noted specifically that the case involved was not a matter under the primary jurisdiction of this Bureau and that we were called into the case for two specific reasons only by the office of the U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of New York.

In transmitting the material on Bernstein to the Bureau, therefore, it is not considered necessary either to deny Bernstein's statement, comment upon it, or explain it.

(NY tel to Bureau 4-10-51, Bernstein case; 36-2219-1472-313)

Action:

This memorandum is prepared for record purposes. No further action is contemplated with respect to this matter.
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CHARACTER OF CASE
ESPIONAGE - IS

NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was.

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:
Presiding Judge at Woodbury, N.J., in ADOLPH SCHWIMMER'S civil suit ruled there was no cause for action and gave verdict in favor of defendant.

R U C

DETAILS:
At Bridgeton, New Jersey

the Cumberland County Court of Common Pleas, advised that Judge ELMER B. WOODS, on April 11, 1951, in the civil action in which ADOLPH SCHWIMMER was a defendant, rendered a verdict in favor of the defendant on the basis that there was no cause for action.
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EX. 97

SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE

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.
One copy of this report is being furnished to the Washington Field Office for information, pursuant to the instructions contained in New York teletype to Bureau, Washington Field and Newark, 1/12/51.

TO:    DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM:  SAC, LOS ANGELES
SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was; ESPIONAGE - IS
        (File 65-59184)

Rebulet to New York dated 4/10/51.

The indices of the Los Angeles Office failed to reflect any
information concerning BERNSTEIN under the alias of NED BERNEY.

RUC.
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Washington Field
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PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
**FBI Blues No. 1**

**This case originated at:**

**New York**

**File No.** 65-2410

---

**Report Made At:**

**Miami, Florida**

**Date When Made:**

6-4-51

**Period for Which Made:**

5-3-22-51

**Report Made By:**

ms

**Character of Case:**

Espionage - Is

---

**Synopsis of Facts:**

No long-distance toll calls made by subject from Palm Beach, Florida.

---

**Details:**

**At Palm Beach, Florida.**

Mayflower Hotel, advised that the subject had occupied Room 402 from March 18, 1951, to March 24, 1951, and had occupied Room 515 from March 24, 1951, to March 25, 1951. He gave as his home address 136 East 67th Street, New York City, New York, and made no toll calls while in the hotel.

It is noted the Mayflower Hotel has been closed for the off season since April 15, 1951.

---

**Copy in File**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Bureau (65-59184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New York (65-15301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Copies of this report destroyed:**

R 3 2 NOV21 1960

**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.**

---
ADMINISTRATIVE PAGE

He is a New York attorney who has been active in the affairs of Israel and the predecessor state of Palestine. He was born and educated in New York City. Background information set forth. In interview in 1948 he admitted that he handled funds for the purchase of arms on behalf of the Jewish Agency in Palestine.
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANT of known reliability, made available the following background information concerning NAHUM BERNSTEIN:

He was born on September 5, 1907 at New York City. His mother was JENNIE BERNSTEIN, nee Steinberg, and his father CHARLES BERNSTEIN. Both of his parents were born in Russia. NAHUM BERNSTEIN received his primary education in the New York Public School System, and subsequently attended the College of the City of New York, from which institution he obtained a B.S. Degree in Social Science in 1929. In 1931 he graduated from Columbia University Law School with the degree of LL.B. He was admitted to the bar in the State of New York on June 13, 1932. From the date of his birth in 1907 until the present time, he has resided in the New York City area. He presently resides at 136 East 67th Street, New York City with his wife and two children. He is a partner in the law firm of Silver and Bernstein, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York. His partner, EDWARD SILVER, is also the Chief Assistant in the District Attorney's Office, Kings County, New York.

On March 31, 1950, the law firm of Silver and Bernstein sent out the following announcement:
"We announce the opening of an Israeli office at 26 Rothschild Boulevard, Tel Aviv. Mr. Arnon R. Aronsky of the Israeli Bar is Counsel in Charge."

This announcement was signed by four members of the firm of Silver and Bernstein, namely Edward S. Silver, Nahum Bernstein, George H. Kaplan, and Donald R. Seawell.

On January 13, 1948, Nahum Bernstein was interviewed by SAS of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On the occasion of this interview, Bernstein advised that in November of 1947, he received a telephone call from one whom he had known for some years as one like himself who was active in Zionist affairs. On the occasion of this meeting, Bernstein was requested to assist him in a project which had as its aim the acquiring of a stock pile of material for eventual shipment to Palestine.

Informed Bernstein that he had consented to assist in this project and that now it was necessary that a reputable, well-known person act as Disbursing Officer for the funds available to finance this project. Bernstein requested Bernstein to function in this capacity. Bernstein advised that he agreed to do so. Further indicated to Bernstein that the sum of $750,000.00 was available to finance this project, and that such funds would be made available by the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

According to Bernstein, shortly after his talk, he received a verification of this proposition from the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Told Bernstein that when purchases were made by either himself or his associates, Bernstein would be notified of the amount of money necessary for the particular transaction and that Bernstein should then request to forward a check to him for this amount. Bernstein would, in turn, issue a check for the same amount to the payee named. According to Bernstein, the above outlined plan was followed in connection with the purchase of materials.
On May 12, 1948, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was again interviewed at his office at 20 Pine Street, New York, New York, by SAS of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

On the occasion of this interview, BERNSTEIN advised that he, as an attorney, had been called upon on numerous occasions by various sections of the Jewish Agency for Palestine for legal advice in matters pertaining to their operations. He stated that in the Fall of 1947, it was decided by the policy level members to instigate an organization that could, if Palestine was partitioned, step in and relieve the other governments of considerable effort and manpower.

It was decided, according to BERNSTEIN that certain funds should be allocated for the purchase of aircraft. A. W. SCHWIMMER was designated as the individual who should purchase and reconvert whatever aircraft was believed necessary to institute a fair-sized airline. Approximately $120,000.00 was deposited with BERNSTEIN, which funds came from the Jewish Agency for Palestine. At the request of SCHWIMMER, BERNSTEIN would forward whatever money the former requested.

In January, 1950, ADOLPH W. SCHWIMMER was tried in the United States District Court, Southern California Division, in the case entitled, "The United States vs. Schwimmer and Others". The trial involved ADOLPH W. SCHWIMMER and five other individuals, who were charged with conspiracy to violate the Neutrality Act and the Export Control Act by smuggling aircraft to Israel. As a result of this trial, three individuals, namely ADOLPH W. SCHWIMMER, LEON GARDNER, and MAX SELK, were convicted and fined $10,000.00 each for conspiracy to violate the United States Neutrality Act. Three other defendants were acquitted by the jury.

On January 15, 1950, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was called as a witness by the defense in this case. In response to a question by the court as to what the defense intended to prove by this witness, the defense lawyers, namely ISAAC PACHT and WILLIAM STRONG replied, "Everything... that the whole plan of operation of the formation of airways were under BERNSTEIN'S supervision. The setting up of the plan, purchase of the planes, the Panamanian situation....everything".

- 4 - TOP SECRET
In answer to a question by Mr. Pacht, Bernstein replied that he was the legal representative of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, which he explained was an agency created and recognized by the old League of Nations. Mr. Pacht in his questioning of Bernstein showed that the Jewish Agency for Palestine financed the entire project of the purchase of aircraft under the direction of Bernstein, and that the defendants in the case were merely agents.

Bernstein pointed out that at the suggestion of one he took over the general supervision of handling the funds and again agreed to contact one of the defendants, Schwimmer to head up a project of acquired aircraft.

Confidential informant of known reliability, advised that on November 5, 1950, who at that time was visiting in the United States, contacted Nahum Bernstein and made arrangements to be at the residence of Nahum Bernstein on that date.
NAHUM BERNSTEIN is presently listed as Secretary of Israel Speaks, Inc., which corporation publishes a bimonthly publication known as Israel Speaks. This is the successor to the organization known as Americans for Haganah, Inc.

-PENDING-
The Confidential Informants mentioned in the report of SA dated June 5, 19__ at New York, New York, are identified as follows:

Anonymous.

Copies of this report have been designated for the information of the Washington Field, Los Angeles and Newark Offices because they in the past have conducted investigation relative to the subject of this investigation and it is believed information in this report should be made available to these offices.
SAC, New York

Director, FBI

NARUM BERNSTEIN, was. Espionage - IS

Rebatelet 4-10-51 requesting information regarding the possibility that captioned subject may be carrying on covert activities under the name of Ned Berney.

You are requested to advise what progress has been made in the handling of this matter to date.

ERW: huh

June 22, 1951
TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, New York

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was. ESPIONAGE - IS

Rebutals to New York 4/10/51 and 6/22/51.

A mail cover has been maintained under the name of NED BERNEY, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York, for the past two and a half months. Up to the present time no mail of any nature has been addressed to NED BERNEY at this address. This mail cover is continuing. There is no other information in the files of the New York Office relative to NED BERNEY other than that information which has already been made available by the Bureau and which has been, in turn, reported by the New York Office.

A review of information obtained from confidential sources relative to Israeli matters has been made by this office. No information has been obtained relative to the name NED BERNEY. This office will continue to be on the alert for any information relative to this individual.

The New York telephone directory for Manhattan contains the name NED BERNEY with a business address at 20 Pine Street, New York, New York. This listing does not indicate that NED BERNEY is an attorney. In this same directory it is noted that NAHUM BERNSTEIN has listed both his residence address and his business address, with the notation alongside his business address "Attorney." The telephone listing for NED BERNEY at his business address and for NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his address as an attorney are one and the same.

Martindale, Hubbell Law Directory has been reviewed and there is no listing of an attorney by the name of NED BERNEY. This same directory does list NAHUM BERNSTEIN as an attorney at 20 Pine Street, New York, New York.

There is no indication up to the present time in the investigation of NAHUM BERNSTEIN that he has at any time used the name NED BERNEY. This office will remain alert to any indication that BERNSTEIN is carrying on activities under this name. Furthermore, efforts will be made to ascertain if there is, in fact, an individual by the name of NED BERNEY employed by the law firm of Silver and Bernstein.

cc: Los Angeles
Washington Field

DES: EPK
65-15301
SAC, New York

Director, FBI

NAME REDACTED, WAC.

ESPIONAGE - JP

July 9, 1951

New York letter 6-6-51.

For the information of the New York and Washington Field Offices, there is attached one copy of a memorandum which the Bureau has addressed under date of July 9, 1951. The reply furnished in this matter will be made available when received.

65-59184
Attachment

cc - Washington Field
Attachment

LJB

3/28/54 SP[21873]176

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREBIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 4/17/52 BY 9603 ADD RSL

RECORDED - 137

RJ. - 49

JUL 11 1951

FBI
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, New York

DATE: June 6, 1951

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, with aliases
ESPIONAGE - IS
(Brief file 65-59184)


A review has been made of the files in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, entitled United States vs. Mardone, United States vs. Weiss, and United States vs. Goldstein. It was found that the records on file in the Clerk's Office for the United States Court, Southern District of New York, did not contain a transcript of the minutes of any one of these three trials.

A further check was made with the Clerk of the Court of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, located at Foley Square, New York City. In the case entitled United States of America against Maximeilian W. Goldstein, Benjamin Schwartz, there were located the minutes of the trial and the testimony given by NAHUM BERNSTEIN in a preliminary hearing on wire tapping evidence. Three photostatic copies of the pertinent testimony have been made, and there are enclosed for the Bureau and WFO a copy of this testimony. One copy will be retained in the New York files. EXPEDITE PROCEDURE.

It will be noted that the very beginning of the testimony, which had been photostated starts out with the notation, "The reading of the testimony was resumed by Mr. Denby as follows," and then the testimony of NAHUM BERNSTEIN is set forth. This testimony, which runs from page 167 through page 263, was testimony as given by NAHUM BERNSTEIN in a pre-trial hearing in the case United States vs. Weiss. It had been stipulated by the attorneys for the Government and the attorneys for the defense that it would not be necessary to call the witnesses to testify to the same matter that they testified to in the Weiss case, and for this reason this testimony was read into the record in the case of United States vs. Goldstein. This is also true in regard to the testimony that appears relative to SYLVIA SCHWARTZ which is contained in the minutes of the trial of United States vs. Goldstein, page 264 through page 275.

The testimony that was included in the minutes of the case entitled United States vs. Goldstein, page 436 through page 479, was testimony actually given by NAHUM BERNSTEIN in the pre-trial hearing on wire tap evidence in that case. The minutes of the trial United States vs. Weiss in the Clerk's Office of

DES: RAA
65-15301

Enclosure

cc - Washington Field (Enc.)
the Circuit Court of Appeals did not contain the testimony of NAHUM BERNSTEIN as given in that case pre-trial hearing, but it appears that this testimony has been quoted verbatim in the Goldstein case. The minutes of the case United States vs. Nardone as contained in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Appeals did not contain any testimony by NAHUM BERNSTEIN.

It will be noted that in the course of BERNSTEIN'S testimony he testified that a party by the name of SIMPSON, who was employed by the Harley Detective Agency, was in fact the one who actually installed the microphones and was engaged in tapping the telephone. In the course of the pre-trial testimony several of the records were played back for the benefit of the Court. Mr. SIMPSON was called upon to operate the recording machines. LLOYD PAUL STRYKER, who was attorney for the defense, requested that the gentleman who was going to operate the machines be identified. He was finally identified as ROBERT R. SIMPSON and he was placed under oath by the Court. He was asked by the Court if he was requested to come by the United States Attorney, and he replied, "By Mr. Dailey," who was in fact one of the Assistant United States Attorneys in this trial. He was also asked by the Court by whom he was employed, and he replied by Mr. HARLEY, whose place of business was at 122 East 42nd Street, New York City. Mr. STRYKER asked him what kind of business they were engaged in, and Mr. SIMPSON said it was a detective agency. Mr. STRYKER asked SIMPSON, "Is it a private detective agency and a licensed detective agency?" Mr. IRVING KAUFMAN, the Assistant United States Attorney, said, "It is not a detective agency." But in reply to a question by Mr. STRYKER as to whether Mr. HARLEY was a licensed detective, SIMPSON advised that he was in fact a licensed detective.
RECORDED 183-93184
EX-130 65-5-9/24-1

Date: July 9, 1951

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

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: NAHUL BERNSTEIN, was.
ESPINAGE - 18

cc - New York
Washington Field

TOP SECRET.

Classified by 9/7/51
Declassify on 9/7/51

PERSIAI AND CONFIDENTIAL
VIA LIAISON

Classified by 9/14/51
Declassify on 9/14/51

Recorded: 65-5-9/24-1
In view of this, and in consideration of Nahum Bernstein's important position in the United States and his claimed knowledge in the field of wire tapping, we have conducted a review of the Appellate and Supreme Court decisions in the Goldstein, Nardone, and Weiss cases, to establish if possible, the extent of Bernstein's knowledge and proclivity in this field. The review of the Higher Court decisions in these three cases failed to produce the information we require.

Since the cases had been tried originally in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the files of the Clerk's Office for that Court were reviewed in an effort to locate a transcript of the proceedings of any one of these three trials. No transcript was located.

In the office of the Clark of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, a transcript of the proceedings at a preliminary hearing on wire tapping evidence was located among the records in the case of U.S. versus Goldstein. During testimony by Bernstein at this preliminary hearing, he admitted that he was not a technician. At one point he was trying to explain how technical coverage of a telephone was affected by use of an extension telephone. When asked what this thing was, he answered, "that is the technical part I don't know." Asked whether he saw this thing installed on the receiver, he replied, "I may have, but I didn't understand it."

At another point in his testimony Bernstein made a statement which may assist in appraising his claim regarding his planning and directing four fictitious business establishments, one of which was in the textile field. It was brought out during the preliminary hearing that an office at 280 Broadway, New York City, was the point at which a microphone was installed. The office was called Yardley Fabrics to give the appearance
that it was a textile firm. Bernstein explained, "there was a genuine business known as Yardley Fabrics and we called this place Yardley Fabrics so if they checked in the phone book they could find such a place."

You are requested to treat the information set forth above on a strictly confidential basis and to make no further dissemination of these data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT MADE AT</th>
<th>DATE WHEN MADE</th>
<th>PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE</th>
<th>REPORT MADE BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>4/26/51</td>
<td>2/9-4/16/51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHARACTER OF CASE**

ESPIONAGE - IS

**SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:**

NAHUM BERNSTEIN spent two weeks in Florida during March, 1941. He has attempted to contact TED KOLLEK. His law firm may open an office in Washington, D.C.

BERNSTEIN continues to receive much correspondence from Israel. Other correspondence received set out. Other contacts made listed.

**DETAILS:**

The following information concerning the activities and contacts of NAHUM BERNSTEIN was made available by Confidential Informant of known reliability, who is in a position to report the contacts and activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN:

On February 19, 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was contacted by an individual advised BERNSTEIN that he was leaving for Israel the following Sunday and that he wanted to see BERNSTEIN before he left. Arrangements were made for BERNSTEIN to see him on the following day.

**APPROVED AND FORWARDED:**

[Signature]

**COPY IN FILE:**

[Signature]

**COPIES OF THIS REPORT**

- Bureau (65-59184)
- Los Angeles (Info.)
- Miami
- Newark (Info.)
- Washington Field (Info.)
- New York
mentioned that he had read an article in the "Israeli Digest" of February 19, 1951, about gift certificates whereby a New York firm, Eastman Clothing Company, with the approval of the Israeli Government will sell gift certificates. Bernstien was concerned about how that might effect a plan that he and Bernstein were evidently involved in. Bernstein termed the article in the "Israeli Digest" a limited appeal project and made light of it.

At the same time that Bernstein was talking to, he advised him that he had been at an executive meeting of Material for Israel and had talked of the Defense Section of the Israeli Supply Mission.

On February 22, 1951, (phonetic) contacted Nahum Bernstein. On that occasion, advised that he was now with the National Production Board. Bernstein was very much interested in hearing this and invited to come up to see him. Bernstein volunteered the information that he was thinking of opening an office in Washington, D. C.

On March 18, 1951, Nahum Bernstein and his two children departed for a vacation at West Palm Beach, Florida. It was indicated at that time that they were going to stay at the Mayflower Hotel in West Palm Beach, Florida.

On March 23, 1951, contacted the residence of Nahum Bernstein and advised that she could be contacted at the Hotel York in New York City. She wanted Mrs. Bernstein to contact her in the near future.

On March 31, 1951, according to the informant, Nahum Bernstein and his two children returned from their stay at West Palm Beach, Florida.

According to this same informant, on April 11, 1951, Nahum Bernstein attempted to contact Ted Kollek, Israeli Minister in the United States, but Kollek was not at his residence at that time.
On April 14, 1951, this informant advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN contacted the law firm of Fulton, Walter and Halley and advised that he wanted to get in touch with on a purely social matter, the Kefauver Committee.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN received the following correspondence which appears pertinent to this investigation, at his place of business, 20 Pine Street, New York City:

**FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE**

- Date: February 7, 14, 21; March 5 and 19, 1951
February 7, 1951

Addressor

Israel Industries, Inc., Box 2876, Tel Aviv, Israel

February 7, 1951

Addressor

Bank of Montreal, Halifax, Nova Scotia

February 7, 26; and March 5, 1951

Addressor

Szekely-Hoffmann and Company, Jabotinski Street, Tel Aviv, Israel

February 8 and 19, 1951

Addressor

Rahmani Trading Corporation, 17 East 5th Street, New York, New York

February 28 and April 5, 1951

Addressor

Union Bank and Trust Company, 8th and Hill Streets, Los Angeles, California

March 19, 1951

Addressor

Riggs National Bank, 1503 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Washington, D. C.

February 9, 1951

Addressor

Strong and Schwartz, 9141 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California
NY 65-15301

Date                      Addressor
February 12, 1951         National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C.
February 12, 1951         Material for Israel, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York City
February 18, 27; March 6, 20, 27; April 1, 5, 10, and 11, 1951
February 14, 1951         Corn Exchange Bank and Trust Company, Lexington Avenue and 60th Street, New York, New York
February 15, 1951         American Fund for Palestinian Institutions, Inc., 267 West 71st Street, New York 23, New York
February 16; March 20; and April 6, 1951
February 16, 1951         Self-selected Parcel Service, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York, New York
February 17, 1951         Common Council for American Unity, 20 West 40th Street, New York City
February 17, 1951
February 20; March 31 and April 13, 1951
February 21 and March 1, 1951

-5-
NY 65-15301

February 26, 1951

The Cumberland County Court,
DAVID L. HORWITZ, Judge, Court
Chambers, 26 South Laurel Street,
Bridgeton, New Jersey

March 1, 27 and
30, 1951

JOSEPH LANN, 37 Wall Street,
New York, New York

March 13, 1951

Landseas Products Corporation,
39 Broadway, New York, New York

March 20 and
April 6, 1951

7th Zionist District, 41 East 42nd
Street, New York, New York

March 20, 1951

Government of Israel Supply
Mission, 250 West 57th Street, New
York, New York

March 29, 1951

Inland Machinery and Metals
Corporation, 245 Fifth Avenue, New
York City

April 9, 1951

- PENDING -

CONFIDENTIAL
LEADS

[MIAMI] X(u)

[At West Palm Beach, Florida] X(u)

Will obtain the toll calls from the Hotel Mayflower where NAHUM BERNSTEIN is known to have spent his vacation from March 18 to March 31, 1951.

[NEW YORK] X(u)

[At New York, New York] X(u)

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with his Israeli activities.

Copies of this report have been designated for the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices for information as those offices are currently engaged in investigation of Israeli activities. It is, therefore, felt that information contained in this report should be made available to those offices.

One copy of this report has been designated for the information of the Newark Office since it is known that NAHUM BERNSTEIN has a summer residence at Pompton Lakes, New Jersey.
The Confidential Informants mentioned in the report of SA[unreadable] dated April 26, 1951 at New York, are identified as follows:

Mail cover on mail received by NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his place of business, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York.

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

DATE OF REMOVAL 8-2-51

DATE OF MAIL 7-10-51

FILE NUMBER 65-57187-63

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT

3906366-1 caller 9-127-701
BERNSTEIN sold his summer home at Pompton Lakes, N.J., and is spending the summer at a cottage at Bellport, L.I. He has attended a luncheon of Material For Israel and has been in the company of [person]. He remains active in affairs of Israel. He has been contacted by National Lawyers Guild. Correspondence received by BERNSTEIN listed.

Confidential Informant [Redacted] of known reliability, advised that the National Lawyers Guild contacted NAHUM BERNSTEIN and attempted to interest him in a health insurance plan that was being put forth by the National Lawyers Guild. BERNSTEIN, according to the Informant, indicated that he was not interested in such a plan at this time. This same Informant advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN and his wife MAXINE intended to attend a luncheon on May 12, 1951. This same Informant advised that on May 12, 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN did attend a luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, which was sponsored by the organization, Material For Israel.
NY 65-15301

This Informant also advised that on this same date, BERNSTEIN met with DAVID-BEN-GURION, Prime Minister of Israel, who on that occasion was visiting New York City.

On June 21, 1951, this Informant advised that NAHUM-BERNSTEIN and his wife MAXINE intended to spend the summer at a cottage they had rented at Bellport, Long Island. It was also ascertained through information supplied by this Informant, that BERNSTEIN had sold the summer cottage that he owned at Pompton Lakes, New Jersey.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised NAHUM-BERNSTEIN received the following correspondence, that appears pertinent to this investigation, at his place of business, c/o Silver and Bernstein, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Addressor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 1951</td>
<td>Material for Israel, 250 West 57th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jay Transfer Company, 115 King Street, Brooklyn, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Bank and Trust Company of Los Angeles, Eighth and Hill Streets, Los Angeles, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 1951</td>
<td>Seventh Zionist District, 41 East 42nd Street, New York 17, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 1951</td>
<td>Wyandotte Hotel, Great South Bay, Bellport, Long Island, NY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 1951</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Department, Division of Disbursement, Washington 25, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1951</td>
<td>Israeli Consulate, 11 East 70th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 1951</td>
<td>Embassy of Israel, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1951</td>
<td>Material for Israel, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1951</td>
<td>Food Line to Israel, 38 East 57th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Addressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1951</td>
<td>Landseas Products Corporation, 39 Broadway, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1951</td>
<td>State of Israel, Ministry of Finance, Jerusalem, Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1951</td>
<td>Pacht Tannenbaum and Ross, 9700 Wilshire Blvd., Beverly Hills, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 1951</td>
<td>Pacht Tannenbaum and Ross, 9700 Wilshire Blvd., Beverly Hills, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 1951</td>
<td>National Lawyers Guild, 902 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 1951</td>
<td>Landseas Products Corporation, 39 Broadway, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 1951</td>
<td>Landseas Products Corporation, 39 Broadway, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 1951</td>
<td>Material for Israel, 250 West 57th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 1951</td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 1951</td>
<td>Israeli Consulate, 11 East 70th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1951</td>
<td>Embassy of Israel, Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1951</td>
<td>El Al, P.O. Box 438, Tel-Aviv, Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1951</td>
<td>Commonwealth Plastics, Leonminster, Massachusetts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1951</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2876, Tel-Aviv, Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1951</td>
<td>Mrs. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, 220 West 58th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1951</td>
<td>Honorable T. Vincent Quinn, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, 1951</td>
<td>Progressive Israel Products, 38 West 88th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 1951</td>
<td>Coastal Machinery Company, 1775 Broadway, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16, 1951</td>
<td>Ultramart International Corporation, 200 West 57th Street, New York, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All information on this page is classified unless indicated otherwise.**
Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that no correspondence, which appears pertinent to this investigation, was received by NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his residence, 136 East 67th Street, New York, New York, from April 16th through August 10, 1951.

-PENDING-

CONFIDENTIAL
Mail Cover received by NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his place of business, 20 Pine Street, N.Y., N.Y.
Mail Cover on mail received by NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his residence, 136 East 67th Street, New York, New York.

MISCELLANEOUS

Copies of this report have been designated for the Los Angeles and Washington Field Office because it is known that those offices are presently engaged in the investigation of Israeli activities. It is felt that information contained in this report should be made available to those offices.

LEAD

New York

At New York, New York:

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with his Israeli activities.

TO: Director, FBI

FROM: SAC, New York

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN; ESPIONAGE - IS

DATE: September 11, 1951

On September 6, 1951, [redacted] who has been in contact in the past with NAHUM BERNSTEIN and who listed NAHUM BERNSTEIN as the person to whom he was coming when he entered the United States, was in contact with [redacted], a known Soviet espionage agent who is the subject of the current investigation ESPIONAGE - I. On that occasion [redacted] stated that a mutual friend in Israel had requested that [redacted] meet [redacted]. The name of this person was not disclosed, but it is known that [redacted] suggested that [redacted] contact her at the Hotel York, New York City, where she and her husband are residing.

[Redacted] appears to be identical with the individual of the same name who is mentioned in the case entitled ESPIONAGE - G, in the report of ASAC Wayne S. Murphy at Honolulu dated 4-11-45. On page 2 of this report it is stated that a Mr. and Mrs. LAJB ITELESON owned a home in Palestine located at 35 Montefiore Street, Tel Aviv; that LAJB ITELESON was in 1945, about 70 years of age; that his wife's name was ESTERA, also known as ANNA ITELESON, and that she was, in 1945, about 67 years of age.

It was also indicated that LAJB ITELESON owned and operated a silk stocking manufacturing plant at Rheims, France, and in 1939 the ITELESONS all resided in Paris, France.

[Redacted] According to this report, in May, 1939, [redacted] was residing in his father's house in Paris; however, shortly before the war broke out in 1939 he was reported to have returned to Palestine where he maintained a residence at his father's house there.

Mr. and Mrs. LAJB ITELESON

According to the information obtained in 1945, the ITELESON family maintained a residence in Paris at 113-B Rue de la Tour, Paris 16, France.

[Redacted] are presently being checked out by this office at the Hotel York, where they are known to temporarily reside. The Bureau will be kept informed of any further developments concerning their activities.

INDEXED: 113
RECORDED: 113

DES: RAA
65-15301

EX: 74
DATE:  September 6, 1951
TO:  Director
     Central Intelligence Agency
     2430 E Street, Northwest
     Washington, D. C.

FROM:  John Edgar Hoover - Director
        Federal Bureau of Investigation

RE:  NAHUM BERNSTEIN, M.D.
      ESPIONAGE - IS

Your reply in this matter would be appreciated.

DECLASSIFIED BY:  23X1
DECLASSIFIED ON:  3/6/94

RECORDED - 127  65-
8SEPI 1951
EX-5

SECRET

52 SEP 20 1951
DATE OF MAIL (7-8-51)

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1735

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

DATE OF REMOVAL (9-26-51)

FILE NUMBER 65-59184-70

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
DATE OF MAIL (2-12-87)

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

FILE NUMBER 665-59187-77

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
SAC, New York

Director, FBI

LEO M. BERNSTEIN, was.

ESPIONAGE - IS

Reftets 4/10/51 and 6/22/51 and New York let
7/5/51 concerning the possibility of Bernstein's carrying
on covert activities under the name of Ned Berney.

Advise what developments have occurred in
this matter and when the results will be included in an
investigative report.

65-59164

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED.

DATE: 4/6/51 BY 9603-26/06/51
339-539

3/28/51 5P/2875/80
339-539

11/15/51 602501 606/06/51
9V4 9149

October 2, 1951
The Bureau has received from the Department of the Army two loyalty forms indicating that Bernstein and his law associate, Donald Ray Seawell, were appointed on May 16 last to positions as consultants, Office, Secretary of the Army. This matter has been taken up via liaison channels with C-5 in an effort to determine the nature of Bernstein's and Seawell's duties and to secure further additional information which may assist the Bureau in its investigation of Bernstein.
2 October 1951

Received extract from 201 File - Nahum A. Bernstein with copy of Memorandum from 1222d SCSU Reception Center, Camp Upton, NY to Post Personnel Adjutant, Camp Upton, NY, dated 21 Nov 53.

SIGNATURE:

[Signature]

10-3-51

RECORDED 16

INDEXED ON

OCT-10 1951

339-559

FILE INFORMATION 339-559

HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 12/1998 BY 9803 9803

339-559

65-59184
SAC, New York

Director, FBI

MAHUN A. BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

Attached for the New York and Washington Field Offices are copies of two confidential memoranda received from 2-2 via liaison channel 3 October 3, 1951. One of these memoranda consists of a statement prepared by me on November 24, 1943.

New York should institute inquiries to locate Mr. Knight so that consideration may be given to interviewing him regarding his statement.

Enclosure

ECORRED - 16

COMM - FBI
OCT 9 1951
MAILED 24

EX-13

ECORRED - 16

cc - Washington Field (Enclosure)

WRW: hmb

3927101
CLASSIFIED BY 392236dowcallby
DECLASSIFICATION DATE:
9/14/1979

CONFIDENTIAL
cc - Mr. Perle
Dr. Young - Room 2258

September 10, 1951

The Director

DaW Ladd

cc - 85-39184
FRA: hmb
DHT: hmb

FUTURE:

To advise you that one of the four principal subjects in captioned matter and his law partner have taken positions with the Office of the Secretary of the Army as consultants.

Details:

You will recall that by Memorandum dated April 2, 1951, in captioned matter, it was pointed out that following receipt of this information, the Bureau, through liaison channels, contacted the Directors of C-2, OWI and OI, who were unable to provide any information which might assist in determining the meaning of the item.

We have now received from the Office, Secretary of the Army, two Loyalty Forms reflecting that Nahum Abner Bernstein and a law partner of Bernstein were appointed on May 16, 1951, as consultants in that office. Nahum Bernstein is one of the principal subjects in our investigation concerning the United States.
The translation of the report was made in the latter part of February, 1950, and on March 2, 1950, its contents were discussed with G-2 representatives, including [redacted]. Shortly thereafter, G-2 was provided with a translation of the complete report.

The Loyalty Forms on Bernstein were prepared on the same date as their appointments as consultants in the Office, Secretary of the Army. Thus, no loyalty investigation was made or requested by the Army prior to the date of appointment, May 16, 1951. The form concerning Bernstein was received in the Bureau on July 9, 1951, indicating a delay of nearly two months after the individuals were hired. Before the Bureau was even advised of such action. After processing, the forms were received in the Loyalty Unit together on September 5, 1951. It is noted that these are routine Loyalty forms, not marked "sensitive."

This situation raises the question of the Department of the Army was appoint individuals apparently without even checking the records of G-2 to determine if sufficient derogatory information is available to indicate that a loyalty risk may be involved.
Bernstein is an American citizen, having been born September 5, 1907, in New York City. His law partner, who is also an American citizen, has been involved in no information has been developed during our investigation of continued matter indicating that he has been involved in (S). However, his close association with Bernstein as a law partner would certainly make him suspect.

Action:

Our liaison unit will take up this situation with appropriate officials at the Department of the Army and protest procedures whereby persons constituting loyalty risks receiving appointments in the Department of the Army are not even checked through G-2 files prior to appointment. This matter will be closely followed and you will be advised whether Bernstein and others are continued in their present positions with the Army and of any further pertinent developments.
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It is believed that Bernstein's position in the Office, Secretary of the Army, 

To disseminate information regarding our Israeli espionage case on Bernstein in reply to the Loyalty Form would not only jeopardize our future espionage investigation of Bernstein and of the

but might also reveal information received from communications intelligence sources to individuals who have not been cleared for this type of material. Therefore, it is believed to be more advisable for our Liaison Unit to discuss the Bernstein matter with the appropriate official of the Department of the Army and determine in what manner the Bureau should handle the Loyalty Form to the satisfaction of the Department of the Army.

With respect to the Loyalty Form on a law partner of Bernstein, it may be noted that on June 1, 1950, the Bureau's Legal Attaché in London advised that

SECRET
You will note that in the memorandum to the

consultants, it was pointed out that the loyalty forms on

their appointment as consultants with the Army, were

dated July 9, 1941, and the forms were not returned

in due course. After receiving the

form of satisfaction by the Army, no further

requests were made for the return of the forms.

I was asked to note that the

Observations:

information to warrant a preliminary investigation

would ultimately

lead to his associations with Kahne, Bernstein and

Loeb. In such cases, the

recommendation to have publications distributed under

the program and at the scene, would not jeopardize a

particular area. However, such

recommendation in connection with the investigation

and the handling of the

information of the

loyalty forms,
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department of the

loyalty forms,
This situation raises the question how the Department of the Army can appoint individuals, apparently without even checking the records of G-2 to determine if sufficient derogatory information is available to indicate that a loyalty risk may be involved.

This situation also places the Bureau in the untenable position of possibly compromising a highly confidential and important espionage investigation if, in response to the loyalty forms, we furnish data concerning this investigation. It would have been a simpler matter at the outset to prevent the appointments of Bernstein than it is at the present time to cause their discharge on loyalty grounds. It is felt therefore that we should lodge a vigorous protest with the Department of the Army and at the same time determine what course will be followed in handling the forms on these men to the satisfaction both of the Department of the Army and the Bureau.

It is noted that these Loyalty Forms indicate that the positions are "excepted" and therefore it is possible to dispose of these Loyalty Forms, to the satisfaction of the Bureau and the Army, without having to advise the Civil Service Commission of the information in our files.

Action

If it meets with your approval, it is recommended that our Liaison Unit vigorously protest to the appropriate official of the Department of the Army the manner in which these two cases have been handled. It is further recommended that our Liaison Unit determine from the Department of the Army the manner in which the Loyalty Forms on Bernstein may be handled so as not to jeopardize our espionage investigation and possibly compromise communications intelligence sources. It is requested that our Liaison Unit follow this matter closely in order that the Bureau may be advised whether Bernstein are continued in their present positions with the Army.
TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, New York
SUBJECT: NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN

ESPIONAGE - IS

Rebutlet October 9, 1951.

WFO is requested to have an agent of that office make a check at
the Identification Division of the Bureau for any record of
mentioned in reference letter.

A check is presently being made at Governors Island, New York, on
any record of the present whereabouts of Likewise
a letter has been directed to the St. Louis Office requesting that a check be
made under the name in the event he may no longer be connected with the Service. In the event his present whereabouts are
ascertained, he will be immediately interviewed concerning his knowledge of
Communist connections of NAHUM BERNSTEIN.

DES: RAA
65-15301

cc - Washington Field
To recommend that no dissemination be made at this time to the Criminal Division in captioned matter. To suggest that a copy of a summary report be furnished confidentially.

Memoranda were submitted recommending that the facts of the individual cases not be disseminated to the Criminal Division at this time since our investigation of Israeli activities is continuing and it was felt that dissemination might prejudice our over-all future investigation in this field as well as our individual investigations.

For the same purpose, it is felt that dissemination in the case of Bernstein, an American citizen, should not be made to the Criminal Division at this time.

You will recall that the Bureau has been working in close cooperation with G-2 in our investigations in the Israeli field. G-2 has previously been furnished information in the Israeli intelligence picture. You will further recall that by memorandum dated September 18, 1951, in the case, you were advised that Bernstein on May 16 last was appointed to a position as consultant, Office, Secretary of the Army. At the present time, our Liaison Unit is in contact with G-2 to protest the manner.
in which the appointment of Bernstein and his law associate
to Army positions were handled without prior loyalty checks.

is also endeavoring to determine

how the Loyalty Forms of Bernstein and his law
associate may be handled so as not to jeopardize our
espionage investigation of Bernstein, has already
taken up the Bernstein matter

and

has requested

to

compile information in order that he may give due consideration
to the problem. called at the Bureau this
morning for the purpose of securing certain background informa-
tion with regard to Bernstein. Although G-2 previously has
been furnished information by the Bureau showing the nature
and extent of Bernstein's involvement in Israeli intelligence
operations, that agency does not have too much information
regarding Bernstein's education, previous employment and
similar matters.

Our file on Bernstein contains a summary report
submitted by our New York Office under date of June 5, 1951.
This report not only summarizes the derogatory subversive
information on Bernstein but also sets forth complete
background data. The derogatory subversive information is
similar to that which has previously been furnished G-2.
It is believed advisable at this time to turn over a copy of this summary report requesting that
it be handled on a strictly confidential basis and be
maintained under his personal control in order that the contents
thereof will not become available to other sections of the
Department of the Army.

Information provided to a unit in the
past has been maintained in a special file and it is felt
that this report if delivered should be
accorded the same treatment.

Action:

If it meets with your approval, it is recommended
that the facts in this case not be disseminated at this
time to the Criminal Division for the reasons previously stated. It is suggested, however, that our Liaison Unit personally deliver to [redacted] for his confidential information a copy of the summary report previously mentioned with the request that the report and its contents be maintained under his control and not disseminated generally in the Department of the Army.
NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was.

visited the residence of NAHUM BERNSTEIN on 10/15/51. BERNSTEIN has purchased a new home in Harrison, NY. Information reported re BERNSTEIN'S business connection They have an interest in a dress factory in Israel and contemplate forming a corporation in NY to work closely with Israeli Industries, Inc. BERNSTEIN'S office address listed as NY address of Israeli Industries, Inc. NED BERNEY appears identical with NAHUM BERNSTEIN. Contacts of NAHUM BERNSTEIN listed.

CONFIDENTIAL

DETAILS: Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that on the evening of October 15, 1951

was at the residence of NAHUM BERNSTEIN, 136 East 67th Street, New York, New York.

APPROVED AND FORWARDED

SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE
Confidential Informant advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN returned from his summer residence on Long Island on September 11, 1951 and took up residence again at 136 East 67th Street, New York, New York.

On that date this Informant advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN was contacted by an Israeli attorney the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN in Israel. On that occasion, advised BERNSTEIN that he expected to be in the United States for a couple of weeks on vacation. They further discussed the visit to the United States and it was indicated that BERNSTEIN had a business interest both in the United States and in Israel.

On September 19, 1951 it was indicated, according to this Informant, that Mr. and Mrs. ITELS son were to be dinner guests at the BERNSTEIN home on that evening.

On September 16, 1951 NAHUM BERNSTEIN advised an unidentified individual that he was interested in buying a house in Harrison, New York near North Street and Locust Avenue. Subsequently, on this date, NAHUM BERNSTEIN advised another unidentified individual that he was seriously thinking of buying the former AMELIA ERHARDT home in Harrison, New York.

On September 21, 1951 MAXINE BERNSTEIN, wife of NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was in contact with her husband, according to Confidential Informant. On that occasion, NAHUM BERNSTEIN advised his wife that he had signed a contract for the house and that everything was signed, sealed and delivered.

There was no indication, according to Confidential Informant, when the BERNSTEINS intend to take possession of their new home in Harrison, New York.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, made available the following letters and correspondence which pertain to the business relations of NAHUM BERNSTEIN These documents, which are self-explanatory, are herewith set out.
"Mr. Nahum A. Bernstein
Israeifindustries Inc.
20 Pine Street
New York City.

"Dear Nahum,

"Thank you for your letter of March 8, 1951; it has arrived on the day of my return from the Army where for one month I stayed out of - as you say - the cares and burdens of dresses, ice and 'tsurris'. Now that I am back, I am already deep again into all these burdens and cares.

"Referring to the matter of the certifications, please note that in accordance with the requirements of the Government, these should be certified and signed by the supplying firm; therefore those certifications relating to:

"the machines - should be signed by Schiff, if possible, otherwise by Smartcraft or Bern-Hodges.

"the textile machines (also the parts (Reeds) as per the invoice amounting to 409.63 dollars) - should be signed by the supplying firm at Patterson.

"the cut-dresses - by Smartcraft.

"the finished goods, specifying the invoice as much as possible, - should be signed by Bern-Hodges.

"With respect to the amount of IL. 2562 mentioned in your above letter, I wish to refer you to my letter dated August 21, 1950 and your reply on this matter in your letter dated September 1, 1950 where you asked that we hold this for your account as you do not wish to invest it.

"March 23, 1951"
sent me a copy of your letter dated March 9, 1951, and in this respect I wish to bring to your notice the following:

"1. "We understood from your letter dated February 2nd, 1951 that the cost of the raw materials amounts to about 33-1/3% of the sale-prices, assuming same to include all freight c.i.f. Tel-Aviv or Haifa. There was no question of freight and it was on our suggestion to ask for the concession that payments for freight be made in Israeli currency. Now in your above letter you bring figures showing that the cost of materials c.i.f. Tel-Aviv or Haifa should amount to about 50% of the price derived in foreign currency. Had we been aware of these figures we would have applied for a higher rate of allocation to cover same.

"2. "The Government agreed to increase the rate of foreign currency allocation for the replacement of raw materials to 50% merely because we asked for such rate, as being the actual cost of the materials and - to quote letter - 'In view of the changes of prices of raw materials, we agree......'. Therefore, had we asked for a greater percentage or had the changes in prices been higher, there could have been no reason why the Government would not have agreed to this. During our discussion said that there could be no difficulty to obtain the government's approval to the increase, because rates of allocations should vary in accordance with the changes in the prices of the raw materials.

"3. "I do not see the use of approaching the Government again on this project; I am certain that the Government, when convinced that the cost of the raw materials exceeds the rate of 33-1/3%, would agree to an increased allocation as long as the main condition is being kept, i.e. 2/3 of the production for export sales and 1/3 for the home market, and as long as the total allocations for the raw materials, royalties and profits do not exceed the amount of foreign currency derived through export sales, especially if we explain that at present PARTS are being imported for assembling only, the cost of which exceed the fixed rate of 33-1/3% and that gradually the machines will be manufactured completely in Israel out of raw materials costing 33-1/3% of the sale-price.
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"There is to note that what was asked from the Government is 50% of the selling-price (viz. 50% of $645 as mentioned in your above letter) and there is also to remember that the 50% allocation is to cover the cost of raw materials only, and if further expenses would be involved, then these would have to be allocated out of the remaining 50%.

"With kindest personal regards,

"Sincerely,

"/s/...

"June 7, 1951

"Penson & Company
11 Broadway
New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen:

"We are pleased to enclose herewith invoice, in triplicate, covering 6 rolls of paper to be shipped to Israeli Industries Incorporated, Jabotinsky Road, Ramat-Gan, Israel. The goods are now at Smartcraft, 213 West 35th Street, New York City. Each roll is marked III TEL AVIV, and their total gross weight is 252 pounds.

"We are sending these goods to Israel as an investment, without payment. The import license number is 51875. Freight and forwarding expenses will be prepaid by us. Please have this merchandise insured.

"We should appreciate having your invoice covering the freight and forwarding expenses as soon as possible.

"Sincerely yours,
August 16th, 1951.

Isreal Industries Incorporated,  
P.O. Box 2676,  
Tel Aviv, Israel.

"Dear 

We acknowledge receipt of your cable today agreeing to our concluding arrangements with our candidate, pursuant to conditions previously conveyed to you .

We are proceeding immediately and wish to record the specific terms of these arrangements so that there will be no misunderstanding in the future:

1. The price will be that previously indicated to you. In fact, we are now proceeding to see if we cannot also get a partial credit which will make it much easier to pick up the option.

2. Our candidate will retain one-half and hold the other half available under option for one (1) year.

3. Our candidate, together with those who pick up the option, shall succeed to all of the rights of the prior owners and be entitled to one-half of the profits and Israeli Industries Incorporated shall be permanently entitled to the other half of the profits.

4. We shall proceed to form a new, separate New York corporation. We shall try to get the name, Israeli Industries
"Apparel Corporation. However, if you can think of a name which may have greater significance in Israel, please cable it. The corporation shall have 2 classes of stock. Preference stock shall be issued at par value for the exact consideration for which we made the purchase from the former owners. The preference stock shall bear no interest and shall not share in the profits of the business but shall be entitled to payment in full upon dissolution before any payment to the holders of common stock. Thus, common stock will in effect represent only an interest in the profits of the business and not in the capital. 100 shares of no par common stock shall be divided equally between the new owners and III. This will take care of the equal division of profits automatically as well as protect the return of the purchase money. It is understood that the conversion privileges into dollars to the full extent of the Investment Laws under which we operate as an Approved Investment shall be given only to the present purchasers and shall not apply to the common shares held by III for management.

"5. This arrangement will completely replace any previous 5% of sales for III. It is quite clear that under an equal division of profits between investors and III there is no place for a 5% of sales charge in addition, which practically eats up most of the profits.

"6. A contract of lease for the premises must be transferred to the new corporation, as in the case of Szekely-Hoffman.

"You must realize that Adash and I have been struggling with this problem now for many months. The above represents our joint opinion that this is an excellent and fair proposition for all parties concerned. We shall bend every effort to try to conclude it within the next 30 days. This will result in a permanent solution in which we will be able to control our own destinies forever after. I hate to think of the only other alternative which is that the present interests will sell to someone of their own choosing and we will have to accept such terms as may be dictated to us.
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"With kindest personal regards,

"Sincerely,"

"NAB: MD"

"October 4, 1950

"Mr. Nahum Bernstein
20 Pine Street
New York City.

"Dear Mr. Bernstein:

"At the suggestion of [Redacted] Pepsi-Cola Company, who is now in Peru, we are writing you regarding the dress factory which your organization has established in Israel.

"We are interested in the possibilities of importing women's medium price dresses for the Peruvian market and are in a position to import from Israel making payment either in Peruvian Soles or Sterling.

"We would appreciate very much any information you can give us regarding this plant and its address and the name of its manager in Tel-Aviv so that, if feasible we can get in touch direct.

[Redacted] has also told us that you are interested in other manufacturing enterprises in Israel. We would appreciate any information as to their products so that we may study their sales possibilities in the Peruvian market.

"Yours very truly,

"IMPORTACIONES GENERALES S.A.

"H. A. Pierce"
June 22nd, 1951

Tel Aviv, Israel.

"Dear [Name],

There is still a few dollars on deposit in your account at the Corn Exchange Bank and the bank has notified us that they are going to start making monthly service charges. Therefore, please sign and return the enclosed authorization or otherwise the few dollars will be eaten up by service charges.

"With kind regards to you and yours,

"Sincerely,

"/s/ Nahum"

"NAB:MD
Enc."

May 9th, 1951

New York 13, N.Y.
"Dear [Name],

The Israel Export Journal of April 1951 contains an article written by Mr. F. Norgenstern, whom you have met during your last visit in Israel, headed "SURVEY OF ISRAEL'S TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS EXPANSION". Assuming that it might be of interest to you, we took the liberty to forward to you via air mail a copy of the above Journal.

"On this opportunity we wish to remark that on the eve of your departure from Israel you informed us about the survey that you were preparing concerning the textile industry in Israel and that a copy of same will be sent to us together with a photostat of Dr. Gruenbaum's letter written in reply to the memorandum submitted to him regarding your projected enterprise. We would much appreciate it if you will kindly send us same at your convenience.

"There is to point out that the concessions granted by the Israeli Government for your project far exceed the limit that the Government grants now to any other applicant. We came to know someone who would be willing to invest the dollar capital for a like project if it would include participants such as your good-self. Therefore we would be grateful if you will please let us know how the matter stands and if there exist no problem in acquiring the necessary equipment and the difficulty is in the raising of the capital, we would much like to try and see whether we might be able to raise it from our end. We presume that your above survey covers the two important problems - raw materials and sales, if not please make us acquainted with them in order that we may meet with likely inquiries in this respect.

"Hoping to hear from you,

"We are,

"Very sincerely yours,

"ISRAELI INDUSTRIES INC.

"Copy to: NAB, I.I.T., New York
"June 27, 1951

"Government of Israel Supply Mission
250 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y.

"Att:

"Dear [Name],

As you have been advised, the Citrus Board in Israel has placed at my disposal the sum of $3500.00 to purchase materials to be used for manufacturing electric starters in Israel.

I attach herewith, in triplicate, one order for such material to 'Leeds', in the total amount of $134.00. I should appreciate your making the necessary arrangements to open a Letter of Credit in favor of 'Leeds' for $134.00 out of the $3500.00 placed at my disposal. Please open this Letter of Credit for three months.

Thank you for your cooperation and courtesy in this matter.

"Sincerely yours,

[A:sh]

Encls.

"c/o The Empire Hotel
Broadway and 63rd St.
New York, N.Y.

"Government of Israel Supply Mission
250 West 57th Street
New York, N.Y.

[Signature]
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"Dear Sirs,

We request to place at the disposal of Mr. N. Bernstein, 20 Pine Street, New York, the amount of $3500 for the purchase of materials to be used for manufacturing of electrical starters in Israel.

"Yours truly,

[Signature]

"June , 1951.

Corn Exchange Bank, 770 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

"Re: Account [signature]
c/o Silver & Bernstein

"Gentlemen:

This will authorize you to withdraw the entire balance from my account at your bank and pay some to the order of 'Silver & Bernstein, Special', and mail directly to them at the above address.

"Very truly yours,

[Signature]
"April 26th, 1951.

Chase National Bank
20 Pine Street
New York City.

Re: Leib Itelson
Ester Itelson

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith please find two (2) checks, payable to your order, in the sum of $1,000.00 each.

Please open irrevocable Letters of Credit for $1,000.00 each, in favor of Leib Itelson and Ester Itelson, whose present address is Hotel Splendide, 50 Blvd. Victor Hugo, Nice, France; which sums will become available to the beneficiaries at your head office upon presentation by the beneficiaries in person of their passports, but only after their arrival in this country and not later than November 1st, 1951. The interests of the beneficiaries under these Letters of Credit are solely for their personal benefit and may not be assigned or transferred, and if the beneficiaries do not present themselves in person (together with their passports), at your bank to claim the said sums on or before the date above specified, then said credits will terminate and you will pay over the said sums to us, or our legal representatives, successors or assigns.

Please notify the United States Consul, at Nice, France, to the foregoing effect this day by air mail."

"April 27th, 1951.

United States Consul,
Nice, France.
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"Re: Visa applications - Leib Itelson
Estera Itelson"

"Dear Sir:

"You have doubtless been informed by our bankers, The Chase National Bank of New York, that we have deposited $1,000.00 to the account of Leib Itelson and $1,000.00 to the account of Estera Itelson.

"In further support of these applications for visas for temporary entry to the United States, please be advised that our firm is representing a group of eminent American textile manufacturers who are negotiating for the establishment of a textile weaving plant in Israel with American capital. These negotiations have progressed to the point where the interested parties are about to commit their capital to this project, providing satisfactory arrangements can be made for the management and technical details concerning the operation in Israel. The American interests also insist that an experienced Israeli textile manufacturer join this enterprise by way of investment and participation in the management. We believe that such an association can be consummated between the American interests and Mr. Itelson, who is a well known and long established Israeli textile manufacturer. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that Mr. Itelson and his wife proceed to the United States at once to negotiate these proposals for a joint American - Israeli project. If consummated, we believe this project would be of great commercial value to the American group as well as to Israel. We, therefore, respectfully request that you act upon these applications immediately as this project is now at a standstill awaiting the arrival of Mr. Itelson in the United States.

"Very truly yours,

"Nahum A. Bernstein"

"NAB:MD"
It will be noted that the correspondence emanating from Israel on the stationery of the Israeli Industries, Incorporated lists the New York Office of this corporation as 20 Pine Street, Suite 1907, Telephone Whitehall 3-7171. This is, in fact, the office address and telephone exchange listed to the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN in New York City.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that the only contact that has been made to the knowledge of with NED BERNEY, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York, during the past three months has been a contact with the address 265 Henry Street, New York, New York.

This is the building that houses the Henry Street Settlement and also the National Association of Consumers. It is believed likely that this contact may have been in the form of an advertisement or a solicitation for funds of some sort.

On October 11, 1951 the office of SILVER and BERNSTEIN was contacted by Confidential Informant of known reliability, and a request was made to speak with Mr. NED BERNEY. The individual at this law office who answered the inquiry at first stated that there was no such individual by this name connected with the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN.

Subsequently, when another contact was made by Confidential Informant insisting on speaking to Mr. NED BERNEY, after considerable time the individual at the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN stated that they were mistaken and there was a Mr. BERNEY there who would speak to the Informant immediately.

Confidential Informant advised that he was familiar with the voice of NAHUM BERNSTEIN and it appeared to him that the individual who identified himself as Mr. BERNEY was, in fact, NAHUM BERNSTEIN.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that the following contacts appear significant to this investigation which were made with NAHUM BERNSTEIN on the dates listed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Company Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11, 1951</td>
<td>JOSEPH J. LANN Securities, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37 Wall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18, 1951</td>
<td>Material for Israel, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 West 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 1951</td>
<td>Israeli Consulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 East 70th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 22, 1951</td>
<td>Embassy of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27, 1951</td>
<td>Israeli Industries, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel-Aviv, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30, 1951</td>
<td>Israeli Industries, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel-Aviv, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30, 1951</td>
<td>Landseas Products Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 1951</td>
<td>Smartcraft Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213 West 35th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person or Company Contacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 1951</td>
<td>Material for Israel&lt;br&gt;250 West 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 1951</td>
<td>LL AL Corporation:&lt;br&gt;29 West 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12, 1951</td>
<td>Government of Israel&lt;br&gt;Supply Mission&lt;br&gt;250 West 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 1951</td>
<td>Swiss-Israeli Food Service&lt;br&gt;38 East 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 1951</td>
<td>Embassy of Israel&lt;br&gt;Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28, 1951</td>
<td>Ampal House&lt;br&gt;17 East 71st Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1951</td>
<td>Israel Speaks, Incorporated&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 1951</td>
<td>SZEBKELEY-HOFFMANN and Company, Ltd.&lt;br&gt;Herzl Street 100&lt;br&gt;Tel-Aviv, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 1951</td>
<td>Pepsi-Cola Company&lt;br&gt;3 West 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person or Company Contacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 1951</td>
<td>Smartcraft Corporation 213 West 35th Street New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 1951</td>
<td>SZEKELEY-HOFFMANN and Company, Ltd. Jabotink1 Ramat-Gan Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PENDING
Mail cover on mail addressed to NED BERNEY, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York.

Pretext telephone call made by SA ____________ to the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York, on October 11, 1951.

Mail cover maintained on mail received by NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his business address, c/o SILVER and BERNSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York.

Copies of this report are being designated for the information of the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices because it is known that those offices are currently conducting investigation relative to Israeli activities and it is believed that information in this report may be of assistance to them in their investigation.
ADMINISTRATIVE (continued)

LEAD

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.

REFERENCE

Date: October 25, 1951
Case References: MAURM. A. BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - B
Consized to: SAC, Washington Field

PERSONAL ATTENTION
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SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: Mail Room, place date of shipment and registry number; Shipping Room, show date of shipment and initial this invoice; then return it to person whose name is checked in column right. After this checked name has been initialled, invoice should be placed in administrative file.
DATE OF MAIL: 6-12-77

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT: JUNE MAIL

DATE OF REMOVAL: 11-7-75

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGING OUT
On October 15, 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was in contact with also an attorney in the law firm of Silver and Bernstein.

On that occasion BERNSTEIN asked to call (phonic) to inform him that BERNSTEIN had seen on Friday and Saturday that had been in contact with Washington in connection with the arrest. It was indicated by BERNSTEIN that had not been indicted but he had been arrested. BERNSTEIN indicated that when the understanding that an opportunity for a conference in connection with the arrest would be held in Washington. Further, someone in Washington had written a letter to the United States Attorney's office in New York to "hold up."

BERNSTEIN further indicated that the United States Attorney's office at New York had pointed out that the Statute of Limitations would run this week. BERNSTEIN stated that he had talked it over and BERNSTEIN indicated, "They would lose absolutely nothing by telling Washington that although the Statute would expire this week there is no need for unseemly haste to rush it through" because reiterated everything he had in his affidavit in his testimony before the King Committee a month ago. BERNSTEIN indicated that for this reason the Statute had just begun to run. There was mention that the charge was one of perjury.

BERNSTEIN further indicated that had contacted Department of Justice, who suggested that the matter be taken up with the United States Attorney in New York. BERNSTEIN stated that on Saturday last went down to see an Assistant United States Attorney and to talk the whole matter over. BERNSTEIN stated, "Anything that avoids immediate action in this time of investigation hysteria is better for us." BERNSTEIN indicated that spoke with Assistant United States Attorney, who would not commit himself, but it was indicated that was meeting on the afternoon of October 15 to discuss this matter. BERNSTEIN remarked, "At least we got him to take up that issue to see whether that wouldn't stop him from immediate precipitated action."

Since this matter pertains undoubtedly to attorney-client relationship, no inquiries have been made at the United States Attorney's office, Southern District of New York.
This information is being made available to the Bureau for whatever action the Bureau may deem advisable in this matter.
Re: Report 10/31.

Inquiries via liaison channels at O-2 have established that Bernstein was appointed on May 16, 1951, as a consultant to a committee known as the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee. On October 16, 1951, O-2 made available a restricted blind memorandum on this committee, copies of which are attached for each office.

O-2 has advised that the matter regarding the employment of Bernstein is under current consideration. O-2 has stated that steps are being taken to abolish the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee for the purpose of terminating the employment of Bernstein by the Department of the Army. This matter is being followed by the Bureau and you will be advised of developments.
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TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, WFO (65-5508)

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was.
ESPIONAGE - IS

DATE: November 14, 1951

FJD: HT

cc: New York (65-15301)
DATE OF REMOVAL 11/21/57

DATE OF MAIL 11/22/57

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY

FILE NUMBER 66-2554-7530

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
DATE OF MAIL 11-1-51

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL
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PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGOUT
HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL
HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 56-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL
SAC, New York

Director, FBI

MANUEL A. BERNSTEIN
SPY NO. - 18

RECORDED - 100

3/28/50 SPY 219,567

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE: 4/6/50 BY
339.539

TO:

St. Louis' 1st dated 10-26-51.

From a review of the records on file in the Officers' Section of the Department of the Navy, it was ascertained that
The following is additional information contained in this officer's record:

Name:
Date of birth:
Place of birth:
Race:
Height:
Weight:
Eyes:
Hair:
Scars, Marks or Tattoos:
Marital Status:
Social Security Number:
Citizenship:
Former Occupation:
Military Occupation:
Schools:

Employer:

Home Address:

Relatives:
Decorations and Awards:
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
ATTENTION IDENTIFICATION DIVISION
SAC, ST. LOUIS

DATE: October 26, 1951

FROM: NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

SUBJECT: Re New York letter to St. Louis dated 10-16-51

Personnel at RACAG advised that they were unable to locate Army service record for [name redacted]. They further advised that a card in their files indicated that a request for [name redacted] record had been made by PIB, AGO, Washington, D. C. on December 20, 1949, at which time it was ascertained that no records were located.

Inasmuch as the records for the above-named subject may be located at AGO, Washington, D. C., the Identification Division is requested to make appropriate check there for this record. If located, will handle lead in referenced letter.

For the information of the Identification Division, a copy of referenced letter is enclosed herewith.

RUC

GWM: sae
65-1652
cc New York
Enclosure
Your office is requested to check the records of the United States Army under the name of [redacted]. It is believed that he is no longer connected with the United States Army and the records of your area should be checked for his present whereabouts. The only identifying information concerning [redacted] is as follows:

[Redacted]

The address listed upon his discharge from the Army should be ascertained and this office should be immediately notified by letter.

DEB: RAA
65-15301
DATE: December 5, 1951

TO: A. H. Belmont
FROM: C. E. Hennrich
SUBJECT: NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN ESPIONAGE - IS

Purpose:

To have our Liaison Unit deliver a blank memorandum to the appropriate officer of G-2 for the purpose of securing information regarding the subject.

Details:

There is attached a self-explanatory blank memorandum for delivery to G-2. The communication has been prepared in this fashion since Bernstein is one of the principal subjects in our investigation and the information is based in part on data received from...

Action:

If it meets with your approval, it is recommended that our Liaison Unit deliver the attachment to the appropriate officer at G-2 who is cleared for communications intelligence matters.

Attachment 65-59184

[Signature]

[SCREENTEX]
He reported that such information would have been supplied
to him by C-2 at the Post since it was not data based on
his personal knowledge. [Blank] said that according
to his recollection, Lieutenant Colonel Frank Outley, now
deceased, had maintained a complete file on C-2 activities
at the Post. It was his opinion that the material from the
C-2 files would still be in existence although he is not
aware of its present location.

It would be appreciated if you would endeavor
to develop from C-2 records any additional information
available regarding possible Communist connections on the
part of Bernstein and make the same available to this
Bureau.
Office Memorandum  •  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: A. H. Belmont
FROM: C. E. Hennrich

DATE: December 7, 1951

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was ESPIONAGE - IS

PURPOSE:

DETAILS:

ACTION:

65-59184

This matter advised can be affected at leisure by 12-21-51

RECORDED: 123
**SYNOPSIS:**

NAHUM BERNSTEIN has moved from NYC to Harrison, New York, but continues as a practicing attorney in NYC. He was in the company of BEN-SURION during his visit to U.S. He has been contacted by National Lawyers Guild. NAHUM BERNSTEIN visited the residence of NAHUM BERNSTEIN during his recent visit to U.S. BERNSTEIN known to have interest in Israeli Industries, Inc. In May, 1951 he was appointed to the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee of the U.S. Army. This Committee was subsequently abolished.

**DETAILS:**

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN and his wife, MARINE, intended to attend a luncheon in the company of Mrs. and Mrs. BEN-SURION, Prime Minister of Israel and his wife. The same Informant advised that BERNSTEIN did, in fact, meet on May 12, 1951 at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria. This Informant advised that in May, 1951, an individual connected with the National Lawyers Guild contacted NAHUM BERNSTEIN and attempted to interest him in the purchase of health insurance that was being offered by the National Lawyers Guild. On that occasion, BERNSTEIN did

**PROPERTY OF FBI:**

This confidential report and its contents are retained by the FBI and are not to be released outside of agency to which loaned.

**FILE NO.**

MLO

**DATE WHEN MADE:**
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not indicate that he was interested in making such a purchase at that time.

The same informant advised that in June, 1951 NAHUM BERNSTEIN sold his summer cottage that he owned at Pompton Lakes, New Jersey. It was indicated by the informant that BERNSTEIN and his wife had rented a summer cottage at Bellport, Long Island, where they spent the summer of 1951.

Confidential Informant also advised that

spent the evening of October 15, 1951 at the residence of NAHUM BERNSTEIN, 136 East 67th Street, New York, New York.

advised that on September 21, 1951 NAHUM BERNSTEIN advised his wife that he had purchased the Amelia Erhardt Estate in Harrison, New York.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN received correspondence at his law office, 20 Pine Street, addressed to Mr. NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN, Israeli Industries, Inc. It was further indicated by this informant that the letterhead of the Israeli Industries, Inc. contained its New York address as 20 Pine Street, Suite 1907, telephone Whitehall 3-7171. This is, in fact, the office address and telephone exchange listed to the law firm of Silver & Bernstein in New York City.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised NAHUM BERNSTEIN was appointed on May 16, 1951 as a consultant to a committee known as the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee of the Department of the Army. According to the informant, this committee was established to select top level attorneys for employment in the War Department and to pass upon the qualifications of these candidates. The committee in 1951 also performed the same function for the Department of the Air Force as well as for the Department of the Army. Recommendations for the promotions of attorneys employed by the two departments also were passed upon by the committee.
This informant also advised that the law firm of Silver and Bernstein was also appointed in 1951 as a member of the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee.

This same informant advised that the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee with which Bernstein were associated was abolished in November, 1951.
Informants

Anonymous source.

Miscellaneous

Copies of this report have been designated for the information of the Washington Field and Los Angeles Offices because they have, in the past, conducted investigation relative to the subject of this investigation. It is believed information in this report should be made available to those offices.

Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: MR. A. H. BELMONT
FROM: V. P. KAY

SUBJECT: ISRAELI INTELLIGENCE SERVICE
(NAHUM BERNSTEIN)
ESPIONAGE - IS

PURPOSE:

To record the results of discussions and information obtained at G-2 in connection with the above-captioned matter.

BACKGROUND:

Reference is made to a memorandum to you from Mr. Henrich in the above-captioned matter dated September 18, 1951, and to a memorandum to you from Mr. Henrich entitled, "Nahum Bernstein, was, Espionage - IS," dated September 27, 1951. These memoranda indicate that the Bureau received a loyalty form indicating that Nahum Bernstein and his law partner, Donal Eay Seawell, had been appointed to the position of Consultants in the Office of the Secretary of the Army on May 16, 1951.

The referenced memorandum dated September 18, 1951, recommended that the Liaison Unit vigorously protest to the Army the manner in which these two cases have been handled. It further recommended that it be determined from the Army the manner in which the loyalty forms on Bernstein and Seawell may be handled so as not to jeopardize pending Bureau investigations.

The referenced memorandum dated September 27, 1951, attached a summary report on Bernstein to be furnished confidentially and recommended that be cautioned that the report was for his confidential information and that the report and its contents must be maintained under his control and not disseminated generally in the Army.

DETAILS:

has discussed this matter at length

It has been ascertained there exists in the Department of the Army a committee which is known as "The Civilian Legal Personnel Committee." This committee passes upon the employment of all lawyers within the Department of Defense. The committee employs the use of consultants who set up standards and conduct examinations, etc. of legal personnel applying for positions within the Department of the Army. Bernstein and Seawell were
employed as consultants in New York City. That he had ascertained that these individuals did not have access to any classified information, therefore, there were no name checks made of the files at G-2. It was pointed out, however, that, in view of the highly classified nature of the information made available to G-2 by the Bureau regarding Bernstein, an ordinary name check made by the Secretary of the Army would not have disclosed the information in G-2 regarding Bernstein. \[\text{ACTION:}\]

It is recommended this be forwarded to the Espionage Unit for the attention of Mr. Wannall. It is suggested that, before the loyalty forms are returned to the Civil Service Commission indicating that Bernstein are no longer employed by the Department of the Army, a recheck will be made by the Liaison Unit within a reasonable period of time in order to make certain that the action of disbanding the committee has, in fact, been taken.
SAC, New York

Director, FBI (65-59184)

NAHUM BERMAN, wag.
ESPIONAGE - IS

Rebute 10/2/51 and 10/29/51.

G-2 has now advised that the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee with which subject associated has now been abolished.

For your information.

NY:shmbk

COMM - FBI
NUV 1-1351
MAILED 24
Subject is in the special section of the Security Index. We require a summary report on him from New York, the office of origin, every six months. The last such summary report was dated June 5, 1951. The last regular typed investigative report from the New York Office was dated 10/23/51.

On 12/12/51, we sent an O-1 form to the New York Office asking when the summary report due 12/5/51 might be expected. We received a reply to this form on 1/3/52 to the effect that the summary report would be submitted 1/11/52. As of 1/22/52, the report had not been received at the Bureau.

While discussing another matter telephonically with ASAC Whalen of the New York Office on 1/23/52, Mr. Henrich was advised that the summary report on Bernstein was being mailed that evening to the Bureau.

ACTION

None. The above is for record purposes.
TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)
SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

DATE: March 4, 1952

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

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

NAME

ALIASES

NATIVE BORN ______ NATURALIZED ______ ALIEN ______
COMMUNIST ______ SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY ______ INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE ______
MISCELLANEOUS (Specify) ______
TAB FOR DETCOM ______ TAB FOR COMSAB ______ RACE ______ SEX ______
DATE OF BIRTH ______ PLACE OF BIRTH ______
BUSINESS ADDRESS (Show name of employing concern and address)

RECORDING - 48

RESIDENCE ADDRESS

NATURE OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS (Specify from Vital Facility List)

RECORDED - 48
NAHUM BERNSTEIN moved on 11/26/51 to Harrison, New York. BERNSTEIN has been in contact with and arranged for a meeting with Israeli officials in New York.

BERNSTEIN has been in contact with ARNON ROJANSKY, an Israeli attorney who represents the law firm of SILVER & BERNSTEIN, in Israel. He advised ROJANSKY he is doing work for the Israeli Government and they discussed generally attorneys working for foreign governments. BERNSTEIN has indicated that he knows who was involved in shipment of dynamite to Israel. Contacts of BERNSTEIN set out.
On November 26, 1951, Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN and his family had moved from their New York City residence to their new home in Harrison, New York.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that on February 13, 1952, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was contacted by the bi-monthly newspaper, "Israel Speaks" and who has been very active in the affairs of Israel. On that occasion an appointment was made with BERNSTEIN to meet with him on the following Tuesday. This informant had previously advised that these four individuals were very interested in the status of the publication "Israel Speaks" and it was believed by this informant that the proposed meeting was to take place to discuss the future of this publication.

The United States from Israel, of the Israeli Government attached to the Israeli Consulate in New York City.

Confidential Informant advised that on November 10, 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was in contact with ARNON R. ROJANSKY. He is identical with the Israeli attorney who is handling the legal affairs of the law firm SILVER & BERNSTEIN, in Israel. On March 31, 1950, the law firm of SILVER & BERNSTEIN sent out announcements to leading New York attorneys as follows:

We announce the opening of an Israeli Office at 26 Rothschild Boulevard, Tel Aviv. Mr. Arnon R. Rojansky of the Israeli Bar is counsel in charge.

The informant advised that at the time NAHUM BERNSTEIN contacted a discussion ensued concerning attorneys in the United States representing foreign governments, pointed out to BERNSTEIN that he had noticed an article in Look Magazine about foreign agents working for other governments and specifically he stated this article referred to attorneys. This particular discussion was not elaborated upon.
On the occasion of this contact BERNSTEIN told ROJANSKY that he had to go to the Israeli Consulate on Tuesday to pick up some papers as he stated he had finished work for the Israeli Government and he wanted to finish up his accounts with them. It was agreed that ROJANSKY and BERNSTEIN were to meet the following Tuesday. It was noted on that date that ROJANSKY was visiting in the United States.

On November 18, 1951, Confidential Informant advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN was in contact with an individual identified as . It was evident, according to the informant, that advised him that

advised BERNSTEIN that had been in trouble for sending dynamite to Israel. BERNSTEIN advised that if such a man were sending dynamite to Israel he, NAHUM, should know him. After further discussion BERNSTEIN advised that is a fine fellow and that he knew him quite well.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised the following individuals and organizations were in contact with NAHUM BERNSTEIN on the dates indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Organization In Contact with NAHUM BERNSTEIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/19/51</td>
<td>War Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/51</td>
<td>MATERIAL FOR ISRAEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750 West 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/51</td>
<td>National Lawyers Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 Exchange Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person or Organization In Contact With NAHUM BERNSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/51</td>
<td>McGOLDRICK, WINN, DANNETT &amp; BURKE 37 Wall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/51</td>
<td>American Friends of Hebrew University 9 East 69th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/51</td>
<td>Import-Export Industries 30 Rockefeller Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/51</td>
<td>American Israeli Corporation 1 Wall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/51</td>
<td>Government of Israel Supply Mission 250 West 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NY 65-15301

Date

11/20/51

11/24/51

11/24/51

11/28/51

12/4/51

12/5/51

12/5/51

12/6/51

Person or Organization In Contact With NAHUM BERNSTEIN

Young & Rubicam, Inc.
285 Madison Avenue
New York, New York

National Lawyers Guild
40 Exchange Place
New York, New York

Israel Speaks, Inc.
250 West 57th Street
New York, New York

Corcoran & Kostelanetz
52 Wall Street
New York, New York

Government of Israel
250 West 57th Street
New York, New York

Government of Israel Supply Mission
250 West 57th Street
New York, New York

SECRET
NY 65-15301

Date

Person or Organization In Contact With NAHUM BERNSTEIN

12/8/51 American Israeli Shipping Company
27 William Street
New York, New York

12/13/51 Zakely-Hoffman & Company
100 Herzl Street
Tel Aviv, Israel

12/14/51

12/17/51 National Lawyers Guild
40 Exchange Place
New York, New York

12/19/51

12/24/51

12/26/51 Israeli Consulate
11 East 70th Street
New York, New York

12/31/51 U.S. Department of Commerce
Patent Office
Washington, D.C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Organization In Contact With NAHUM BERNSTEIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/3/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/52</td>
<td>Material For Israel, Inc. 250 West 57th Street New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/52</td>
<td>Department of the Army, Washington Finance Office U.S. Army Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/52</td>
<td>Jewish Agency For Palestine 16 East 66th Street New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/52</td>
<td>Israel Purchasing Service, Inc. 17 East 71st Street New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person or Organization in Contact with NAHUM BERNSTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/52</td>
<td>U. S. Treasury Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Collector of Internal Revenue, Customs House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/52</td>
<td>Government of Israel Supply Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 West 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/52</td>
<td>Szekely-Hoffman &amp; Company, Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 Herzl Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel Aviv, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/52</td>
<td>Smartcraft Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213 West 35th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/52</td>
<td>Ultragar International Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 West 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION IN CONTACT WITH NAHUM BERNSTEIN

2/8/52

207 East 30th Street
New York, New York

WLB NY

2/23/52

Israel Speaks
250 West 57th Street
New York, New York

3/6/52

Israeli Consulate
11 East 70th Street
New York, New York

PENDING
IDENTITY OF INFORMANTS

Mail cover on mail received by NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his business address, c/o SILVER & BERNSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York, New York

MISCELLANEOUS

Copies of this report are being designated for the information of the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices because it is known that these offices are currently conducting an investigation relative to Israeli activities. It is believed that information in this report may be of assistance to them in their investigation.

LEADS

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.
NY 65-15301

ADMINISTRATIVE (Cont.)

REFERENCE

Report of SA 10/23/51, New York b7C
NAHUM BERNSTEIN moved residence to 355 Locust Avenue, Rye, NY. He is still a practicing attorney at 20 Pine Street, NYC. On March 18 and 20, 1952, subject was in contact with and discussed the merger of "Israel Speaks" with the "Jerusalem Post". Previous meeting held in 1951 concerning this merger, GERSHON AGRON, Editor of "Jerusalem Post" present. Contacts of BERNSTEIN set out.

As previously reported, Confidential Informant of known reliability, on September 6, 1951, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN told an unidentified individual that he was interested in buying a house in Harrison, New York. Subsequent to this date the subject advised another unidentified individual that he was seriously thinking of buying the former AMELIA ERHARDT'S home in Harrison, New York.

On September 21, 1951, MAXINE BERNSTEIN, wife of NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was in contact with her husband according to Confidential Informant. On that occasion NAHUM BERNSTEIN...
advised his wife that he had signed a contract for the house and that everything was signed, sealed and delivered.

On November 26, 1951, Confidential Informant advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN and his family had moved from their New York residence at 136 East 67th Street to their new home in Harrison, New York.

In December, 1951, Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN and his family resided at 355 Locust Avenue, Rye, New York.

The Westchester County, New York, telephone directory for May, 1952 reflects a listing for NAHUM BERNSTEIN, 355 Locust Avenue, Rye, New York, telephone number Rye 7-0093.

Confidential Informant of known reliability advised of a meeting held between NAHUM BERNSTEIN, on March 18, 1952, at which they took up the arrival of suggested a meeting be held on March 25, 1952, prior to the arrival indicated the contemplated meeting was to discuss the merger of "Israel Speaks" with the "Jerusalem Post." was unable to identify or to advise of any details concerning this merger.

Further advised on March 20, 1952, of a meeting held at the home of NAHUM BERNSTEIN, which was attended by one phonetic) and which meeting concerned the publicity business. was unable to further elaborate on the nature of this meeting.

It is to be noted that in June, 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was listed as Secretary of Israel Speaks, Inc., which corporation publishes the bimonthly publication known as "Israel Speaks." The May 23, 1952, issue of "Israel Speaks" carries DAVID WAHL as Publisher.
On April 4, 1952, [redacted] was interviewed by SAS at the New York Office. At this time prepared a narrative statement in which he admitted he worked in London, England, [redacted] on which he decided to come to New York City and to enlist in the service to assist Palestine in its fight against the Arab countries. [redacted] through the assistance of an organization known as "Service Airways" he took off for Rome, Italy, and upon arrival there described as the newspaper "Jerusalem Post," formerly known as the "Palestine Post." According to the last he heard [redacted] previously mentioned, on March 28, 1951, [redacted] was in contact with the Israeli government to the United States, at which time they were discussing the question of the merger of "Israel Speaks" and the "Jerusalem Post." [redacted] there was another problem, indicating that the "Jerusalem Post", was in New York and that he was talking to a leader in the Israeli movement in the New York area, concerning the question of the two publications. [redacted] indicated that he had luncheon a short time before and that he had informed what the facts were and pointed out that particularly with respect to financing the matter, the merger would require more financing than the present situation calls for. [redacted] raised the question whether [redacted] would be willing to go to Jerusalem to handle the weekly. [redacted] indicated that he had told that there wasn't any basis for discussing these matters in the vague context which had existed for the past two years and still exists. According to on April 4, 1951, the Israeli Supply Mission in New York City, [redacted]
contacted and volunteered the information that he thought "Israel Speaks" was a much better name for a newspaper than "Jerusalem Post." indicated that was here, meaning in the United States, and wanted cooperation in running the "Jerusalem Post." Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that the following individuals and organizations were in contact with NAHUM BERNSTEIN on the dates indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Organization in Contact with Bernstein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 1952</td>
<td>Szikely-Hoffman and Company, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jabotinski Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramat Gan, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13, 1952</td>
<td>Congress of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 1952</td>
<td>Sonneborn Sons, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 Fourth Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York 10, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 1952</td>
<td>The Nation Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Vesey Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York 7, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person or Organization in Contact with Bernstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 1952</td>
<td>Irving Trust Company&lt;br&gt;1 Wall Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 1952</td>
<td>Material for Israel, Inc.&lt;br&gt;250 West 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 1952</td>
<td>Free Sons for Israel Post&lt;br&gt;252 West 92nd Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 1952</td>
<td>NAACP&lt;br&gt;20 West 40th Street&lt;br&gt;New York 18, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 1952</td>
<td>Hanover Bank&lt;br&gt;Box 33, C. S. Sta.&lt;br&gt;New York 15, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1952</td>
<td>Self-Selective Parcel Service, Inc.&lt;br&gt;250 West 57th Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 1952</td>
<td>Corcoran-Kostelanetz&lt;br&gt;52 Wall Street&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 1952</td>
<td>National Lawyers Guild&lt;br&gt;40 Exchange Place&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 1952</td>
<td>Gadsby Fabrics&lt;br&gt;Empire State Building&lt;br&gt;New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person or Organization in Contact with Bernstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| April 30, 1952 | Intercontinental Airways  
                          | Gate 125  
                          | Lockheed Air Terminal  
                          | Burbank, California |
| May 1, 1952  | National Civil Service League  
                          | 120 East 29th Street  
                          | New York, New York |
| May 2, 1952  | Civil Service Reform Association  
                          | 120 East 29th Street  
                          | New York, New York |
| May 7, 1952  | Government of Israel Supply Mission  
                          | 250 West 57th Street  
                          | New York, New York |
| May 8, 1952  |                                                                                      |
| May 9, 1952  | Common Council for American Unity  
                          | 20 West Fourth Street  
                          | New York, New York |
| May 9, 1952  | Trans Caribbean  
                          | 160 Central Park South  
                          | New York, New York |
| May 19, 1952 |                                                                                      |

- PENDING -
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ADMINISTRATIVE PAGE

INFORMANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity or Description of Information</th>
<th>Date of Activity or Description of Information</th>
<th>Agent Who Received Information</th>
<th>File No. and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/6/51 / 9/6/51 / November, 1951 / November, 1951 / Instant report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/18/52 / 3/20/52 / March, 1952 / Various dates / Instant report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail cover placed on subject's place of business, 20 Pine Street, New York City

MISCELLANEOUS

Copies of this report are being designated for the information of the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices because it is known that these offices are currently conducting an investigation relative to Israeli activities. It is believed that information in this report may be of interest to them in conducting their investigations.
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LEADS
NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.

REFERENCE

SAC, New York (65-15301)  
June 19, 1952

Director, FBI (65-59184)

MAHUM BERNSTEIN, was.
ESPIONAGE - II

Report SA ____________________________ dated 3-18-52, at
New York City.

On Page 3 of report it was reported that as the result of a mail cover maintained on subject's office, it was learned that Bernstein had received a communication from the War Department, Washington, D. C., on October 19, 1951. On Page 7 of report this same source reflected that he received another communication on January 18, 1952, from the Department of the Army, Washington Finance Office, U. S. Army, Washington, D. C.

Upon receipt of report, inquiries were instituted via liaison channels in an effort to determine the reason for the correspondence from the Department of the Army to Bernstein. The Bureau has now been advised that a check of the Army files on Bernstein has revealed no record of the contacts described above.

The information received from the Army, as set forth heretofore, was classified Security Information - Confidential. In the event it is utilized in an investigative report or other communication prepared for dissemination outside the Bureau, it should be suitably paraphrased.
Office Memorandum  
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: W. A. Branigan
FROM: W. R. Wannall
SUBJECT: NAHUL A. BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

DATE: June 16, 1952

PURPOSE: For record purposes.

DETAILS:

On 10-3-51 we received information indicating that the 201 file maintained on subject while he was in the Army had contained information to the effect that

[Handwritten note: This is for record purposes.]

On 12-5-51, we prepared a blind memorandum to this effect which was delivered to G-2 and in which we requested that Agency to endeavor to develop additional material from its files on Bernstein's alleged Communist connections.

This matter has been followed personally by writer on February 7, February 26, April 3, May 5, and June 11, 1952.

Writer will continue following this matter with Major Coffin.

ACTION: None. This is for record purposes.
This memorandum has been prepared as a matter of record and in order that the attached search slips of captioned subject may be made a part of the main file. The search slips cover the review of all see references on the subject for the period January, 1950, to May 22, 1952.
SERVICE UNIT
SEARCH SLIP

Supervisor: Wannall Room 15-31

Subj: Tarzan Brothers

Exact Spelling: X
All References: Searchers
Subversive Ref.: Initial: JB
Main File: Date: 5/22
Restricted to Locality of
After Jan 1/50

FILE NUMBER SERIALS

SL65-60090-72
LN 5V SZ
125-18832-19, 20, 21
SL65-58621-184
77-2866-87, 737
701-2261-169

SL65-60678-8
SL42-7804-222, 20842

08-59153 Initiated

SECRED
SERVICE UNIT
SEARCH SLIP

Supervisor Warren Room 5-31

Subj: Rachum Bernstein

Exact Spelling Searchers
All References Initial RB
Subversive Ref. Date 722
Main File
Restricted to Locality of

FILE NUMBER SERIALS

M 65-5-9/184-7

C5145-13449-8

SECRET

CLOSURE
It has been determined at the request of the Government to make dissemination of certain investigative reports received in the past on a selective basis. In effecting this dissemination and in order to protect to a greater degree the information developed regarding our investigation of [ ] in this country, these reports are being disseminated on a selective basis and are being classified prior to dissemination not less than "Security Information - Secret."

The reports being disseminated at this time are as follows:

Summary report prepared by [ ], dated June 5, 1951, at New York City.
Summary report prepared by [ ], dated January 30, 1952, at New York City.
Regular report prepared by [ ], dated March 10, 1952, at New York City.
Regular report prepared by [ ], dated June 3, 1952, at New York City.

It is noted that the Newark Office received one copy only of the first report listed above. The Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices received one copy of each of the four reports.

In the future, reports submitted in this case should bear a classification not less than "Security Information - Secret."

- 2 - Los Angeles (68-5048)
- 2 - Newark (68-4048)
- 2 - Washington Field (68-5884)
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : A. H. Belmont  
FROM : W. A. Branigan  
SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was ESPIONAGE - IS

DATE: July 7, 1952

PURPOSE:

Bernstein is considered to be one of the primary subjects in our investigation regarding espionage in this country. His name is included in the Special Section of the Security Index. Dissemination of reports in the past has been made on only two occasions on a selective basis and for a particular reason. To recommend that two summary reports and two regular investigative reports which set forth all pertinent information regarding our investigation of Bernstein from an espionage standpoint be disseminated at this time to Assistant Attorney General James M. McInerney of the Criminal Division of the State Department, and to recommend that future reports in this case be given the same dissemination. To have our Liaison Unit deliver the copies of the reports personally to:

BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION:

...
PAST DISSEMINATION IN THIS CASE:

Since the inception of this investigation, reports have been submitted by the field on a regular basis. Dissemination has not been given to these reports regularly because it was determined that dissemination should not be made pending the outcome of our investigation of the espionage allegations against Bernstein. In two instances, which are described fully below, reports were disseminated for a particular reason and on a selective basis.

NEUTRALITY ACT-CONSPIRACY VIOLATION

On July 28, 1950, our Los Angeles Office submitted a report concerning a Neutrality Act-Conspiracy violation arising as a result of Bernstein's testimony as a defense witness in the trial of the case "United States vs Schwimmer, et al" involving the illegal shipment of military aircraft to Israel. During this trial, Bernstein testified in effect that he had furnished the money and directed the defendants in the purchase of this material and in essence stated that he was responsible for the actions of the defendants. The AUSA in Los Angeles declined prosecution of Bernstein in his district inasmuch as there was no overt action committed by Bernstein there. He stated, however, that had he known of Bernstein's involvement in the case at the outset, he would have included him in the indictment and suggested that consideration be given to indicting Bernstein in the appropriate Federal District.

(65-59184-6)
We referred a copy of our Los Angeles report to the Department for an opinion and were advised by AAG McInerney on September 18, 1950, "in view of the conclusion of the Schwimmer and related cases involving these matters, it does not appear advisable to reopen any aspect of these cases." Therefore, this phase of the case against Bernstein was closed on October 11, 1950. (65-59184-14)

EMPLOYMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY:

In September, 1951, the Department of the Army submitted for regular processing by the Bureau two loyalty forms indicating that Bernstein were appointed on May 16, 1951, to positions as Consultants, Office Secretary of the Army. (65-59184-74)

It was further pointed out that on July 23, 1951, individual memoranda were submitted recommending that dissemination in these cases not be made to the Criminal Division since our investigation was continuing and dissemination at that time might prejudice our over-all future investigations in this field. For the same reason, it was recommended that dissemination in the Bernstein case not be made to the Criminal Division at that time. However, it was pointed out that because of Bernstein's connections with the Department of the Army, it would be particularly beneficial to G-2, Department of the Army, if we would make available to him a copy of a summary report which had been submitted in this case by our New York Office on June 5, 1951. As a result, it was determined at that time not to disseminate in the Bernstein case to the Criminal Division but to make a copy of the June 5, 1951, summary report available on a strictly confidential basis with the stipulation that it be maintained under his personal control. (65-59184-77)

SECURITY INDEX DATA:

On September 19, 1950, our New York Office recommended the preparation of a Security Index card on Bernstein based upon
the allegation connecting him with [ ] New York recommended that after preparation, the Security Index card be placed in the Special Section (Espionage) of the Index. The card was prepared for the Special Section on November 25, 1950, and is still maintained therein. (65-59184-15)

The summary report dated June 5, 1951, prepared by our New York Office, was submitted in accordance with the Bureau requirement that a summary report be prepared periodically on Security Index subjects in the Special Section. This particular summary report contains information showing the predication for our investigation of Bernstein as well as pertinent investigative results as of the time the report was prepared. (65-59184-58)

The New York Office submitted a second summary report in this case on January 24, 1952, bringing the investigation up to date. Since that time, two additional regular investigative reports have been submitted by our New York Office, one dated March 18, 1952, and the other dated June 3, 1952. (65-59184-92, 95, & 96)

A total of 15 regular investigative reports, in addition to the ones mentioned heretofore, have been received in this case. However, all pertinent information regarding our investigation of Bernstein is included in the two summary reports heretofore described and the investigative reports dated March 18 and June 3, 1952.

RECONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTION OF DISSEMINATION:

You will recall further that in disseminating reports in our cases involving [ ] who have been investigated, certain precautionary measures have been taken to prevent insofar as possible the compromise of our investigation of the [ ] These precautionary measures have consisted of classifying each report "Security Information - Secret" and delivering the reports via liaison channels to [ ] the State Department, G-2 and [ ] In making dissemination to the
Criminal Division, Department of Justice, we have sent the reports by memoranda to AAG James M. McInerney and have requested in the memoranda that the Bureau be advised prior to the institution of any action with respect to the subjects of the memoranda and the individuals who have come under investigation. It is felt that similar precautionary measures should be taken in disseminating the reports covering our investigation of Bernstein.

**ACTION:**

If it meets with your approval, dissemination will now be made in this case, in accordance with the procedure outlined above, to the State Department, CIA, G-2 and the Criminal Division. To accomplish this dissemination, the following reports will be distributed:

- Summary report of SA dated June 5, 1951, at New York City.
- Summary report of SA dated January 24, 1952, at New York City.
- Regular report of SA dated March 18, 1952, at New York City.

A copy of each of the above-described reports has been prepared for delivery via liaison channels personally. The necessary letters of transmittal enclosing a copy of each of the reports have been prepared addressed to the State Department; G-2, Department of the Army; and AAG James M. McInerney of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Future investigative reports received in this case will be disseminated upon receipt in accordance with these same procedures. The field is being advised to classify all future reports in this case not less than "Security Information - Secret."
Date: July 7, 1952

To: Department of State
Washington 25, D. C.

Attention: Mr. T. Achilles Polywoides
Director, Special Projects Staff

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, M.D.
ESPIONAGE - 18

March 20, 1952, continued

Reference is made to my communication to you dated March 20, 1952, captioned...

At the same time, I forwarded a copy of a summary report prepared by Special Agent...

In reviewing this report, you will note that our investigation in this matter of necessity included an inquiry regarding the activities of Nahum A. Bernstein, a lawyer with offices at 20 Pine Street...

In order that you may have the benefit of the results of our investigation regarding Bernstein, I am enclosing for your information one copy of each of the following reports...

Report of Special Agent
1951, at New York City.

Report of Special Agent
24, 1952, at New York City.

Report of Special Agent
18, 1952, at New York City.

Report of Special Agent
1952, at New York City.

RECORDED: 70 JUL 9, 1952

SECURITY INFORMATION - RF SECRET
EX - 3

6 JUL 17 1952
The attachments are for your confidential information and should not be disseminated outside your Department. Since our investigation in this case and related matters is continuing, it is requested that dissemination within your Department be restricted to those officials requiring the information in the performance of their duties in order that our further inquiries may not be jeopardized.
To: Director, FBI
From: Legal Attaché, Paris
Subject: SECURITY MATTER - C

August 18, 1950

cc London
Date: July 7, 1952

To: Department of the Army
   The Pentagon
   Washington 25, D.C.

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
       Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: HARRY FERNSTEIN, Espionage - 19

Reference is made to my communication of May 20, 1952, continued

At the same time, I forwarded a copy of a summary report prepared by Special Agent
under date of February 8, 1952, at Washington D.C., Case 185.

In reviewing this report, you will note that our investigation in this matter of necessity included an inquiry regarding the activities of HARRY FERNSTEIN, a lawyer with offices at 10 Pine Street, New York City.

You will recall that in September, 1951, our Liaison representative discussed with you certain information which had come to this Bureau's attention indicating that HARRY FERNSTEIN had been appointed on May 16, 1951, to positions as Consultant, Office Secretary of the Army. At that time our Liaison representative turned over to you for your confidential information a copy of a report prepared by Special Agent of the New York office of this Bureau on June 5, 1951. This report set forth the basis upon which our investigation of Bernstein was predicated as well as developments in that case through May 21, 1951.

Attachment

cc - SECURITY 121

RECORDED 56-58/84 - 58
In order that you may have the benefit of the more recent developments in this case, I am enclosing for your information one copy of each of the following investigative reports:


The attachments are for your confidential information and should not be disseminated outside your department. Since our investigation in this case and related matters is continuing, it is requested that dissemination within your department be restricted to those officials requiring the information in the performance of their duties in order that our further inquiries may not be jeopardized.
Assistant Attorney General  
James M. Mcinerney  

July 7, 1952

Reference is made to my communication to you dated March 20, 1952, captioned

At the same time, I forwarded a copy of a summary report prepared by Special Agent
in which were set forth our investigative results in

You will recall that this Bureau had previously been in
contact with you regarding captioned subject in the case captioned "Nahum A. Bernstein, Neutrality Act-Conspiracy." On
July 28, 1950, the Los Angeles Office of this Bureau prepared
a report setting forth information received as the result
of Bernstein's testimony as a defense witness during the trial
of the case "United States vs Schimmeier, et al." This case
involves the illegal shipment of military aircraft to Israel.
Bernstein testified in effect that he had furnished the money
and directed the defendants in the purchase of this material
and in essence stated that he was responsible for the actions
of the defendants. By memorandum dated September 16, 1950,
you indicated that in view of the conclusion of the Schimmeier
and related cases involving these matters, it did not appear
advisable to reopen any aspect of these cases.

Referring to our current investigation of Bernstein in
connection with the espionage allegations, I am enclosing
herewith a copy of each of the following investigative re-
ports setting forth the results of our inquiries through
June 2, 1952:

Report of Special Agent  
1951, at New York City.  
Report of Special Agent  
84, 1952, at New York City.

DUPLICATE YELLOW  

29-68184  
Attachment  
WRW:reo  
SECURITY INFORMATION - TOP SECRET  

08 JUL 23 1952
A copy of each of the above-listed reports is being made available to:

Department of State

and to:

Staff, C.B.S., Department of the Army.

You are requested to advise this Bureau prior to instituting any action with respect to Rahum A. Bernstein.
SECURITY INFORMATION - SECRET

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

THIS CASE ORIGINATED AT
NEW YORK

REPORT MADE AT
NEW YORK

DATE WHEN MADE
8/11/52

PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE
6/18; 7/16, 17,

REPORT MADE BY

CHARACTER OF CASE
ESPIONAGE - IS

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

NAHUM BERNSTEIN still maintains residence at 355 Locust Avenue, Rye, NY and still maintains law practice at 20 Pine Street, NYC. Advised he is acquainted with BERNSTEIN but has no knowledge of intelligence operations by BERNSTEIN. Believes contact with Department of the Army concerns BERNSTEIN'S position as Consultant to Office of Secretary of the Army. Other contacts of BERNSTEIN set out.

DETAILS:

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN...
Confidential informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that on October 19, 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was in receipt of a communication from the United States War Department, Washington, D.C. [ ] also advised that on January 18, 1952 BERNSTEIN received a communication from the Department of Army, Washington Finance Office, United States Army, Washington, D.C.

Confidential Informant [ ] another government agency which maintains personnel files, advised that the Department of Army, Washington, D.C., had no record of contact with the subject.

[ ] stated, however, that the communication of October 19, 1951 may have referred to BERNSTEIN'S termination of his position as a Consultant to the Civilian Legal Personnel Committee, Office of the Secretary of the Army.

[ ] also stated that BERNSTEIN'S contact with the Washington Finance Office on January 18, 1952 may have concerned the payment of fees due to BERNSTEIN resulting from his service as a Consultant to this committee.

[ ] previously mentioned, advised that the subject was in contact with numerous persons and organizations at his business address, 20 Pine Street, New York City, during the months June and July, 1952.

Date
June 6, 1952

Person Or Organization Contacted

Ultramar Instrument Corporation
200 West 57 Street
New York City

Lawyers Club
115 Broadway
New York City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Organization Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 1952</td>
<td>New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1952</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1952</td>
<td>Paris 16, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1952</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material for Israel
250 West 57 Street
New York, New York
NY 65-15301

Date
July 9, 1952
July 22, 1952

Person Or Organization Contacted

"The Jerusalem Post"
Jerusalem

Bank Leumi
Le-Israel
25 Nine Street
New York City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity and Description</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Agent To Whom Furnished</th>
<th>File Number Where Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July, 1952</td>
<td>7/22/52</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Instant report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail cover</td>
<td>June, July 1952</td>
<td>Various Dates</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Instant report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintained on address of MAUDE BEINSTEIN at 20 Pine Street, New York City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Instant file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Army, 1/18/52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

This report is being classified "Secret" as per Bureau instructions as set out in Bureau letter dated 7/7/52 advising that all reports in this case will bear a classification not less than "Security Information - Secret."
A copy of this report is being designated for information of the Los Angeles Office because it is known that this office is currently conducting an investigation relative to (S). It is believed that information in this report may be of interest to them in conducting their investigations.

LEAD

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.

Will attempt to further identify Bank Leumi Le-Israel, 20 Pine Street, New York City, from whom BERNSTEIN received correspondence on July 22, 1952.

REFERENCE

Bureau letter to New York, 6/19/52.
A. H. Belmont

W. A. Branigan

REBECCA GETZOFF, was.

ESPIONAGE - R

October 20, 1952

The above is for your information and for record purposes.

65-60090

65-59184 (Nahum Bernstein) [5]

65-57923 (Joseph Katz)

Classified by 29046666

DECLASSIFY ON: 25X 449 29-1

3/28/54

Classified by 99670 39-539

NOT RECORDED

138.001124.1952
You will recall that [redacted] visited her relatives in the United States from July 2, 1931, to September 10, 1931. At the end of her visit in the United States, just prior to her departure for Israel, she stayed at the Wellington Hotel, New York City.
The H. Bernstein mentioned above is Nahum Bernstein, a native American, who is a practicing attorney with offices at 20 Pine Street, New York City.

RECOMMENDATION: None, this is for your information.
October 20, 1952

A. H. Belmont

W. A. Branigan

ESPIONAGE - R

ACTION:

The above is for your information and for record purposes.

65-60090

65-59184 (Mahum Bernstein)
65-57912 (Joseph Lats)

CLASSIFIED BY 3/29/51
DECLASSIFIED ON 2/28/54

a44929-1

339-539

NOT RECORDED
138 DCH 24 1952
BURENSTIEM, was

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

In connection with the presentation of "Conquest of the Desert" to be given in Israel 1953,

BERNSTEIN in contact with well known Los Angeles Attorney and Communist Party member. Subject contacted on 10/15/52. Bank Leumi Le Israel is National Bank of Israel represented in New York City.

DETAILS: In November 1951 Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that NAHUM K. ROGANSKY is an Israeli attorney representing the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN. On March 31, 1950 the law firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN sent out announcements to leading New York attorneys as follows:

They announce the opening of an Israeli office at 26 Rothschild Boulevard, Tel Aviv. MR. NAHUM K.
ROGANSKY of the Israeli bar is counsel in charge.
NY 65-15301

Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that

Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that [ ] was connected in New York with an organization [ ] and that this was an exposition. They intended to complete plans for the expositions to take place in Israel in the Spring of 1953.

Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that the following individuals and organizations were in contact with NAHUM BERNSTEIN at his business address, 20 Pine Street, New York City on the dates indicated:

- 2 -
Before the House Committee on Un-American Activities sub-committee hearing at Los Angeles, California, on September 19, 1951, a writer for the motion picture industry and an admitted Communist Party member during the period.
1936-43 advised that [redacted], at one time, to him to have been affiliated with the Communist Party, was
in some capacity.

Confidential informant [redacted] of known reliability
advised that [redacted] was transferred from membership.

Confidential informant [redacted] of known reliability
advised in September 22, 1949 that [redacted] attorney
at law has represented Communist Party members in litigation.

September 25, 1952

October 9, 1952
National Lawyers Guild
40 Exchange Place
New York 5, New York

October 9, 1952

October 9, 1952
Joseph Schim & Company
11 Park Place
New York 7, New York

October 10, 1952
Lamcker and Nostor
760 7 Avenue
New York 19, New York

October 10, 1952

October 10, 1952
Common Council for
American Unity
20 WSE 70 Street
New York 13, New York
Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that the Common Council for American Unity, 20 West 40 Street, New York 10, New York, furnished a printed circular dated January 1, 1947 to Bronx County Communist Party Headquarters. This circular was entitled: "Peace is a job that is up to you and me." The circular urged that a financial contribution be made to the above mentioned council and also reflected the following material: "As you have watched the peace conference at Paris, the struggle over Trieste and war in China, even the United Nations at Flushing Meadow, you have probably wondered whether after all mankind will succeed in breaking out of the age-old pattern of war....God knows whether we shall be in time, but the desperate urgency that we face today is the more necessary to do all we can...to strengthen and support the forces working for a free world."

Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that the Common Council for American Unity, furnished a circular letter to the headquarters of the International Workers Order. This letter extended an invitation to the Council's "Members and Friends," to attend a series of United Nations evenings to be held every Saturday commencing January 18 at 8:30 p.m.

Literature disseminated by this organization reveals it was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1913 to assist immigrants and foreign born to adjust themselves to the American way of life.

October 15, 1952

Ministers of the Israel Embassy to Washington, D.C.

It is noted that the Israel Embassy to Washington, D.C.
As previously reported, AMOS DASTEL was contacted by the Bank Leumi Le Israel, 20 Pine Street, New York City on July 22, 1952.

Confidential Informant [redacted] of known reliability advised on October 28, 1952 that the Bank Leumi Le Israel was formerly known as the Anglo-Palestine Bank Ltd. and that its principal office is at Tel Aviv, Israel. This bank, is the National Bank of Israel and maintains a representative office at 20 Pine Street, New York City. According to

Confidential Informant [redacted] of known reliability advised that the National Bank of Israel would be in Los Angeles on June 14, 1952.

On February 20, 1951, Confidential Informant [redacted] previously mentioned advised that he was in contact with [redacted] could not advise the nature of this contact.

[redacted] also advised that NAHUM [redacted] made the following telephone calls to the individuals identified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Subscriber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 1952</td>
<td>141-5-5462</td>
<td>Koon &amp; Barboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421 3 Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 18, 1952
April 20, 1952
April 28, 1952
May 1, 1952
May 3, 1952
May 10, 1952
May 11, 1952
May 12, 1952
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity and Description of Info</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Agent to Whom Furnished</th>
<th>File Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1 NY 592-S</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/10/51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65-15516-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65-15516-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65-15516-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/9/52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail cover maintained on subject's business address 20 Pine Street, New York, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report is being classified "Secret" as per Bureau instructions as set out in Bureau letter dated July 7, 1952 advising that all reports in this case will bear a classification not less than "Security Information - Secret".

A copy of this report is being designated for the information of the Los Angeles office inasmuch as that office is currently conducting an investigation relative to

LEADS

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM
BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.

REFERENCE

Confidential Information of low reliability, as indicated.

[Redacted]
Prior to the dissemination of the report at the request of the Government, it was necessary to revise page two to eliminate material from paragraph five which tended to identify Confidential Informants. Sufficient corrected copies of this page are attached for each office. The following additional changes were made in the report prior to its dissemination:

The misspelling of the last name of MANUEL BERNSTEIN was corrected in line four of the details on page one; in line one of paragraph one, page six; and in line one of paragraph six, page six.

The misspelling of the first name of \[\text{corrected name}\] was corrected in the sixth line from the bottom of page five, and in line two of paragraph five, page six.

An apostrophe was inserted in the word "representative's" in line five of paragraph two, page six.

The corrected page furnished herewith should be inserted in the copies of the reports retained in the files of the New York and Los Angeles Offices. In addition, the above noted typographical errors should be corrected in each.

attachment

cc - 2 - Los Angeles (65-344) UJM (sufficient)

WR: cme

60 Jan 18 1953

COMM - FBI
DEC 30 1952
MAILED 26
A review of Bumble in captioned matter reflects that the last report submitted by your office was in a pending status and was dated 8-14-52. On 10-13-52 an O-1 form was sent to your office pointing out that the deadline in this case had passed and instructing that a report be submitted immediately. Your reply, received 10-24-52, was to the effect that a report would be submitted by 10-31-52.

There is no record of any report's having been received from your office in this case since August 14, last. You are instructed to submit a report by December 1, 1952.
TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)

FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)

DATE: 11/25/52

SUBJECT: NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

Rebulet 11/19/52.

Rebulet advised that no report has been received in this matter since 8/14/52.

A pending report under date of 11/14/52 was submitted in this matter and should be at the Bureau at this time.
December 8, 19

PERSONAL ATTENTION

A review of the Bernstein file at the Seat
of Government has reflected that the last six reports
submitted by your office were dated 10/29/51, 1/24/52,
3/18/52, 6/3/52, 8/14/52 and 11/14/52. You will note
that between these reports there were lapses ranging
from 54 days to 93 days. On no occasion was a report
submitted before the Bureau sent an O-1 Form to the
New York Office, in spite of the fact that New York is
office of origin and as such is charged with the
responsibility of supervising this investigation.

The Bureau desires that more expeditious
attention be given to this case and that future reports
be submitted on a regular basis when due. If developments
warrant, the reports should be submitted more frequently
than every 45 days.

WRW: hmb 17 4
TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN;
6-M. - 6

DATE: 2/3/53

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ALIASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE BORN</th>
<th>NATURALIZED</th>
<th>ALIEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNIST</th>
<th>SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISCELLANEOUS (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB FOR DETCOM</th>
<th>TAB FOR COMSAB</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS ADDRESS (Show name of employing concern and address)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF INDUSTRY OR BUSINESS (Specify from Vital Facility List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS</th>
<th>355 Locust Avenue, Harrison, New York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

HAMCO: LJR

3/29/54 5 Pit 15 69
3 7 5 5 3
It is noted that according to Confidential Informant [underline] of known reliability, the subject received correspondence from [underline].

It also advised that the subject was in contact with the following individuals and organizations during November and December 1952.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 1952</td>
<td>Material for Israel Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 West 57 Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 1952</td>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>461 4 Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 1952</td>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267 West 71 Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 19, 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity and/or Description of Information</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Agent To whom Furnished</th>
<th>File Number Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>November 19, 1952</td>
<td>11/19/52</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>65-15961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail Cover maintained on November and December 1952 subject's business address, 20 Pine Street, New York City

MISCELLANEOUS

This report is being classified "Secret" as per Bureau instructions as set out in Bureau letter dated July 7, 1952 advising that all reports in this case will bear a classification of not less than Secret.

LEAD

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.

REFERENCES

New York letter to Bureau. 12/16/52, entitled,
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)
SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was ESPIONAGE - IS

Re report of SAC at NY, dated 1/7/53, five copies of which are enclosed.
SAC, New York (65-13301)  
MAJOR GEN 77  
Director, FBI (65-59184)  

Nathan Bernstein, wgt.  
ESPIONAGE - 1S  

February 6, 1959  

Re: Report of a Carbon dating 1-7-53, at  
New York City.  

1)  

2) Bernstein has made him a business offer.  

3)  

4)  

5)  

While the information in item (1) above is pertinent in that it reflects upon the degree of reliability of the informant, it is not felt that the information in the remaining 4 items is pertinent to this case.  

Attachment:  

cc - 2 - Los Angeles (65-5048)  

WR: req'd (2)  

63 FEB 11 1353  

MAILED 3  

63 FEB 11 1353  

CIAAM, FBI
Four copies of report are returned herewith for revision. Eliminate nonpertinent information and data tending to reveal the identity of the informant and forward the revised report to the Bureau within 15 days of the receipt of this communication.

The revised report should either show the results of investigation conducted to identify the correspondent of subject residing at 301 Howard Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, who addressed the subject as "Ned Barney" or should set forth a lead showing that proper attention is being given to this matter.

"Kerpen does not indicate that this investigation is being given the attention required in Bulet 4-12-52 captioned [and Bulet 12-8-52] in instant case. While the "period for which made" shows investigative activity on 7 days, the report contains only the results of one interview and of a mail cover. When the revised report requested above is forwarded to the Bureau, a copy memorandum should be transmitted containing an outline of the future investigative steps you contemplate undertaking for the purpose of bringing this case to a logical conclusion."
SAC, New York (65-15301)

February 13, 1953

Director, FBI (65-59184)

Nahum Bernstein
Espionage - IS

Your attention is directed to the fact that no number SAC Letter I dated 3-14-52 requires that a summary report be submitted once each year on subjects who are carried in the Special Section of the Security Index. Files reflect that the last summary report submitted by your office in this matter was dated 1-24-52.

You are requested to advise the Bureau when the next summary report may be expected in this case.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
Dated 3/29/54 BY DPISBTS

WRW: brg

MAILED 16
FEB 13 1953
COMM. FBI
TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)

DATE: 3/5/53

SUBJECT: MANH. BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

Rebulet 2/13/53.

Referenced letter requested New York office to advise when a summary report may be expected in this case.

This is to advise that it is anticipated that a summary report in this matter will be prepared and forwarded to the Bureau by April 10, 1953.

Due to the urgency of other matters it is believed that a summary report cannot be properly prepared before that date.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 3/5/53  R.D. BUREF 5

R.DED  -  142

MAR 23 1953
NAHUM BERNSTEIN, a CCCP citizen, has been engaged in Israeli intelligence work in Europe in 1949 and 1950, was interviewed by SAS on November 19, 1952. He advised that he had recently been contacted by NAHUM BERNSTEIN concerning a business matter.
It is noted that the records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 70 Columbus Avenue, New York City, reflect that
arrived in the United States
via Sabena Airlines, under temporary visa
Further, that in his application for extended
time on a temporary stay, which application was dated
October 9, 1952, furnished the following information
concerning himself:

His address in the United States was
His passport number was
issued by the State of Israel
His foreign address was given
where he resided from 1920 to
1952. On his application indicated he was visiting
NABUM A. BERNSTEIN
at 20 Pine Street, New York City, and that occupation was
listed his marital status as married, and
furnished his wife's name as
address

The records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service reflect that was granted an extended time
for temporary stay
NY 65-15301

[Blank]

[Blank]

[Blank]

[Blank]

[Blank]

[Blank]

According to Confidential Informant of known reliability, an organization which maintains records of business activities in the New York City area, the Israeli Industries Incorporated was incorporated under the New York State Laws on June 6, 1949, and commenced active operations at 20 Pine Street, New York City, on that date. The officers of the company were listed as:

NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN - President
JAMES HODES - Vice President
EDWARD S. SILVER - Vice President
SAMUEL D. HALPERIN - Vice President
Telarga Ltd.,
Jerusalem, The foreign office is maintained at 26 Rothschild Boulevard, Tel Aviv, Israel. The corporation is an industrial management organization assisting in the establishment and management of American Industrial Enterprises in Israel. The corporation is qualified to do business in Israel and services are performed for various industrial concerns in this country.

It is noted that according to Confidential Informant of known reliability, the subject received correspondence on November 24, 1951. Also advised that the subject was in contact with the following individuals or organizations during November and December 1952:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Organization Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 1952</td>
<td>Material for Israel Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 West 57 Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that NAHUM BERNSTEIN is the Attorney for Material for Israel Incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person or Organization Contacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 1952</td>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>461 4 Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NY 65-15301

Date

November 21, 1952

December 17, 1952

December 19, 1952
(Addressed to NED BERNEY)

Person or Organization Contacted

American Fund for Israel Institutions
267 West 71 Street
New York, New York

- P -
### IDENTITY OF INFORMANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of source</th>
<th>Date of activity and/or description of info.</th>
<th>Date received</th>
<th>Agent to whom furnished</th>
<th>File # where located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/19/52 Description of interview 11/19/52</td>
<td>11/19/52</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>65-15961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>August Bureau 65-15150-1B40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/18/53 Instant report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November &amp; December 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November &amp; December 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail cover on subject's business address at 20 Pine St., New York City.
This report is being classified "Secret" as per Bureau instructions as set out in Bureau letter dated July 7, 1952 advising that all reports in this case will bear a classification of not less than secret.

LEADS

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with Israeli activities.

Will attempt to identify the individual who addressed subject as NED BERNY on December 19, 1952.

REFERENCES


New York letter to Bureau dated 12/16/52, entitled Espionage - IS"
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)
SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was ESPIONAGE - IS

Rebulet to New York dated 2/6/53.

Enclosed herewith are the original and 4 copies of the revised report of SA as requested in rebulet.

It is noted that enclosed report contains information relative to NAHUM BERNSTEIN'S business association with

With regard to investigative steps contemplated by this office, it is noted that the New York Office recently requested permission to conduct a survey on the subject's residence. This office will continue to place mail covers on the subject's place of business, 20 Pine Street, New York City, and residence at Harrison, New York; will also give consideration to effecting arrangements for securing trash from the office of the subject at 20 Pine Street, New York City; will discreetly attempt to ascertain subject's activities through other sources available to this office.

It is noted that the subject's residence, in the past, has been carried as 355 Locust Avenue, Rye, New York, and subject received mail addressed in this manner. However, it has been established that the subject is in fact residing in what is known as the Old Putnam Estate, which is located opposite 355 Locust Avenue, outside the city limits of Rye, New York. There is no number designation for the estate and the property is actually located within the boundary of the town of Harrison, New York.

In the future the subject's address will be carried as Old Putnam Estate, Locust Avenue, Harrison, New York, and the next New York report will reflect this change.

Encs. (5)

Declassified: 25X
INDEXED 142

COPIES DESTROYED 03 APR 7 1953
REGISTERED
HAMS: MZM/IMCL
HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

MOVED BY

FILE NUMBER 65-59-84-114

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
AIR-TEL
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

NEW YORK, 3/4/53
Transmit the following Teletype message to:

NAHUM BERNSTEIN, ESP-IS. REBULET FEBRUARY 6, LAST. REVISED REPORT DICTATED THIS DATE. TRANSCRIPTION WILL BE EXPEDITED AND REPORT SUBMITTED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

BOARDMAN

HAM: MOH (#1) 65-15301
Approved: ____________________________ Sent M Per_
Special Agent in Charge
SAC, New York (65-15301)  
Director, FBI (65-59184)  

MADAM A. BERNSTEIN, Was.
ESPIONAGE - DB

March 17, 1953

Under date of 2-3-53, your office submitted a form, 
FD-122, requesting certain changes on the Security Index card maintained 
on captioned subject. The form was submitted under the caption, "Mabum 
Bernstein; S. M. - C."

The character of the case has been corrected on the form 
submitted by your office. You should make this correction on the copy 
of the form maintained in your files.

EX - 107
RECORDED - 46
MAR, 18, 1953
130
**REPORT MADE AT**

NEW YORK

**DATE WHEN MADE**

APR 8 1953

**PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE**

3/23, 31;

**REPORT MADE BY**


**CHARACTER OF CASE**

ESPIONAGE - IS

---

**SYNOPSIS:**

NAHUM BERNSTEIN continues to reside at Locust Ave., Harrison, NY.

--

**DETAILS:**

At New York, New York

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN and family are currently residing at the Old Putnam Estate, Locust Avenue, Harrison,

---

*PROPERTY OF FBI—This confidential report and any part or summary thereof are not to be distributed outside of*
New York. [Redacted] stated that there is no street number designation for the subject's residence but it is located opposite 355 Locust Avenue, Harrison, New York. Bernstein moved to this address in November 1951, and has maintained residence here since that date.

According to Confidential Informant [Redacted] of known reliability, the subject still conducts a law firm at the address 20 Pine Street, New York City, and is a partner of Edward Silver and they operate under the firm name Silver and Bernstein.

Confidential Informant [Redacted] of known reliability, advised on February 13, 1952, that Nahum Bernstein was contacted by [Redacted] and who has been very active in the affairs of Israel. On that occasion an appointment was made with Bernstein to meet with him, on the following Tuesday. This informant had previously advised that these four individuals were very interested in the status of the publication "Israel Speaks" and it was believed by this informant that the proposed meeting was to take place to discuss the future of this publication. [Redacted]
NY 65-15301

advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN was in contact with AARON R. ROJANSKY on November 10, 1951. ROJANSKY is the Israeli representative of the law firm of Silver and Bernstein, 20 Pine Street, New York City. On the occasion of this contact with ROJANSKY, BERNSTEIN told ROJANSKY that he had to go to the Israeli Consulate in New York on Tuesday to pick up some papers as he stated he had completed work for the Israeli Government and wanted to finish up his accounts with them. It is noted that on that date ROJANSKY was visiting in the United States.

Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that among the subject's contacts during November and December 1952, were: Government of Israel Supply Mission, National Lawyers Guild, the Israeli Consulate, New York City, and the publication "Israel Speaks."

Confidential Informant [ ] previously mentioned, advised of a meeting held between NAHUM BERNSTEIN, [ ] on March 18, 1952, at which time they took up the arrival of [ ] suggested a meeting to be held on March 25, 1952, prior to the arrival [ ] indicated the contemplated meeting was to discuss the merger of "Israel Speaks" and the "Jerusalem Post." [ ]

[ ] further advised on March 20, 1952, of a meeting held at the home of NAHUM BERNSTEIN attended by [ ] Phonetic) and which meeting concerned the publicity business, [ ] was unable to further elaborate on the nature of this meeting. [ ]

It is noted that in June 1951, NAHUM BERNSTEIN was listed as Secretary of Israel Speaks Incorporated, which corporation publishes the bimonthly publication known as "Israel Speaks."
The May 23, 1952, issue of "Israel Speaks" carries DAVID WAHL as publisher.
Confidential Informant previously mentioned advised that NAHUM BERNSTEIN was in contact with [redacted] on September 22, 1952.

Concerning [redacted], the following should be noted:

Before the House Committee on Un-American
NY 65-15301

Activities Subcommittee Hearing at Los Angeles, California, on September 19, 1951. An admitted Communist Party member during the period advised that an attorney, was known to him to have been affiliated with the Communist Party in some capacity.

Confidential Informant[redacted] of known reliability, advised that was transferred from membership at large, to the Los Angeles County Communist Party in 1949.

Confidential Informant[redacted] of known reliability, advised on September 22, 1949, that attorney at law, has represented Communist Party members in litigation.

According to the records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, New York City, address was
given as ____________________________ His
application indicated he was visiting NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN,
at 20 Pine Street, New York City.
listed his marital status as married and furnished his
wife's name as ____________________________

The records at the Immigration and Naturalization
Service described ____________________________ as ____________________________ eyes
hair
nationality ____________________________ and previous date in the United
States - 1949.

It is noted that ____________________________ may be
identical NAHUM BERNSTEIN.

Confidential Informant previously mentioned,
advised that on December 19, 1952, the subject was contacted
by a correspondent ____________________________ The subject was addressed as

NED SERNEY.

Investigation in the area ____________________________ that the number
is nonexistent. The street numbers only run to 820.
It is to be noted that NAHUM BERNSTEIN is the attorney for Material for Israel Incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 1953</td>
<td>American Fund for Israel Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267 West 71st Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York 23, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 1953</td>
<td>Material for Israel Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 West 57th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 1953</td>
<td>Israel Speaks Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 Park Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 1953</td>
<td>&quot;The Jerusalem Post&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post office Box 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 1953</td>
<td>United States Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of Source</td>
<td>Date of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/24/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/20/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various dates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail Cover maintained on the office of subject at 20 Pine St., NYC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity/Description of Information</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Agent to Whom Furnished</th>
<th>Fil Number Where Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1952</td>
<td>May 1952</td>
<td></td>
<td>65-15516-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of Source</td>
<td>Date of Activity and/or Description of Information</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Agent to Whom Furnished</td>
<td>File Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information re</td>
<td>August 1951</td>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td>65-15150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

This report is being given a security classification of "Secret" as per Bureau instructions as set out in Bureau letter, dated 7/7/52, advising that all reports in this case will bear a classification not less than "Security Information - Secret."

Copies of this report have been designated for the information of the Washington Field and Los Angeles Offices because these offices are currently conducting investigations relative to in their areas and it is believed that information contained in this report may be of assistance to them in their investigations.

**LEADS**

**NEW YORK**

At New York, New York

Will continue to follow the activities of NAHUM
LEADS (Cont'd.)

NEW YORK

At New York, New York (cont'd.)

BERNSTEIN in connection with

REFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report of SA</td>
<td>8/14/52</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of SA</td>
<td>11/14/52</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of SA</td>
<td>1/7/53</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE OF MAIL 4/20/53

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1738

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY 5/29/54

FILE NUMBER 65-59184-118

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
DATE OF MAIL  4-7-58

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1735

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT  JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY  5-9 06/6/58

FILE NUMBER  66-57/84-1W

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEBOT
DATE OF MAIL 4/9/53

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY 5/1 MAY 6 1953

FILE NUMBER 65-59184-120

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
DATE OF MAIL 4/17/53.

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1730.

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY

FILE NUMBER 66-59184-121.

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY

FILE NUMBER 65-9/94 - 122

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY MAY 6 1953

FILE NUMBER 65-5934-156

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 173.

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY

FILE NUMBER 65-59184-123

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
The above is forwarded for your information and for the completion of your files with respect to this matter.
DATE OF MAIL 5-20-53

HAS BEEN REMOVED TO BE KEPT PERMANENTLY IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM 1736

SEE FILE 66-2554-7530 FOR AUTHORITY.

SUBJECT JUNE MAIL

REMOVED BY

FILE NUMBER 65-59184-124

PERMANENT SERIAL CHARGEOUT
Date: May 21, 1953

To: Mr. John W. Ford
   Director
   Office of Security
   Department of State
   515 22nd Street, N.W.
   Washington, D.C.

Attention: Mr. Walter E. Jessop

From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
       Federal Bureau of Investigation

Subject: [Blank]
In the absence from the city, on July 19, 1949, our Liaison representative discussed this matter personally with [redacted] was advised that based upon the facts supplied this Bureau would undertake an investigation in an effort to develop complete details regarding this matter. It was pointed out that in handling the matter this Bureau desired to establish complete control over the investigation in order to avoid conflicts between any inquiries which we instituted and investigations being conducted by the Department of State and the various United States intelligence agencies involved. It was stated that he understood the necessity for this and could assure this Bureau that there would be no interference from the Department of State or other agencies. He explained that he had already informed the heads of the other intelligence agencies that the Federal Bureau of Investigation would be handling the matter, but that he would reiterate these instructions to the heads of such agencies.

Thereafter, an active investigation regarding the matter was instituted by this Bureau. The results of our inquiries were furnished either by memoranda or during several conferences in which representatives of his office and representatives of this Bureau participated.

At the outset of our investigations in this matter indicated that he would maintain complete records with respect to various documents involved. It is therefore believed that copies of many of the United States documents described in Agent Burstein's report can be secured by your office. Our communication of March 20, 1952, also described various reports which had previously been forwarded to the Department of State, and in addition, enclosed.

SECURITY INFORMATION - TOP SECRET
On September 29, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 8, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On December 5, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 10, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On March 25, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated February 13, 1952, at Washington, D. C.
On May 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated March 28, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On May 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated April 1, 1952, at Detroit, Michigan.


On May 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated May 6, 1952, at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

On June 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated May 20, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On July 18, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated June 24, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On July 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated July 14, 1952, at Detroit, Michigan.

On September 10, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated July 29, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On September 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 16, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On October 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated October 1, 1952, at New York, New York.

On December 3, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 13, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On January 23, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 7, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On March 20, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 27, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On April 3, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated March 18, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On September 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 17, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On December 11, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 13, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On February 13, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 14, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On March 20, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 27, 1953, at New York, New York.

On April 3, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated March 16, 1953, at Washington, D. C.


On September 12, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated August 14, 1952, at New York, New York.


On March 27, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 7, 1953, at New York, New York.

On May 6, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated April 8, 1953, at New York, New York.

On May 3, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated March 7, 1952, at Los Angeles, California.
On May 13, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated March 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, California.

On March 26, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 6, 1953, at New York, New York.

On March 26, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 25, 1953, at Washington, D.C.


On October 10, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 16, 1952, at Washington, D.C.

On January 9, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated November 26, 1952, at Boston, Massachusetts.

On January 9, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated December 3, 1952, at Washington, D.C.

On February 27, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 9, 1953, at Washington, D.C.

On March 20, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 10, 1953, at Washington, D.C.

On February 12, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated December 14, 1951, at Newark, New Jersey.

On January 14, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated December 21, 1951, at Boston, Massachusetts.


On October 14, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 25, 1952, at New York, New York.

On January 16, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated December 9, 1952, at New York, New York.

On September 17, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 4, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On March 31, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated January 23, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On May 17, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated March 26, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On July 22, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated June 27, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On September 12, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated August 14, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On December 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated July 22, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On December 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 8, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On December 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated October 28, 1952, at San Francisco, California.

On December 30, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 17, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On June 25, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated June 3, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On September 9, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated August 15, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On October 15, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 23, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On October 22, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 30, 1952, at New York, N. Y.

On January 2, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated December 11, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On April 2, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated February 14, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On April 7, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated March 25, 1952, at Boston, Massachusetts.


On May 17, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated April 15, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On June 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated May 13, 1952, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

On July 18, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated June 25, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On September 26, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 4, 1952, at Washington, D. C.
On September 26, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 11, 1952, at New York, New York.

On November 7, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated October 23, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On February 9, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 19, 1953, at New York, New York.

On April 17, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated April 1, 1953, at New York, New York.

On April 17, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated April 2, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On August 15, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated July 29, 1952, at San Francisco, California.

On September 29, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 12, 1952, at San Francisco, California.

On November 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated October 31, 1952, at San Francisco, California.

On December 12, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 24, 1952, at Baltimore, Maryland.

On January 26, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 8, 1953, at San Francisco, California.

On February 18, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 6, 1953, at Cincinnati, Ohio.

On April 9, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated March 23, 1953, at Los Angeles, California.

On December 11, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 4, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On March 3, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 29, 1953, at Washington, D. C.
On November 7, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated October 17, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On May 5, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated April 1, 1953, at Washington, D. C.


On March 12, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated February 6, 1953, at New York, New York.

On May 8, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated April 16, 1953, at New York, New York.

On March 31, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated February 19, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On May 22, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated April 19, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On June 16, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated May 12, 1952, at Newark, New Jersey.

On July 14, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated May 26, 1952, at Phoenix, Arizona.

On July 7, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated June 11, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On August 20, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated July 31, 1952, at Washington, D. C.
SECURITY INFORMATION - TOP SECRET

On September 12, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated August 11, 1952, at New York, New York.

On October 1, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 19, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On December 1, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated November 17, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On February 13, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 9, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On February 9, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated January 23, 1953, at New York, New York.

On March 27, 1953, the report of Special Agent dated March 2, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On July 31, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated July 16, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On September 29, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated September 3, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


On November 25, 1952, the report of Special Agent dated October 31, 1952, at Washington, D. C.


SECRURITY INFORMATION - TOP SECRET

- 11 -
On December 10, 1952, the report of Special Agent
dated November 12, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On March 13, 1953, the report of Special Agent
dated February 12, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

On March 28, 1952, the report of Special Agent

On May 21, 1952, the report of Special Agent

On August 7, 1952, the report of Special Agent
dated July 24, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On September 23, 1952, the report of Special Agent
dated August 1, 1952, at New York, New York.

On December 11, 1952, the report of Special Agent

On March 27, 1953, the report of Special Agent

On September 9, 1952, the report of Special Agent
dated August 21, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On December 11, 1952, the report of Special Agent
dated November 17, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On February 12, 1953, the report of Special Agent
dated January 19, 1953, at Washington, D. C.

After you have had the opportunity to review the above-
described communication and reports, it is requested that you advise
this Bureau of the nature of the investigation you contemplate
undertaking in an effort to determine if classified United States
material was released without authorization by an employee of your
Department, as mentioned in the memorandum of reference (12).
July 16, 1953

MAHUM BERNSTEIN, was.
ESPIONAGE - IS

Rererep SA dated 6-22-53 at New York City.

In order that dissemination of rererep may not be unduly delayed at the Seat of Government, it is requested that you submit five copies of the revised report to the Bureau and one copy each to the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices within fifteen days of the receipt of this communication.

Attachment

cc - 1 - Los Angeles (65-9048) *(For information)*

cc - 1 - Washington Field *(For information)*

WHW:amb

Mailed o

JUL 16 1953

COMM - FBI
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANT [redacted] of known reliability, advised that the subject continues to maintain offices at 20 Pine Street, New York City, and continues to reside at the Old Putnam Estate, 225 East Avenue, Harrison, New York.
Confidential Informant [X] of known reliability, made available information concerning the account of Silver and Bernstein [X]. The informant advised that Silver and Bernstein maintained two checking accounts, one a special checking account and the second a regular checking account.

- 3 -
an employee in the office of the subject.
The above information furnished by   is not to be made public except in the course of a legal proceeding following the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum.

Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability, advised that the subject was in contact with the following individuals and organizations during May, 1953 at his office, 20 Pine Street, New York City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization or Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/23/53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/53</td>
<td>Jewish War Veterans, 55 West 77 Street, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/53</td>
<td>American Fund for Israel, 267 West 71 Street, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/53</td>
<td>Suite 216, 250 West 57 Street, New York 19, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/53</td>
<td>Material for Israel, 250 West 57 Street, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/53</td>
<td>Irving Trust Company, 1 Wall Street, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of Source</td>
<td>Date of Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>5/28/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/18/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/1/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/2/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/2/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/2/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank accounts</td>
<td>5/20/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Silver &amp;</td>
<td>b1 b7C b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein, 20 Pine</td>
<td>b7D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St., NYC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail cover on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver &amp; Bernstein,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Pine St., NYC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info re</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report is being given a security classification of Top Secret inasmuch as information contained in this report was obtained from the report of SA New York, 5/8/53, entitled (S).

Copies of this report have been designated for the Los Angeles and Washington Field offices for information purposes inasmuch as these offices are currently conducting investigations relative to (S) in their areas and it is believed that information contained in this report may be of assistance to them in their investigation.

LEADS

NEW YORK

At New York, New York

Will monitor the subject's personal bank account and the account of Silver and Bernstein in an effort to determine if the subject made a loan of $3,000.00 or others connected with (S).

Will continue to follow the activities of Nahum Bernstein in connection with (S).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER CIP CASE</th>
<th>REPORT MADE AT</th>
<th>DATE WHEN MADE</th>
<th>PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE</th>
<th>REPORT MADE BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAHUM BERNSTEIN, W</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>AUG 3 1953</td>
<td>4/22-5/13 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS**

- Property of FBI—this confidential report and its contents are loaned to you by the FBI and are not to be distributed outside of the FBI to which loaned.
According to Confidential Informant, a check was drawn on the account of SILVER and HERSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York City, in the amount of $154.50. The payee endorsed on this check was shown on the bank that it was for services rendered on May 12, 1953.
NY 65-15301

Recording Machine, Model 210, and one electric scriber. This equipment was picked up The records further reflect that one Webster Recording Machine, Model 210, was pur- chased The price was listed as $154.50.

Confidential Informant of known reliability advised on June 1, 1953, that the records of the Bankers Trust Company reflect that issued a check in this amount to Harvey Radio Company; however, the records of Harvey Radio Company reflect that this set was sold to SILVER and BERNSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York City.

The records of Harvey Radio Company also reflect that purchased wire recording material in the amount of $10.00.

It is noted that this is the same amount made to purchase a Webster Wire Recording Machine from Harvey Radio Company on May 12, 1953. The sales slip for this purchase shows the purchaser to be SILVER and BERNSTEIN.

It is noted above that a check dated May 12, 1953, in the amount of $154.50 was made payable by SILVER and BERNSTEIN. It is also noted that this check was signed by the firm of SILVER and BERNSTEIN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity and/or Description of Information</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Agent to Whom Furnished</th>
<th>File Where Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>3/16/53</td>
<td>3/18/53</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank accounts of SILVER and BERNSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York City</td>
<td>6/2/53</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Instant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>6/1/53</td>
<td>6/1/53</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>65-16277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report is being given a classification of "Secret" inasmuch as information contained in this report was obtained from the report of SA 5/8/53, NY.
NY 65-15301

Copies of this report have been designated for the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices for information purposes inasmuch as these offices are currently conducting investigations relative to [ ] in their areas and it is believed that information contained in this report may be of assistance to them in their investigation. (S)

LEADS

NEW YORK

At New York, N.Y. Covered (S)

REFERENCE

Report of SA NY, 5/8/53, entitled (S)
Office Memorandum - UNITED GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)
SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN, was ESPIONAGE - IS

The Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices are requested to destroy the report of SA 6/22/53, NY.

There are attached hereto, copies of two reports by SA marked "Secret" as requested by the Bureau in relet.

For the further information of the Los Angeles and WFO, the attached report of SA marked "Secret" should not be disseminated in whole or in part without permission of the Bureau.

Encls. - 10
Registered Mail

1 - Los Angeles (Info) (65-5048) (RM) (Encls. - 2)
1 - Washington Field (Info) (RM) (Encls. - 2)
Office Memorandum

TO: Director, FBI (65-59184)
FROM: SAC, New York (65-15301)

SUBJECT: NAHUM BERNSTEIN
ESPIONAGE - IS

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

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

NAME

ALIASES

NATIVE BORN ______ NATURALIZED ______ ALIEN ______
COMMUNIST ______ SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY ______ INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE ______
MISCELLANEOUS (Specify) ______
TAB FOR DETCOM ______ TAB FOR COMSAB ______ RACE ______ SEX ______
DATE OF BIRTH ______ PLACE OF BIRTH ______
BUSINESS ADDRESS (Show name of employing concern and address) ______

RESIDENCE ADDRESS ______ Old Putnam Estate
Locust Avenue, Harrison, New York

HAM: mat
CONFIDENTIAL

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

DETAILS of known reliability advised that the subject continues to maintain offices at 20 Pine Street, New York City and continues to reside at the Old Putnam Estate, Locust Avenue, Harrison, New York.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, who available information concernong the account of SILVER and BERNEITN in New York City.

Informant advised that SILVER and BERNEITN maintained two checking accounts, one a special checking account and the second a regular checking account.

The May 1, 1953, balance for the special account

CONFIDENTIAL
It is believed that [Name] has been residing during his stay in New York City.

It is noted that [Name] is a member of the SILVER and BERNSTEIN firm.
MAXINE BERNSTEIN is the subject's wife.
is believed to be an employee in
the office of the subject.

The above information furnished is not
to be made public except in the course of a legal proceeding
following the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum.

Confidential Informant of known reliability, advised that the subject was in contact with the following
individuals and organizations during May, 1953, at his office,
20 Pine Street, New York City:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization or Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/23/53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/53</td>
<td>Jewish War Veterans, 55 West 77 Street, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/53</td>
<td>American Fund for Israel, 267 West 71 Street, New York 23, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/53</td>
<td>Suite 216, 250 West 57 Street, New York 19, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/53</td>
<td>Material for Israel, 250 West 57 Street, New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/53</td>
<td>Irving Trust Company, 1 Wall Street, New York City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INFORMANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of Source</th>
<th>Date of Activity and/or Description of Information</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Agent to Whom Furnished</th>
<th>File Where Located</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, 1953 Mail cover on SILVER and BERNSTEIN, 20 Pine Street, New York City</td>
<td>May, 1953</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Copies of this report have been designated for the Los Angeles and Washington Field Offices for information purposes inasmuch as these offices are currently conducting investigations relative to that information contained in this report may be of assistance to them in their investigation.

**LEADS**

**NEW YORK**

At New York, N. Y.

Will conduct investigation following activities of NAHUM BERNSTEIN in connection with (S)
NY 65-15301

REFERENCE

Director, FBI

SAC, New York

MAHUM BERNSTEIN, with aliases

ESPIOMAGE - IS

(Bureau 65-59184)


A review has been made of the files in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, entitled United States vs. Marcone, United States vs. Weiss, and United States vs. Goldstein. It was found that the records on file in the Clerk's Office for the United States Court, Southern District of New York, did not contain a transcript of the minutes of any one of these three trials.

A further check was made with the Clerk of the Court of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, located at Foley Square, New York City. In the case entitled United States of America vs. Maham W. Goldstein, Benjamin Schwartz, there were located the minutes of the trial and the testimony given by MAHUM BERNSTEIN in a preliminary hearing on wire tapping evidence. Three photostatic copies of the pertinent testimony have been made, and there are enclosed for the Bureau and WPD a copy of this testimony. One copy will be retained in the New York files.

It will be noted that the very beginning of the testimony which has been photostated starts out with the notation, "The reading of the testimony was resumed by Mr. Denny as follows," and then the testimony of MAHUM BERNSTEIN is set forth. This testimony, which runs from page 167 through page 263, was testimony as given by MAHUM BERNSTEIN in a pre-trial hearing in the case United States vs. Weiss. It had been stipulated by the attorneys for the Government and the attorneys for the defense that it would not be necessary to call the witnesses to testify to the same matter that they testified to in the Weiss case, and for this reason this testimony was read into the record in the case of United States against Goldstein. This is also true in regard to the testimony that appears relative to SYLVIA SCHWARTZ which is contained in the minutes of the trial of United States vs. Goldstein, page 264 through page 275.

The testimony that was included in the minutes of the case entitled United States vs. Goldstein, page 458 through page 479, was testimony actually given by MAHUM BERNSTEIN in the pre-trial hearing on wire tap evidence in that case. The minutes of the trial United States vs. Weiss in the Clerk's Office of
the Circuit Court of Appeals did not contain the testimony of MAHIM BERNSTEIN as given in that case pre-trial hearing, but it appears that this testimony has been quoted verbatim in the Goldstein case. The minutes of the case United States vs. Nardone as contained in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Appeals did not contain any testimony by MAHIM BERNSTEIN.

It will be noted that in the course of BERNSTEIN'S testimony he testified that a party by the name of SIMPSON, who was employed by the Harlem Detective Agency, was in fact the one who actually installed the microphone and was engaged in tapping the telephone. In the course of the pre-trial testimony several of the records were played back for the benefit of the Court. Mr. SIMPSON was called upon to operate the recording machines. LLOYD PAUL STRYKER, who was attorney for the defense, requested that the gentleman who was going to operate the machines be identified. He was finally identified as HOBART R. SIMPSON and he was placed under oath by the Court. He was asked by the Court if he was requested to come by the United States Attorney, and he replied, "By Mr. Dailey," who was in fact one of the Assistant United States Attorneys in this trial. He was also asked by the Court by whom he was employed, and he replied by Mr. HARLEY, whose place of business was at 122 East 42nd Street, New York City. Mr. STRYKER asked him what kind of business they were engaged in, and Mr. SIMPSON said it was a detective agency. Mr. STRYKER asked SIMPSON, "Is it a private detective agency and a licensed detective agency?" Mr. IRVING KAUFMAN, the Assistant United States Attorney, said, "It is not a detective agency." But in reply to a question by Mr. STRYKER as to whether Mr. HARLEY was a licensed detective, SIMPSON advised that he was in fact a licensed detective.
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(The reading of the testimony was resumed by Mr. Denny as follows):

"HAAHUM A. BERNSTEIN, called as a witness on behalf of the Defendants, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

"DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Mr. Bernstein, you were a partner of Mr. Silver? A. Silver, no "s" on it.

"Q. You were a partner of Mr. Silver? A. Yes.

"Q. How long have you been associated with this case? THE COURT: What do you mean by associated with this case?

MR. STRYKER: I will withdraw the question.

"Q. Do you now represent various insurance companies complainants in this case in connection with an investigation as to alleged frauds upon them? A. I would not say the companies were complainants in the case, but I represent the insurance companies in presenting certain evidence to the United States Attorney.

"Q. Which companies are those? A. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, the New York Life Insurance Company and the Travelers Insurance Company.

"Q. When did you begin your employment in this con-connection? A. I think it was the early summer of 1936.
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"Q. And you are still engaged in that, are you not?
A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Would it be fair to say that you have devoted most of your time to it since that time? A. Personally?
"Q. Yes. A. No, off and on.

"Q. When did you first meet Messman? A. In the latter part of May, 1937.

"Q. That was about the time of his arrest? A. No, that was after his arrest.

"Q. You never met him until after his arrest? A. No.

"Q. Which would be the latter part of May, 1937?
A. Yes.

"Q. You never personally talked to Messman until that time, did you? A. That is quite right.

"Q. And in order to get on, would that also be true with regard to the other Government witnesses known as Berger, Spitz and Nelson? A. That is right.

"Q. All those men had been arrested before you ever talked to them? A. That is right.

"Q. Before that time, before May of 1937, when they were arrested, were their wires tapped? A. No, sir --

"Q. Was Messman's wire tapped? A. Prior to what date?
"Q. The date of their arrest?

"THE COURT: You have the statement made by Mr. Dailey that the Messman taps began January 21, 1937,
January to April 16, 1937. You do not have to go over that.

"Q. Will you tell the Court please, what you did in connection with the securing of those wire tapings?

"THE COURT: What is important about that?

"MR. STRYKER: I will withdraw it."

THE COURT: It should be January 29, not 21.

That is a mistake.

(Mr. Denney resumed the reading as follows:)

"Q. Now, beginning at the time when the first telephone was tapped, did you from that time on see the reports of the stenographer and the discs that were made?

"MR. DAILEY: I Object to that. I cannot see what difference it makes.

"THE COURT: Is this gentleman to be a witness at the trial?

"MR. STRYKER: He was not at the last trial, and I cannot say.

"THE COURT: What difference does it make whether he saw the transcripts and the discs?

"MR. STRYKER: I hope to prove from this information secured that this gentleman went over various stories with various witnesses.

"THE COURT: Then ask him that.

"Q. Did you after the arrest of these men, Messman,
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Berger, Spitz and Nelson, talk to them on various occasions?

A. At any time after the arrest?

"Q. Yes. A. Yes, I did.

"Q. Did you talk to them when they were arrested?

A. No, I did not.

"Q. How long after they were arrested was it when you talked to them? A. Some time after all of them had confessed. I did not speak to any of them prior to their confessions.

"Q. Do you know whether or not any of these telephone conversations were played to these men prior to the time when they confessed?

"THE COURT: I will have to restrict that question. Were you present at any time when any records were played to these men or any of them prior to their various confessions?

"THE WITNESS: No, sir.

"Q. Did you learn who it was that played those records to these witnesses, if any one did?

"THE COURT: That is assuming that someone did. He could not learn unless he was there.

"MR. STRYKER: He could be told.

"THE COURT: I am not interested in hearsay.

"MR. STRYKER: Just so I have my intention plain: My purpose is to pursue this in accordance with this case
and ascertain whether or not it be a fact that the playing of these telephone talks induced their confessions and subsequently their becoming witnesses.

"THE COURT: The best way to do that would be to ask them.

"MR. STRYKER: Ask who, your Honor?

"THE COURT: The men who made the confessions.

"MR. STRYKER: That is one way.

"THE COURT: That is the direct way.

"MR. STRYKER: I should imagine I would not be bound by their testimony, but I might indicate those of the Government acting with them.

"THE COURT: This witness has said no record was played to any of these men in his presence. We will accept that as a fact.

"Q. I would appreciate it if you will tell me, if his Honor allows it, whether you learned that, Just the fact, yes or no, from one of the Assistant United States Attorneys that these conversations were played to these men on their arrest or shortly thereafter?

"THE COURT: Your question assumes by putting into the witness' mouth that you learned certain fact. That assumes it is true. I will just have to say that I do not care to hear from this witness whether anybody ever told him anything about these records, because if somebody did, it might not be the fact.
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"MR. STRYKER: I do not wish heresey, but I wish to ascertain that from which I may produce legal evidence. I will take an exception.

"Q. Mr. Bernstein, did you talk with these men about their alleged participation in these frauds and their alleged participations with the defendants?

"MR. DAILEY: I object to that because if he did talk it must have been after they confessed.

"THE COURT: He says he did not speak to any of them until they had confessed.

"Q. After that, did you talk to them?

"MR. DAILEY: That would not make any difference.

"MR. STRYKER: I submit it goes directly to the issues involved in this proceeding.

"I will withdraw the question.

"Q. Mr. Bernstein, did you personally hear these taps played regardless of whether the witnesses were present or not? A. When do you mean, any particular time?

"Q. Well, from time to time after they were recorded? A. I heard some records played when they were being transcribed shortly before the trial. That was during the period prior to the actual trial when I was in the courtroom and they were playing them and the United States Attorneys were present and I was present.

"Q. Did you ever hear any of them before that? A. I don't think I did.
"Q. Did you have the typewritten transcripts of the conversation before the trial? A. Did I have them? No.

"Q. Did you see them? A. I think I may have seen some.

"Q. When did you first begin to see them and how long did they go? A. I am not just sure when. During the course of preparing the case I may have seen a few on occasion when one of the United States Attorneys saw fit to show them to me.

"THE COURT: Referring to this exhibit, did you see any of those transcripts before or after you interviewed any of these defendants, Messman, Spitz, Berger or Nelson?

"THE WITNESS: I may have seen some. I think perhaps I did.

"THE COURT: Before you interviewed them?

"THE WITNESS: Yes.

"Q. As a matter of fact these transcripts were made by stenographers that you paid for, weren't they? A. Our joint firm paid for them, yes, sir.

"Q. They were paid by you or your legal associates? A. Yes, sir.

"THE COURT: Were they stenographers in your office or outside stenographers?

"THE WITNESS: The Government asked us whether we could furnish stenographers who were experienced in this
field and we told them we would, and we turned certain girls over to the Government.

"THE COURT: They were your employees?
"THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
"THE COURT: Prior to that time?
"THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

"Q. Having in mind the answers you have just given to the Court, won't you tell me whether or not as these employees of yours recorded these conversations, they did not show them to you? A. They did not.

"Q. Did not someone show them to you? A. No, sir. I can tell you if you want me to explain how I came to see them.

"Q. Yes, surely. A. Occasionally from time to time either Mr. Deiley or Mr. Kaufman or one of the assistants on the case might occasionally show me a record they got, pointing out to me the facts contained in them in the course of discussing the case with them while the case was being prepared. My only knowledge of the records came from the Assistant United States Attorney.

"Q. Where did these employees of yours transcribe their notes? A. They transcribed them --

"THE COURT: You mean, where did they do the typing?

"THE WITNESS: Right where they worked.
Q. Where did they dictate them and what did they do with them? A. Inspector Shea used to call for them at the end of each day. That was the arrangement and he took them to the United States Attorney's office.

Q. Were you at the United States Attorney's office practically every day from then on to the arrest? A. No, sir.

Q. Were you at the United States Attorney's office very frequently? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you were there in connection with this case, weren't you? A. That is quite right.

Q. And you knew your employees were taking these records? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Didn't you ask anyone to be shown these records as they came along?

THE COURT: You are not going to cross examine. He has told you he did not see them.

MR. STRYKER: I withdraw it. I am sorry.

Q. Do you remember any particular records you saw? A. No, I do not.

Q. What? A. I don't remember any particular records.

Q. Do you remember seeing the telephone interception of February 13th between Berger and Kessner regarding a proposed visit to Mr. Weiss' office on the following day? A. No, sir.
"Q. You never saw that? A. I don't think so. I saw very few records.

"Q. Did you ever see that after the arrest? A. I don't recall whether I did or not.

"Q. Now after the arrest and after these various men pleaded guilty were you even more frequently at the United States Attorney's office? A. Yes, than in the previous period.

"Q. Would it be fair, and if it would not, will you give me the fact—tell me whether you were there four days out of five during that period? A. For parts of the day, I should say.

"Q. And during those times did you talk with these people, Nelson, Berger, Spitz and Messman? A. Occasionally I did.

"Q. And you talked about the case? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did you talk with them after you had read various of the telephone interceptions that the Government had shown you? A. Well, I had read a few of them; I hadn't read many. I cannot recall any particular conversation I ever read. I just have a recollection that I must have seen some of them.

"Q. Was Mr. Silver there more frequently than you? A. No, far less frequently.

"Q. Naturally in preparing the case for trial or in
helping to prepare it, which I assume is what you were doing, you went over the various narratives of these witnesses?

"THE COURT: That is quite a recitation.

"MR. STRYKER: I will withdraw the question.

"Q. Did you go over with --

"THE COURT: Did you help prepare the case for trial?

"Q. Please take that question. Did you help prepare the case for trial? A. Certain aspects of it, I did.

"Q. Did you help prepare for trial with respect to the aspects of testimonial evidence? A. To the extent that I spent most of my time culling from among the files belonging to my clients, the insurance companies, information which I thought would be valuable and which the United States Attorney requested me to get for him.

"THE COURT: Getting down to the point, what I want to know is how much of your preparation involved the testimony of these men Messen, Berger, Spitz and Nelson.

"THE WITNESS: My only connection with their testimony was --

"THE COURT: How much of your time in the preparation for trial involved them?

"THE WITNESS: Very little.

"THE COURT: What does very little mean?
THE WITNESS: Occasionally in the presence of the United States Attorneys I would be working with them and I would ask them, ask these witnesses, how this paper came to be signed, or when this paper was sent to the companies. That would be in the presence of the United States Attorney. That is the extent to which I helped.

THE COURT: When you say I would ask how did this or that paper come to be signed are you referring to papers you had taken from the miscellaneous files?

THE WITNESS: I am referring to the papers in the files relating to their cases which we had from the insurance companies.

Q. Did you or did you not talk with these four men regarding the testimony they would give at the trial? A. Yes, regarding those aspects of their testimony.

Q. Did you do that on one or more occasions? A. On more than one.

Q. On a great many? A. The trial briefs were soon completed. It was over a period of a few weeks.

Q. Would it be correct to say that over a period of three or four weeks you talked with them practically every day regarding the testimony they would give at the trial of the present defendants? A. Not practically every day.

Q. About four days out of five? A. I wouldn't say that.
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"Q. Three out of five? A. Something like that.

"Q. And during that period you did talk to them about their testimony? A. I did.

"Q. Did you go over with these witnesses the various record papers that your clients had, such as proofs of claim? A. Yes.

"Q. And would it be fair to assume that you did that thoroughly?

"THE COURT: You wouldn't expect him to say he didn't do it thoroughly.

"Q. And that means you went overall of the proofs of claim that finally were sorted out as being exhibits which you thought were relevant to this issue? A. That is right.

"Q. And that would include Exhibit 210, namely, the proof of claim signed by Messman and Berger, one signature being dated February 20th and the other February 22nd. You remember that exhibit? A. Yes, I remember it.

"Q. And you went over that? A. I don't remember specifically going over it, but I assume I did.

"Q. From the practice which you followed would it be a fair statement?

"THE COURT: He says it is likely that he did.

"Q. When you went over that exhibit, did you also not go over the tap of the telephone call which was intercepted on the 19th of February and which indicated that these two
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men among themselves had prepared or intended to go down to Mr. Weiss' office on the following day?

"THE COURT: Mr. Stryker meant to say in his question, assuming that you saw that exhibit, did you see in connection with it the transcript of the telephone tap to which he has alluded.

"Q. Will you take the question as amended by the Court. A. I don't remember whether I did or not; I doubt it very much.

"Q. Would you say that at some time you had these transcripts of these telephone interceptions with you when you talked to the witnesses? A. No, not while speaking to the witnesses. I say I was occasionally shown these transcripts, a few of them, not many; and I cannot remember right now any of them specifically.

"Q. At the time these interceptions were made you regarded that as proper practice? A. Certainly.

"Q. Therefore, there was no feeling, there was no reason why you would refrain --

"THE COURT: Are you cross examining the witness?

"MR. STRYKER: I don't know. Do you think I am?

"THE COURT: Yes.

"MR. STRYKER: Then I will withdraw it.

"Q. Did these men tell you that they had heard these telephone conversations played to them?
"The Court: Meaning these four named men?

"Mr. Stryker: Yes, sir, I am doing that to save time.

"Q. The ones you have spoken of so often? A. No, sir.

"Q. Is this the fact, that at no time during these weeks of preparation of these witnesses, neither you nor they mentioned the wire taps, is that right? A. No, that is not right. You asked whether they said they had any played to them. We never discussed that. They had already confessed.

"Q. Did they talk about the wire taps? A. I don't recall any conversation about the wire taps; there might have been. It was a matter everybody thought quite proper. I may have seen some of them, but I don't remember discussing the contents of any of them. I believe I was present at some conferences in the office among the District Attorneys.

"The Court: You don't mean you cannot separate the District Attorneys from the defendants?

"The Witness: No. Sometimes defendants were present and I cannot separate them.

"Q. What is your best recollection as to whether or not at any time you talked over with any of these four men, Messman, Berger, Nelson and Spitz, the fact of the wire tapping or the contents or substance of the wire taps; did you or did you not discuss those things at any time with
A. Yes.

"Q. Where did you use the Harley people in August, 1936? A. We had their apparatus installed at 380 Broadway.

"Q. This was the Kipnis office? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Was that done with the assistance of the United States Government or the police? A. We did it ourselves.

"Q. Mr. Shea was not quite equal to that. Was that a machine designed to overhear or take down telephone conversations, as well as recording conversations in a room?

"THE COURT: You are way beyond me. I didn't know there was any machine that took anything down.

"MR. STRYKER: Strike it out.

"Q. This Harley Detective Agency rented you a machine? A. That is right.
"Q. What kind of a machine was it? A. It was a phonograph recording machine upon which you can record conversations from any source that are led into the machine. Any wire that led into the machine would be recorded.

"BY THE COURT:

"Q. That is not the same as the Dictaphone? A. There may be a dictaphone on the other end and the conversations on the dictaphone would be recorded in this machine.

"Q. What was in Kipnis's office, what kind of a machine? A. There was a microphone on the wall and that led up into another room on the floor above, and all conversations that were had in the room could be recorded on that phonograph apparatus.

"BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Was there also something connected with the telephone? A. The telephone itself was connected to that machine. In Kipnis's office there was a phone, and the phone company installed an extension of that phone on the fifth floor, and that extension telephone was placed into the machine.

"Q. This machine would do two things, it would record what people said in a room without reference to telephone wires? A. That is right.

"Q. And as it recorded then it would place the conver-
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sations on a disc very much like singing them to a gramophone record? A. That is right.

"Q. It had another function, it was in some way connected with the telephone? A. That is right.

"Q. How was it connected with the telephone? A. The phone company had installed an extension phone on the fifth floor so that a person making a call on the fourth floor in Kipnis's office, that conversation could be listened into on the extension on the fifth floor, and that extension was hooked up with the recording apparatus so it could also be recorded on the discs while being listened to on the extension phone.

"Q. The result was that incoming and outgoing calls on the telephone in that office were intercepted on that machine and recorded on it? A. No, only those were recorded that Mr. Kipnis arranged in advance should be recorded. Very few were recorded.

"Q. Such as were desired to be listened to were overheard through the instrumentality of this machine which was attached to the telephone and which in turn recorded on a disc what was heard, is that right? A. Exactly, that is right.

"Q. Was the same kind of machine that was used there in August, 1935, in Kipnis's office, was that the same type or kind as was used in January, 1937? A. Well, I don't
John = Harley
name
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know. I am not familiar with that. It was obtained from the same people.

"Q. So far as you know, it was the same? A. So far as I know it was the same.

"Q. Did the Harley Detective Agency furnish you in August, 1936, the records of these talks, whatever number there were, I think somebody said about ten, taken in the Kipnis office in August, 1936? A. Yes.

"Q. Did they do the same thing in January, 1937? A. I understand they did not. I understand it was altogether different.

"Q. I am speaking of what you remember. A. No, they did not.

"Q. What do you mean by different? In August, they gave you the disc so you could hear them? A. Yes.

"Q. And you had a machine so you could hear the disc played? A. That is right.

"Q. That was in August? A. Yes.

"Q. Did you continue to have that reproducing mechanism in your office in January, 1937? A. No.

"Q. Where was that done then? A. I am not sure. I think the United States Attorneys had one.

"Q. What became of the one you used in August, 1936? A. We returned all the apparatus back to John S. Harley just as soon as we were finished with our investigation.
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That was prior to the time we brought the evidence to the United States Attorney's office.

"Q. When this recording began to take place in January, 1937, naturally as a lawyer you were interested in knowing about that? A. Certainly.

"Q. Did you ask anyone about that or have them played off to you? A. Certainly not. I spent most of my time with the United States Attorney. Nobody was playing them.

"Q. I am not cross examining —

"THE COURT: You mean not very much. I want to get the facts as much as you do.

"MR. STRYKER: If I seem to cross examine, it is unfortunate and when your Honor thinks I trespass, if you will indicate, I will bow to your decision at once.

"Q. Was this machine used in August of 1936, or a similar type to the machine used in the Midtown Hosiery, 132 East 28th Street, Friedman's place?

"THE COURT: If you made a comparison you may state. Did you?

A. I looked at the two machines and they looked alike.

"Q. As far as you know they were the same? A. As far as I know they looked alike.

"Q. And did that machine in Friedman's place, the Midtown Hosiery, 132 East 28th Street, did that record
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Telephone conversations intercepted?

Silver: "THE COURT: If you know.

Mr.: Yes, in the same way.

Q.: When was that used? A. Somewhere around the summer of 1936.

Q.: Now, Mr. Bernstein, let me ask you this: Your interest in hearing the results of these interceptions was not any less, was it, in January and the succeeding months of 1937, than it was in August, 1936?

"THE COURT: You don't want him to compare his respective interests, do you? You want facts.

"MR. STRYKER: I want to probe his memory and refresh it. Sometimes you may have to ask a question of that kind. If your Honor thinks it is objectionable, I will withdraw it.

"Q.: Another point: Is it or is it not a fact that the information you revealed to Inspector Shea when he called at your office, I think he said in December, 1936, did that information include the stenographic transcripts of these conversations overheard or recorded by this machine in August, 1936? A. Yes, it did.

"Q.: All of them, did it not? A. Everything.

"CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. DAILEY:

"Q.: Mr. Bernstein, tell us how your firm and the other firm became interested in this investigation? A. The firm
Other law firm
of Hodges, Reavis, Pantaleoni & Downey and our own firm, Silver & Bernstein, were jointly retained to investigate the insurance disability frauds. We proceeded to obtain evidence of the activities of people involved in the frauds. When we had gathered all our evidence together in the form of statements and documentary proof and actual recorded conversations proving the fraud in operation we came to Mr. Lamar Hardy and yourself, United States Attorneys, with officials of the insurance companies and presented you with all that evidence. Then Inspector Shee was assigned by Mr. Hardy and we were asked if we would turn over all our records and files and we gave complete access to those records and files to the Government and Mr. Hardy said he wanted me and Mr. Silver, if possible, to come to the United States Attorney's office and aid in the preparation of these cases. We told Mr. Hardy that Mr. Silver's time could not be spent to any great extent in this, but I would spend such time as I could in aiding them.

"Q. And since that time you have been assisting the United States Attorney? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. You testified you never talked to Messman, Nelson, Berger and Spitz, until after they had confessed? A. That is correct.

"Q. Did your conversations with them thereafter have to do with the - if you know - have to do with the development of new avenues of research or more detailed statements
of the testimony they had already given?

"MR. STRYKER: It seems to me that is a conclusion that won't help us.

"THE COURT: What he means is, did it have to do with this case or other cases. Were you talking about this case or others, is that what you mean?

"MR. DAILEY: I will withdraw that question and ask this question:

"Q. Had the witnesses with whom you had conferred already given a complete confession of their part in the crime at the time you spoke to them?

"THE COURT: The witness could not by any stretch of imagination answer that. How does he know whether the confession was complete or not?

"MR. DAILEY: I will withdraw the question.

No further questions."

"THE COURT: We will resume Monday morning, gentlemen, at 10:30.

"MR. LOEB: If your Honor please, may I at this time, pursuant to a conversation I had with Mr. Dailey yesterday, respectfully ask that the defendant Rubin be paroled in the custody of his attorney of record?

"MR. DAILEY: I have no objection. It has been represented to me that it is either that or go to jail, and he has always been available to the United States Attorney
whenever we wanted him; so I have no objection to his continuing his parole.

THE COURT: Then let us have it understood that there will be no change, but of course the United States Attorney reserves the right to call it to the attention of the Court if he deems necessary.

MR. LEE: Yes.

MR. DAILEY: May I say something, your Honor? In glancing over the testimony of Dr. Messman, which is quite a bit, your Honor will recall that a great deal, almost half of it, if not more, was taken up with the cross examination of the mathematical perjury, which never added up very much.

THE COURT: On the 19th of February?

MR. DAILEY: Yes. And I do not think these gentlemen will have any interest in it at all, and I was wondering perhaps if we could not save time by calling Dr. Messman instead of reading all this cross examination, which was cross examination in connection with the other trial, into the record.

THE COURT: My suggestion would be this, gentlemen: Is that the only copy of Dr. Messman's testimony that is available, the one you hold in your hand, Mr. Dailey?

MR. DAILEY: I imagine the stenographers
office got up additional copies.

THE COURT: Well, would you be willing to lend that copy to defendants' counsel if they return it to you?

MR. DAILEY: Yes.

THE COURT: I suggest that you gentlemen, one or two of you, run over Dr. Messman's testimony between now and Monday, and the chances are that you will find that you will agree entirely with what Mr. Dailey says. There is a great deal of repetitious and unnecessary matter, and perhaps we can save time by having Messman on the stand. I suggest that you look at it.

(Adjourned to Monday, May 27, 1940, at 10.30 o'clock A. M. )
HEARING RESUMED.

MR. DAILEY: Would your Honor adjourn the sentence of Joseph J. Weiss for a week? I have not had much opportunity to talk to him, and I understand the Probation Department is not ready either.

THE COURT: A week from today? The 3rd?

MR. DAILEY: The 3rd of June, yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right, gentlemen.

(Mr. Denney resumed the reading as follows:)

"N A H U M A. B E R N S T E I N, resumed the stand:

"REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Will you please tell me the name, and if you have it, the address of the man who installed whatever instrument was installed on or in the telephone in that Kipnis and Friedman office. Do you know that? A. Yes.

"Q. Who was it? A. It was Mr. Arthur Simpson of John S. Harley, Incorporated.

"MR. STRYKER: Is he here?

"MR. DAILEY: No, he is not. I think Mr. Bernstein knows.

"MR. STRYKER: I suggest that I defer pressing
THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein is an attorney and I think we can rely on his statement. If he knows and is able to explain this instrument he will say so, and if he cannot, I would expect him to say that.

Q. Were you present when this device was placed in this telephone instrument? A. Yes, I was.

Q. You are not a technician, of course? A. No.

Q. Give me as a lawyer your best statement of what the instrument looked like and where you saw it placed.

A. You are speaking of the instrument in the room or the recording instrument?

THE COURT: Tell us what all the mechanical setup consisted of within the room.

THE WITNESS: In Mr. Kipnis' room on the wall there was a microphone. That microphone would pick up all of the talk in that room.

THE COURT: May I interrupt for a minute? Are we getting into now the listening device in 280 Broadway?

MR. DAILEY: Yes, I think so.

THE COURT: Now, is there any use being made of the room conversations in this present case?

MR. DAILEY: Yes, that will be gone into.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as
From that microphone a pair of wires ran up to the fifth floor. Those wires ---

"THE COURT: Was that one floor above?

"THE WITNESS: One floor above. Kipnis' room was on the fourth floor.

"Q. Go ahead. A. Mr. Simpson installed those wires. They had nothing to do with the telephone. They were hooked on to the microphone and ran across the courtyard and up into the upstairs room. Those wires were attached to a switching device in the upstairs room, they were on terminals, and when the switch on the switching device was turned to these terminals it would make a connection with the recording machine.

"The recording machine consisted of an amplifier. I don't know the nature of it, except it is for the purpose of amplifying the sound. And from the amplifier they ran on to turn-tables, there were two of them, so that at the conclusion of one record, the other one would start and you had an overlapping conversation at the end.

"Q. I would like to cover each point. What you are now talking about is something separate and distinct from the telephone wire? A. Entirely distinct.

"Q. Now, what other device ---

"THE COURT: Have you told us all about that?
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THE WITNESS: That is the complete hookup as I know it, of the microphone. The room conversations could be recorded regardless of the telephone as if there was no telephone in existence.

"Q. That device would pick up the conversation of a person present in the room talking over the phone? A. Yes, one-half of the conversation.

"Q. Yes, I am confining myself to that. A. It could do it, but as a practical matter, it did not because as soon as the telephone went on, if the people wanted to record the telephone conversation they would have to disconnect the microphone, and then if the telephone conversation was recorded you would get both sides of that conversation.

"Q. Did this microphone or not pick up and record through the discs or through earphones to stenographers all conversations in the room, including at least the conversation of any person in the room who talked through the telephone? A. It did not, as a matter of fact. It had the potentialities of doing it. If they operated on that basis they could, but they didn't do it.

"Q. You weren't there all the time? A. No.

"Q. I mean, who would know what happened when you weren't there, Simpson? A. Miss Schwartz would know more than anybody.
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"Q. Was she employed by you? A. By us.

"Q. She is available in the event that we want to call her? A. Yes.

"Q. Now, let me ask this question: Is Dictaphone the proper name for it? A. Microphone.

"Q. Over and above that, were there any other instrumentalities of any kind in that room? A. No, not in that room.

"THE COURT: You are speaking of the fifth floor?

"MR. STRYKER: The lower floor.

"Q. That would be the fourth floor? A. The fourth floor, yes.

"Q. Were there any instrumentalities of any kind fixed to, attached to or inserted in any telephone instrument on the fourth floor? A. No.

"Q. Were there any instrumentalities of any kind affixed to a telephone on the fifth floor? A. Yes.

"Q. Please tell us exactly what those were? A. You must first understand that the telephone on the fifth floor was an extension of the telephone on the fourth floor that was installed by the telephone company.

"Q. Let me get that. We all have extensions in our offices from one room to another. Now, was this what we understand as the ordinary extension, in other words, the wire was extended but instead of being extended to another
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Q. Was something put in or on that receiver?
A. Exactly that, the ordinary extension.

Q. What was done of your knowledge with that extension telephone? A. I don't know the technical way in which it was done, but the wire that runs into the ear mechanism, what it is you hold in your hand.

THE COURT: The receiver.

THE WITNESS: The receiver was connected to another set of terminals on the machine.

Q. You were talking about what the Judge says we all understand as the receiver. A. That is the idea.

Q. And you were speaking about the receiver on the fifth floor? A. That is right.

Q. Was something put in or on that receiver? A. Something was put on that receiver.

Q. What was that thing? A. That is the technical part I don't know.

Q. Did you see it put on? A. I may have, but I didn't understand it.

Q. I just want to see if we can save time without getting the technical man. Was something put on?

THE COURT: What did it do?

THE WITNESS: So that any conversation coming over that telephone, if he wanted it to, could be recorded on the recording machines, provided you threw the switch
off the microphone and switched it on the telephone.

"Q. Then there was a device of some kind on that receiver, on the telephone extension on the fifth floor, which was so constituted, without trying to state how, through electrical processes, was so constituted that a person other than a person holding the receiver to his ear, could receive the messages which came over that wire to the person holding the receiver to his ear; is that right?
A. That is right.

"Q. With what was that device connected? A. With a switching device.

"Q. Can you give me a better description than that?
A. Yes, it was essentially four terminals, two to the microphone and two to the telephone extension, so if you switch to the terminal of the microphone, the microphone conversation would be fed to the recording machine, and if you wanted the telephone conversation you would have to disconnect that and switch it to the other.

"Q. There was a device on this receiver connected with an instrument which by the mere throwing of a switch would enable an additional machine known as a recording device to record the messages that came over that telephone to that extension receiver. Is that a fair statement? A. That is true.

"Q. You, I take it, do not have personal knowledge of
what was done there when you were not there? A. Only what the practice was. We had a regular practice.

"Q. But you would not have knowledge of what was done other than what people reported to you? A. Except when I was there.

"Q. You were not there for extended periods? A. No, from time to time I would drop in.

"Q. My question is directed to this machine. You dropped in from time to time? A. Yes.

"Q. That would be a few minutes? A. Sometimes longer.

"Q. This instrument was on all day long? A. No. You see, the instrument would only come on when a conversation was arranged for in advance, and we generally knew in advance when there was to be a conversation.

"Q. The instrument was in the receiver all the time? A. Yes, but we didn't listen to all conversations.

"Q. The instrument continued in the telephone receiver from the time it was placed in it until it was taken out, is that right? A. Not the recording instrument. The wires, yes.

"Q. This thing that was put inside the receiver, that remained continuously in the receiver until it was taken out? A. That is right.

"Q. When was it put in and when taken out? A. I don't know the exact date. I should judge it was put in in the
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summer of 1936, and ran for perhaps a month or two thereafter.

"Q. A month or two? A. Yes.

"Q. During that month or two, whichever it was, there were very many hours of the day when you personally were not there and don't know what transpired there from your own knowledge. Is that fair? A. Yes, except let me point out that it was only occasionally that any conversations were recorded. We knew a conversation was coming. For instance, I would receive a phone call that a conversation was to be had.

"Q. You were describing what you tell us was the system you instituted as to the use of this? A. No. Although I was not there very frequently, I was there a great deal when the conversations were taken down. Sometimes a few days would elapse without a conversation.

"Q. When you tell us what was done there in your absence you were speaking of orders and directions or instructions you gave about a system? A. When I was not there, yes.

"Q. Miss Schwartz was the lady who was there throughout the time this instrument was on? A. Yes.

"Q. And Mr. Simpson, is that the name of the man we had in the last trial? A. Yes.

"Q. He was there? A. Yes.
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"Q. Now of your own knowledge other than what was reported to you by those two persons, do you know what, if any, conversations which came through the telephone and as through this instrumentality were recorded? A. Do I know which ones were recorded, you say?

"Q. Of your own knowledge. A. I would say I know most of them of my own knowledge.

"Q. I am talking of your own knowledge. A. I understand that.

"Q. I don't question you saw what was reported to you, but your knowledge goes to that only. A. I was present when most of the conversations were had.

"THE COURT: Did you listen to the conversations?

"THE WITNESS: Yes, you could hear it right off the record.

"Q. I would like to clear this up. Other than those you personally listened in to, you had no knowledge other than what was reported to you as to what was done or overheard or reported through that instrument at times when you were not present. Is that a fair statement? A. That is correct.

"Q. Now were certain stenographic reports or transcripts furnished to you of conversations overheard in this way? A. Yes.

"Q. Where with reference to this receiving instrument
THE COURT: I want to know whether you were talking about the conversations recorded through the microphone as well as the conversations recorded through the telephone.

MR. STRYKER: I will try to make that clear.

Q. Eliminating from your thought and from my question for the moment conversations heard on the extension wire from the microphone, let us leave those out for the moment. Is it a fact that stenographic notes or reports of the conversations coming over that wire and through that instrument other than the microphone were written out and furnished you?

THE COURT: In other words, you were talking about the telephone taps?

A. That is correct.

Q. Now, a transcript of those were given you? A. Yes, sir.

Q. About how many of them were there? A. I don't know offhand.

Q. Give us your best recollection, twenty? A. About that, perhaps.

MR. STRYKER: As to the documents to which the witness has just referred, I should think my motion was clearly tenable.
"THE COURT: Are you renewing your motion as to transcripts of telephone conversations?

"MR. STRYKER: Yes, sir.

"THE COURT: What have you to say as to that, Mr. Dailey?

"MR. DAILEY: Two Judges, and I think three in this court, have held that such conversations having been intercepted do not constitute telephone taps within the meaning of Section 605. I believe two of those cases to which I have referred are now on appeal before the Circuit Court of Appeals to ascertain whether they are telephone taps. So far as the Government is concerned, we do not feel they are taps. If they are taps certainly Mr. Stryker should have made available to him the contents of those messages.

"THE COURT: Why aren't they telephone taps?

"MR. DAILEY: Because it is done, for one reason, with the consent of the person who is a subscriber to the telephone. He knew all about it.

"THE COURT: That goes to the question of consent, but physically they are telephone taps.

"MR. DAILEY: No more than when you tell your secretary to pick up a telephone and listen to a conversation you were having with someone outside.

"THE COURT: I simply want to get the mechanical
operation straight. Mechanically they are taps, whether they are authorized is quite apart from the question I am putting to you.

"MR. DAILEY: Yes, in that way, I would say they are taps.

"THE COURT: What is the difference between those and other taps?

"MR. DAILEY: In the ordinary tap neither party knows anything about it. Somebody without authority puts in an instrument.

"THE COURT: Your position is based on the ground that Kipnis consented, is that it?

"MR. DAILEY: I assume that is the only distinction between the two.

"THE COURT: I just want to know that I understand it. You say he consented to this and his consent is to be differentiated from the consent discussed by Mr. Justice Roberts.

"MR. DAILEY: That is right.

"MR. STRYKER: Your Honor has clarified the situation and I gather that it now gets to the point that clearly these things we are talking about, these telephones interceptions are indicated, and we are entitled to them, unless we are not entitled to them by reason of the word consent.
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STRYKER: On that point maybe you will hear me for a moment.

THE COURT: Surely.

MR. DAILEY: I wonder if we would save time by eliminating this, because those were finally turned over, you know.

THE COURT: Yes, that is true. Is it satisfactory not to read all this colloquy?

MR. YOUNG: Yes. I think we can agree that the colloquy be omitted at this point.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):

"Q. Now, Mr. Bernstein, so I will once and for all have it clear, were there any other instrumentalities of any kind in that office on the fourth or fifth floor other than the normal instrumentalities of the telephone company? A. Not other than I have described.

"Q. Did this instrument that was connected with this disc in the telephone receiver, was that the same type of mechanism for recording conversations as was used in connection with all the other or subsequent telephone taps on Messman's wire and the other ones?

"THE COURT: I don't quite understand your question. There was one recording device which consisted of
"Bernstein-redirect the ordinary phonographic disc.

"MR. STRYKER: Then I will withdraw it. Mr. Bailey has handed me a telephone talk on January 12, 1937, at 12:30 between Louis Kaplan and B. Friedman. Is that right?

"MR. DAILEY: Alter Kaplan comes in here, too.

"THE COURT: Kaplan and Friedman.

"MR. STRYKER: Yes, sir. As I go along perhaps it would be more orderly to have each one marked for identification.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit C for identification.)

"MR. STRYKER: Mr. Dailey also hands me a telephone transcript of a conversation taken September 18, 1936, 12:32 P.M., between Norman Lefkowitz and Benjamin Friedman.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit D for identification.)

"MR. STRYKER: I am also handed a telephone interception and recording of it on November 21, 1936, between Harry Kipnis and Mannie Goodman at 11:13 A. M., and Barney Chalfin.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit E for identification.)

"MR. STRYKER: I am next handed a transcript of a telephone conversation taken at 2:32 P. M., September 2, 1936, between Kipnis, Seligsberg, Goldman and Barney Chalfin.
"Mr. Stryker: I am also handed a transcript of a telephone conversation dated November 7, 1936, at 2:00 P.M. between Alter Kaplan and Benjamin Friedman.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit G for identification.)

"Mr. Stryker: Also a telephone conversation dated September 15, 1936, 5:33 P.M., between Harry Kipnis and J. J. Weiss.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit H for identification.)

"Mr. Stryker: Also a telephone conversation February 1, 1937.

"Mr. Bernstein: Who was the conversation between?

"Mr. Stryker: Between Benjamin Friedman and Norman Lefkowitz.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit I for identification.)

"Mr. Stryker: Also transcript of a telephone communication dated December 14, 1936, Benjamin Friedman and Alter Kaplan, 1:41 P.M.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit J for identification.)

"Mr. Daily: Perhaps you better inquire as to this one.

"Q. Mr. Bernstein, I am handed a transcript, the heading is, Conversation Harry Kipnis and Dr. Messman, taken in shorthand by Ruth P. Lehnoff, January 2, 1936. It doesn't state whether it is a telephone communication or
not. A. That is a telephone communication taken under entirely different circumstances.

"Q. Can you tell me the circumstances? A. Yes. Kipnis was in our law office, and to establish the truth of what he was telling us he said, 'I can call Dr. Messman on the telephone,' and he took our regular office telephone, and our young lady in the office was listening in on the extension and took it down.

"Q. Did she intercept the message between Messman and the man in your office? A. I don't know about that.

"Q. She took down what came over the wire? A. Yes.

"MR. STRYKER: I ask to have it marked for identification.

"(Marked Weiss Exhibit K for identification.)

"MR. STRYKER: I don't know what the practice is as to a short morning recess, your Honor.

"THE COURT: I don't approve of them. If I take a recess for ten minutes you will not be back here for a long time.

"MR. STRYKER: Well, anyhow, that is my first point. My second point is that I can save a great deal of time by going over these now and I think I should have five or ten minutes to look at these documents which I never saw before.

"THE COURT: You just sit down and look at them.
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As I say, if I should say we will have a ten-minute recess, you will show up at about one o'clock. I will wait until you examine them.

"MR. STRYKER: All right, sir.

"(Mr. Stryker examines papers.)

"MR. STRYKER: The Exhibits are C to K, inclusive, and there are nine of them.

"THE CLERK: Correct.

"Q. Now, Mr. Bernstein --

"MR. DAILEY: May I make another statement? I have here some eight or ten more telephone conversations which have been handed me which I did not have in the file, conversations which the Government considers negligible, but which we will turn over for inspection.

"MR. STRYKER: Perhaps they could be marked and I will go along and look at them later.

"THE COURT: Why not look at them at noon time and have such marked as you wish."

MR. DAILEY: I think that was the time we turned over all these telephone conversations.

(At this point Mr. Dailey turned over certain documents to defendants' counsel.)

THE COURT: If you wish to make a note in this record, perhaps I can help you.

Weiss Exhibit C for identification is the talk
of January 12, 1937, between Kaplan and Friedman.

Weiss Exhibit D for identification is a talk on September 16, 1936, between Norman Lefkowitz and Benjamin Friedman.

Weiss Exhibit E for identification is a talk on November 21, 1936, between Kipnis, Goodman and Chalfin. Exhibit F for identification is a talk of September 2, 1936, between Kipnis and Seligsberg. Exhibit G for identification is one of November 7, 1936, between Kaplan and Benjamin Friedman. Exhibit H for identification is one of September 15, 1936, between Kipnis and J. J. Weiss; is that correct?

MR. DAILEY: That is right.

THE COURT: Exhibit I for identification is one of February 1, 1937, between Friedman and Norman Lefkowitz. Exhibit J for identification is one of December 14, 1936, between Benjamin Friedman and Kaplan. Exhibit K for identification is a tap of January 2 -- I must be wrong -- January 2, 1936. That does not sound right.

MR. NATHAN: That is the date on the exhibit.

THE COURT: That is Kipnis and Messman in Bernstein's office, I think. But the date seems wrong. Is the date right?

MR. DAILEY: That should be 1937.

MR. NATHAN: It appears in Exhibit K for identification, your Honor, as January 2, 1936, at 5:40 P.M.
MR. DAILEY: I suggest that Mr. Nathan change it on there now. May I, with the consent of the other people, write down --

THE COURT: Well, you gentlemen have no objection, do you, to changing it to 1937, because I think it is confusing to refer to it as January 2, 1936.

MR. DAILEY: If you want to object, Mr. Young, to its being altered, you can do so.

THE COURT: Exhibit B for identification was a wire tap of February 1, 1937, and that has to do with an appointment at the office of J. J. Weiss on February 20, 1937. That is correct, is it? That was a subject of very considerable comment.

MR. NATHAN: May we have a ruling at this time, your Honor, in reference to this list of exhibits which run from Defendants' Exhibit B to K for identification on the other hearing; that after having gone over them, to find which, if any, of them are deemed material in this hearing, that we have the privilege of marking those for identification on this hearing?

THE COURT: Oh, surely.

MR. NATHAN: It is impossible to go through them now.

THE COURT: That is the purpose of turning them over to you now, so that you may acquaint yourself with
them and take any action that you deem proper.

MR. NATHAN: Does your Honor want us to do it now or at any time during the hearing?

THE COURT: Oh, at any time during the hearing, I think.

MR. DAILEY: Your Honor, I am also turning over Weiss' Exhibit L for identification.

THE COURT: I thought that was included.

MR. DAILEY: I do not think you referred to it; I am not sure.


MR. NATHAN: And the same ruling is made as to that, your Honor?

THE COURT: Oh, yes, of course. That is the purpose of it.

(The reading was resumed as follows):

"Q. Did you receive these Exhibits C to K for identification, inclusive, being nine in number? A. Yes.

"Q. Who handed them to you, your own girl? A. I never received these specific papers but ones like them.

"Q. If you didn't receive these papers, you received copies of them? A. Yes, sir.
"Q. And also would that be true with regard to Exhibit A for identification, being a room conversation - it is Goldstein, Exhibit A for identification. A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Now, after you received these documents, did you talk to anyone about them, did you read them? A. Yes, sir, I read them.

"Q. Each and all of them? A. No.

"Q. Did you not read the transcripts which were handed to you? A. No, I only read those that they told me had something damaging in them.

"Q. Someone read them before you did and told you that? A. The girls told that.

"Q. Did Silver participate in that? A. Yes.

"Q. And he sometimes read those which you did not read? A. I don't know.

"Q. Did he report to you and did you act on his report? A. No, we would discuss these matters together and the matters we thought damaging --

"Q. You discussed the damaging matters? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did you take any further steps with reference to the persons whom you thought had been damaged one way or another by these talks? A. No, just continued on in the same way.

"Q. You continued on in searching for information? A. No, the whole thing consisted of conversations. That
"Bernstein-redirect is all there was.

"Q. Did you later talk with Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Friedman - I won't go over them - with all the other participants in these conversations? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did you talk with any of them? A. Mr. Friedman and Mr. Kipnis we discussed in the office.

"Q. After you received these documents, did you discuss them with all or any of the persons mentioned in the documents? A. Only the people working with us.

"Q. Who were they? A. Mr. Hodges, Mr. Kipnis and Mr. Friedman.

"Q. Mr. Friedman was in your employ? A. He was not in our employ, he was working on this.

"Q. In whose employ was he? A. He was acting more or less as informer.

"Q. He was paid money by somebody? A. Yes.

"Q. By who? A. We paid him.

"Q. Beginning when and ending when?

"THE COURT: Is it Friedman or Kipnis?

"THE WITNESS: Both.

"Q. Let us take Friedman first. When did you first begin to pay him and in what amount?

"THE COURT: What relevancy has that?

"MR. STRYKER: I propose to connect it. I will withdraw the question for the moment.
"Q. You did talk over with these two men who were being paid money by you, Kipnis and Friedman, you did discuss, did you not, the contents of the documents which I have offered for identification this morning? A. We knew the contents.

"Q. My question -- A. We discussed matters concerning it, not the actual contents.

"Q. You had the documents in your possession? A. That is right.

"Q. And after you had them you talked to some extent about the contents with, among other people, Friedman and Kipnis? A. That is right.

"THE COURT: Let me understand you. Did you discuss with them the matters which were alluded to in the documents, or did you discuss with them the documents as such to the extent that the matters referred to in the documents were thereby revealed. Do I make the distinction clear? Were you discussing events or the contents of papers?

"THE WITNESS: We were discussing events.

"Q. Were you discussing events which were referred to directly or indirectly in the papers? A. No, we were discussing what further steps to take, but the events in the papers had already happened.

"Q. You did discuss with these men the further steps
to be taken after you had read these telephonic transcripts? A. That is right.

"Q. And in discussing what further steps were to be taken or you thought should be taken you had in mind, did you not, what you had read in these telephonic transcripts? A. I always had it in my mind, Mr. Stryker. I did not forget them.

"Q. Did you have the contents, the substance of what is contained in these telephonic interceptions in your mind when you discussed with either Kipnis or Friedman or anyone else, the further steps you deemed wise to be taken?

"THE COURT: I think I ought to caution you that Mr. Stryker has in mind to direct your attention to the real source of your information. Was the source of your information a series of transactions which you were familiar with independent of these papers or was it not?

"THE WITNESS: The source of our knowledge was completely independent of these papers. They merely gave corroboration to what we knew already existed.

"Q. Now, Mr. Bernstein, you paid money to have these things recorded, didn't you? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Were they or not of any use to you in the investigation?

"THE COURT: How is that going to help you?

"MR. STRYKER: I withdraw it.
"Q. Did you use these documents in connection with your investigation? A. We did not.

"Q. Did you have in your mind the substance of these documents when you talked with anyone regarding further steps in the investigation? A. The substance of the documents were always in my mind from the time I read them.

"Q. Did you have it in your mind or not, did you have the substance of these papers, these exhibits, in your mind when you talked with Friedman, Kipnis or anyone else when you considered further steps to be taken? A. Yes, I remembered them, they were in my mind.

"Q. Mr. Bernstein, my question is this: Did you or did you not have in your mind the substance of the contents of those documents when you thereafter discussed with Friedman or Kipnis or with anyone else the question of what further steps should be taken?

"THE COURT: May I point out something to you?

"MR. STRYKER: I wish you would, your Honor.

"THE COURT: An intelligent person with a reasonable good memory reads a paper and he stores it somewhere in the pigeon holes of his brain, and in that sense, it is there. Having read these papers it is to be assumed that this witness had them stored away in his mind, but that doesn't begin to help me. What was it that he used? You are seeking the source of his mental processes; were they to lay bare everything that constituted the basis of his
analytical processes as he directed this investigation, and that would include information that he had gotten probably without reference to these intercepted telephone communications.

"MR. STRYKER: I thoroughly agree with your Honor's view, but it is my purpose to bring out evidence that it is impossible that these things in some way were not used by an admittedly intelligent man in furtherance of the investigation, and if they were used --

"THE COURT: It is so argumentative that I wonder about it.

"THE WITNESS: I think I can help by giving certain other facts as to how the investigation was conducted.

"Q. Go ahead. A. We had evidence of what we considered the whole gamut of this prior to these, and these room conversations were only for the purpose of seeing if these were corroborated when these men conferred, and when we read it we saw that they were, and then we turned it over to the United States Attorney's office. We were not getting leads and tracing them down. We had the truth in advance, and we just corroborated it.

"Q. Now, let me see. I notice in one of these conversations - I won't stop to pick it out. You will agree with me, I am sure - Mr. Weiss talked to somebody? A. Yes.

"Q. Prior to that time you had not arrested Mr. Weiss.

"THE COURT: At the time of the conversation.
"A. We never arrested him.

"Q. Mr. Weiss was not arrested, was he? A. No.

"THE COURT: That conversation was September 15, 1936.

"Q. Now, did you fail to investigate what you regarded or thought was Mr. Weiss' participation in a fraud? A. Thereafter, certainly.

"Q. Did you at the time that these conversations were recorded and transcribed, particularly Exhibit H for identification, did you then have in your possession evidence as to any alleged participation between Weiss and Messman, Nelson, Berger and Spitz concerning the alleged crime set forth in this indictment? A. We knew substantially the whole gamut of the fraud, every element in it.

"THE COURT: You will have to answer that specifically.

"Q. Did you have any evidence?

"THE COURT: He doesn't mean to characterize it as evidence. Did you know anything of the alleged complicity of Weiss in this matter prior to September 13, 1936?

"THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, and I can go further --

"THE COURT: You don't need to go further.

"Q. Did you prior to this telephone conversation of September 13, 1936, have evidence that either Nelson, Berger,
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or Spitz had been treated by Messman and that false electrocardiograms had been taken of their alleged heart systems? I would like a categorical answer. A. You have several things there. The answer is not as to all of them.

"THE COURT: As to any part of it, had you information? You don't need to call it evidence.

"THE WITNESS: We knew about Nelson. We knew that shall I tell you what we knew?

"Q. Just tell us who you knew about. A. Nelson, and the fact that Messman was his doctor and we knew about Spitz, that he had been laid up with —

"MR. DAILEY: Did you know about them, is the question.

"THE WITNESS: We knew about Spitz. Who were the other two?

"Q. Berger. A. Berger's claim did not start until much later, until after our investigation was over.

"THE COURT: Then your knowledge about Spitz included knowledge about Messman, did it?

"THE WITNESS: Oh, yes.

"Q. Had you information regarding Berger, Nelson or Spitz false histories, that is, false electrocardiograms prior to this telephone talk?

"MR. DAILEY: I think that should be divided.

"Q. All right. Did you prior to this telephone tap
September 13, 1936, have information that Nelson had been doctored by Messman and had presented false and fraudulent hospital records and false electrocardiograms, did you know that? A. Yes.

"Q. Did you have that information from Messman himself?"

"THE COURT: Is that a legitimate question?"

"MR. STRYKER: That is for your Honor to decide."

"THE COURT: It occurs to me it is unnecessary."

"MR. DAILEY: I have no objection."

"THE COURT: Yes, but I should like to have this hearing concluded some time during the Christian era. I understood you called this gentleman back for two questions. That was at 12:00 o'clock, and it is now 12:18."

"MR. STRYKER: I called him back on the instrumentality, and after I saw these papers, it naturally led to further inquiries."

"THE COURT: I am not shutting you off. Don't misunderstand me."

"Q. Now what you stated that you had information regarding, let us take them in order. Messman and Nelson, as to a false claim that you had such information prior to September 15, 1936. What was that information?"

"THE COURT: That is what I think you are not entitled to ask."

"MR. STRYKER: Let me ask this preliminary question."
"Q. Was the information that you had hearsay evidence?

"THE COURT: I don't think he needs to characterize it. I think the only proper question is, did he gain that information through any telephone tap.

"MR. STRYKER: That might be a conclusion that I would be foreclosed on.

"THE COURT: I think that would be a proper question.

"Q. Did you gain that information through any telephone taps? A. No, sir.

"Q. From what source did you gain it?

"MR. DAILEY: We object to that.

"THE COURT: I will exclude that.

"MR. STRYKER: Must I be bound by his statement?

"THE COURT: Yes, you called him, and the purpose is to find out to what extent the evidence in this case arises from telephone taps, not as to the source of information outside of the telephone taps.

"MR. STRYKER: Your Honor does not take the position that I am bound by a hostile witness.

"THE COURT: We agree on that, I assume.

"MR. STRYKER: I respectfully except to your Honor's ruling.

"THE COURT: I don't know what you except to.

"MR. STRYKER: To your declination to allow me to
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"Bernstein-redirect inquire what the nature of the information was.

"THE COURT: You have the exception coupled with the statement of the witness that he did not obtain the information by telephone taps.

"Q. Now, did you ever talk yourself with Messman before his wire was tapped? A. No, sir.

"MR. DAILEY: I object to that. I think that is included in your Honor's ruling.

"THE COURT: I will allow the question."

MR. NATHAN: Your Honor, I am not altogether clear in my mind as to whether on this hearing the testimony which is now being read is taken into the present record; whether or not when Mr. Stryker takes an exception, it is necessary for us to repeat that exception for this record. Has your Honor made a ruling on that point? If not, why, then, I think it is encumbent upon the defendants to take the same exception here if the same ruling is adhered to by your Honor.

THE COURT: I think that is the safer thing for you to do, because after all this is a separate hearing; it is a separate case.

MR. NATHAN: Then on behalf of the defendant Hessenberg, and I take it for all of the defendants, we except to your Honor's ruling made with respect to Mr. Stryker's question.
THE COURT: That exception is noted.

MR. NATHAN: If there were any prior exceptions taken - and I cannot call them to mind now, your Honor - with respect to this same testimony, may we have the benefit of the same objection and exception?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STRYKER: Hereafter we will repeat it, your Honor.

(The reading was resumed as follows):

"Q. When did you first talk with Nessman? A. After he had confessed to the United States Government.

"Q. That was after he was arrested? A. Quite a time after.

"Q. The end of May or thereabouts, 1937? A. Yes.

"Q. And that was after his wire had been tapped from somewhere beginning in January of that year? A. So I understand.

"Q. Would that answer, so as not to tire the Court unnecessarily, be true also in respect to Nelson, Berger and Spitz? A. That is right. I never spoke to any Government witness until after they had confessed.

"Q. When you talked to these witnesses, is it a fact that you told them or you heard the United States Attorney tell them that they had the wire taps? A. After that?

"Q. After their arrests.
THE COURT. He said he didn't interview any of them until after they had confessed.

"Q. Were you not present at any interviews prior to the confessions? A. No, sir.

"Q. Were you in an adjoining room? A. No, sir, I was not.

"Q. Did you have a dictaphone connection between the room where they confessed and where you were? A. Certainly not.

"Q. Did you submit to Mr. Shea or one of the United States Attorneys, all of these exhibits for identification this morning, C to K, I think, and the room taps, did you submit those to Mr. Shea or one of the assistants? A. Yes.

"Q. And were those submitted to them prior to the arrest of any of these four men, Nelson, Messman, Berger and Spitz?

"THE COURT: If you know.

"A. 'Submitting' is what is wrong. The Government sent Mr. Shea down to our offices and he took away whatever he felt like taking.

"Q. Did you hand them to Mr. Shea? A. Some of the girls did.

"Q. You know he got them long in advance of the arrest of these men? A. That is right.

"Q. You know also, do you not, that Mr. Shea or some-
one for the Government got these telephone taps, Exhibits C to K, prior to the time that taps were placed on the wires of Messman or J. J. Weiss; that is so, isn't it?
A. Yes.

MR. MCKNIGHT: I believe some of those are January or dates subsequent to when Inspector Shea was at the office.

THE WITNESS: Yes, some were later.

Q. They were handed to Mr. Shea or someone for him?
A. Yes.

Q. And those were handed prior to the tap on Messman's wire? A. He took them all at the end of November, 1936.

Q. Won't you tell me whether he got them before Messman's wire was tapped?

THE COURT: Messman's wire was tapped January 29, 1937.

Q. Were they handed prior to January 29th? A. Yes, sir, prior to that.

Q. The last tap I find is January 12, 1937, so that would be included in those given to Mr. Shea prior to the taps on Messman's wire, is that right? A. That is right.

Q. You have told me that both Friedman and Kaplan, was it – Kipnis were on your personal payroll or your clients? A. Yes.

Q. How long did that continue?
"Bernstein-redirect

"MR. DAILEY: I think that was objected to before.

"THE COURT: The objection is sustained.

"MR. STRYKER: An exception."

MR. NATHAN: We ask the same exception.

THE COURT: Same ruling. The exception is granted.

(The reading was resumed as follows):

"Q. Did you discuss the payments of money --"

THE COURT: Just a moment. It occurs to me that perhaps we ought not to dispose of that matter quite so summarily. The reason I sustained the objection to these questions in the Weiss case was that the opinion of the Supreme Court indicated that the entire situation was known to the Court in the Weiss case. Mr. Justice Roberts referred to the matter of compensation to the witnesses, and I think the amounts that had been paid there. Therefore it seemed to me utterly unimportant to rehearse that element in the Weiss case. Now, perhaps that would not be true in this case, but it seems to me that what was paid in the Weiss case has no bearing on the questions in this case; but if the question hereafter arises in this case of the payment of witnesses in the employ of Silver & Bernstein, I should consider that the question will have to be disposed of on its own merits in this case. Have I made this clear?
Bernstein-redirect

MR. NATHAN: In this preliminary hearing?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NATHAN: Yes.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):

"Q. Did you discuss the payments of money that you were making to these men with them after these telephone taps in 1936 were made?

"MR. DAILEY: I object to that.

"THE COURT: I don't understand the bearing of that, Mr. Stryker.

"MR. STRYKER: I cannot develop it in one question. The bearing is inter-related. These two men are provocateurs or employees. They cooperated to have their wires tapped or at least one of them does, and other persons talk on the wire. The witness says, as I have understood it, that nothing was done at all with these documents. He simply had it in his mind with a lot of other knowledge and it stopped right there. My purpose and my hope and belief is that I can show that these telephone talks led on as clues or aids to the investigation of this case. The extent to which they led on, I can only determine by probing, and that is what I am endeavoring to ask about.

"THE COURT: You were asking if he talked their
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salaries over. I suppose he did, but I don't care whether he did or not.

"MR. STRYKER: I realize that it must be connect-
ed with the issues before your Honor, and the only way I can find out is to ask.

"THE COURT: You will have to make a more con-
vincing showing than that.

"MR. STRYKER: May I ask one or two questions?

"THE COURT: I don't understand how a conversation concerning salary helps me in reaching a conclusion as to the poisoned tree and the fruits of the poisoned tree.

"MR. STRYKER: My view is that we have not only the poisoned tree of the tapping of these wires and the attempted entrapment of others by having them talk with these employees of the insurance companies, but we have the delivery of these transcripts of these interceptions to the government, and we have the further fact that thereafter further things were done to investigate among which was the tapping of Lessman's wire on January 29, 1937, and Leiss' some time in February.

"Now, as a matter of ordinary logic and common sense to me it would appear now, and in fact I would be prepared if I had no other evidence to argue as a fair conclusion that this poisoned tree or this fruit of the poisoned tree poisoned the very mainsprings of this case.
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It is like one germ in a blood stream. It may be one germ, but one germ may poison the whole system. We now have interwoven the crime of wire tapping. The courts have stated that. It is a violation of the Federal statutes. It is what the Supreme Court denounces as 'dirty business' and inimical to ethical standards, and we have interwoven with that paid provocateurs. Now with that picture, if the fruit is not poisoned, if the whole tree is not poisoned, if the ground around that tree is not poisoned, if the shade the tree casts is not poisoned, then I don't know. As an ordinary lawyer, knowing how investigations go forward, I know that when a lawyer learns one thing he goes on from that to the next.

"THE COURT: Why not ask how much money they paid these men.

"Q. How much money did you pay Kipnis and Friedman?

"THE COURT: Was it a weekly salary?

"THE WITNESS: It was a weekly salary, but I don't know now --

"Q. What was it? A. I think it was $50 a week and it might have been $70 at one time.

"THE COURT: When did it begin?

"Q. When did it begin and when did it end? A. Kipnis began around the summer of 1936 when this thing started.

"Q. Did you have any agreement, expressed or implied,
to pay any additional money to them over and beyond what you denominate as salaries? A. No, sir.

"THE COURT: What was Messman's salary?

"THE WITNESS: I never talked to Messman until after he confessed.

"Q. How much did he get?

"MR. DAILEY: The insurance companies never paid him.

"Q. You know how much he was paid? A. No, I don't know. I have heard you argue it a number of times.

"THE COURT: Never mind about arguments. What is your information, if you have any; have you any information, and if you have, say so.

"THE WITNESS: I know it. Mr. Dailey told me.

"THE COURT: Who is Mr. Dailey?

"THE WITNESS: The United States attorney.

"THE COURT: How much was Messman's salary?

"MR. DAILEY: He became a Government witness and Dr. Messman was paid $65 a week for a short period and then he was paid $100 a week for, oh I should say roughly a year. These are just guesses. I can get the accurate information. And then he was paid $65 a week which he is still being paid.

"THE COURT: Now, may we go on to something else.

"MR. DAILEY: That money was paid by the United
States Government.

"MR. STRYKER: May I have it as to the other
Government witnesses who were paid salaries. What were
the other witnesses paid?

"MR. DAILEY: I don't think it has any merit,
but I will make the statement. You know.

"MR. STRYKER: I think I do, but I am not stating
it.

"MR. DAILEY: Nelson was paid $50 a week.

"MR. STRYKER: For how long?

"MR. DAILEY: Oh, I am not sure whether it was
fifty or thirty-five.

"MR. STRYKER: Is he still being paid?

"MR. DAILEY: No, not for over a year.

"MR. STRYKER: Did the Government pay Kipnis or
Friedman?

"MR. DAILEY: No.

"Q. Now, Mr. Bernstein, did you discuss with these
paid persons what the nature of their duties were in con-
nection with this wire tapping, the exhibits which we now
have?

"THE COURT: You will have to segregate as to the
Government and the insurance companies.

"MR. STRYKER: Question withdrawn.

"Q. Did you discuss with Kipnis and Friedman whom you
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paid, what the nature of their duties were, what services
for that pay they were to render in connection with the
tapping of their wires?

"THE COURT: If you don't want to answer that
you need not.
"A. We never engaged in wire tapping as you put it. If
you are speaking of the phone conversations taken off
extensions all right.

"Q. Your last answer does not in any wise limit or
change the testimony it took so long to get this morning
about these instrumentalities.

"MR. DAILEY: If it took long, it was due to Mr.
Stryker.

"THE COURT: Probably it was my fault.

"Q. You are not changing your testimony?

"THE COURT: I assume not. Ask him what he dis-
cussed with Kipnis.

"Q. Will you state to his Honor what you said, if any-
thing, to either Kipnis or Friedman regarding the services
they were to render in connection with the instrumentali-
ties you described on their wires this morning, what they
were to do for the cash that you gave them? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. All right, let's have it. A. Kipnis came to us
and made a complete confession of his part in the fraud.
And I think that is what confuses us all along.
"Q. May I interrupt.

"THE COURT: If you interrupt you are taking that much more time.

"MR. STRYKER: I didn't think it was responsive.

Go ahead.

"THE WITNESS: After Kipnis had fully confessed to us and made a statement of all his part in the fraud and we then discussed with him whether he would be willing to cooperate along with us and asked him whether he met these people in the usual course of events and he said that he did. We asked him if he would cooperate with us by revealing these frauds further and let us record the conversations that would occur in the room, and he said yes, that he wanted to cooperate because the racket was going to collapse and it could not go on, and he would rather make amends right now. And it was on that basis that we paid him. And it was to corroborate the confession already made that we got these conversations, and we did nothing with them but to read them and turn them over to the United States Attorney.

"Q. What was the agreement that these men made with you for the weekly cash payment you were making to them?

"MR. DAILEY: I think that question has been answered.

"THE COURT: Do you wish to add anything to your
"Bernstein-redirec
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answer?

"THE WITNESS: No, I think I have explained it.
"THE COURT: The next question.

"Q. Had Kipnis at the time he went on your payroll, if that is a fair statement, or your clients, had he told you, had he given you evidence that - had he confessed concerning Nelson, Spitz and Berger? A. He told us about Nelson, but Berger's claim had not arisen.

"Q. He didn't tell you anything about Spitz? A. No, but in a conversation, a room conversation, not over the telephone with Mr. Gross, Mr. Gross told us about the fraud in the Spitz case.

"Q. That was after Kipnis had confessed? A. That was after Kipnis had confessed, yes.

"Q. After you had these men in your employ and these wires installed that we have talked about, did you confer with any one regarding the desirability from the standpoint of the investigation of tapping Messman and Weiss' wire. Yes or no, if you can.

"MR. DAILEY: I object to the question.

"MR. STRYKER: It is like walking down

"MR. DAILEY: I withdraw the objection.

"Q. Will you answer the question? A. I did not confer.

I was present while discussions were going on back and forth between Mr. Dailey and Inspector Shea as to whether
it was a good or a bad idea.

"Q. Didn't you participate with them in that discussion? A. I heard them talk and I think they asked my views and I had to think about it and I was skeptical whether it was a good idea.

"Q. And you expressed your opinion that it was desirable to go on with other taps? A. I wouldn't say whether my views were asked at that time.

"Q. Some time before the Messman and Weiss taps were made, and at some time after the last of these exhibits we have been talking about this morning were made, was your view asked and did you express your view regarding the desirability of going further with the investigation by tapping these two new wires?

"THE COURT: Was Mr. Bernstein a witness on the trial?

"MR. DAILEY: No.

"THE COURT: Is he to be called?

"MR. DAILEY: No, sir.

"THE COURT: I exclude the question."

MR. NATHAN: May we have the benefit of an exception to that ruling?

THE COURT: Yes, surely.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):
Friedman was only concerned in one case before you put the taps in this room, is that true? A. Yes, in one case.

"Q. What case was that? A. The Alter Kaplan case. He also knew of Kipnis.

"Q. He was not, according to his confession, concerned in the frauds of Nelson, Berger and Spitz? A. No, but he knew of Kipnis' part in the fraud.

"Q. According to his statement to you? A. Yes.

"Q. Did you arrange at that time or at any time to have Friedman send a case to Mr. Weiss?

"MR. DAILEY: I object to that question on the same grounds.

"THE COURT: Is it related to the telephone situation?

"MR. STRYKER: I think so.

"MR. DAILEY: If Mr. Stryker thinks it is, I will withdraw my objection.

"Q. Did you not arrange to have Friedman send a man by the name of Lefkowitz to Joe Weiss? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did you arrange with Friedman to have a claimant by the name of Alter Kaplan sent from Lefkowitz to Mr. Weiss? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did you discuss? A. Discuss him going to Weiss?

"Q. Yes. A. I was told that Lefkowitz intended to
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"Q. You were also told that Friedman knew Lefkowitz?  
A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did you get that information prior or subsequent to the tapping of these wires in this Kipnis and Friedman office?  
A. I don't get that. What information?

"Q. About sending this client to Mr. Weiss.  
A. Well, I just thought that I explained that we never discussed sending Kaplan to Mr. Weiss. It was reported to us that that was happening.

"BY THE COURT:

"Q. Was that before or after the 15th of September, 1936?  
A. I think it was before.

"Q. Was it before January 29, 1937?  
A. I wouldn't remember the date, it was somewhere --

"Q. You were not implicated with that maneuver?  
A. Yes, and there was no such maneuver, so far as I know.

"BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Now, Mr. Bernstein, you talked with Messman after he was arrested you have told us?  

"THE COURT: Three times he has told that.

"Q. Did you discuss with him the telephone interception of his wire in connection with his being permitted to practice medicine?
MR. DAILEY: I object to that as attempting to insinuate something that he has no relevancy to wire tapping.

MR. STRYKER: I think it has.

MR. DAILEY: I don't think so, and I object.

THE COURT: I will ask a question. Did you discuss with Messman the possibility of his retaining his right to practice medicine at any time?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Next question.

Q. Did you ever hear that discussed between Messman and the United States Attorney's office?

MR. DAILEY: What difference does that make?

THE COURT: If it was discussed, it would have to be before January 29, 1937, to be relevant.

Q. Was it discussed?

BY THE COURT:

Q. Were you present when that subject was discussed at any time? A. I don't think so. I know Mr. Dailey discussed it with him.

Q. Were you present at any discussion between Messman and Mr. Dailey on that subject? A. I don't think so.

Q. It is not your recollection that you were? A. No.

THE COURT: Next question.

BY MR. STRYKER:

Q. Do you know as a fact that no charges were made to
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remove Messman from the medical profession and that he is
still practicing?

"THE COURT: That is excluded.

"MR. STRYKER: An exception."

MR. NATHAN: May we have the benefit of that
exception?

THE COURT: Oh, yes.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as
follows):

"Q. Did you directly or indirectly ever allude or
refer to the continuation of his practice with Messman
when you were preparing this case?

"THE COURT: I will exclude the question. He
said he never discussed it with Messman, and that covers
it.

"Q. Did you at any time see Messman read the trans­
scripts of any intercepted telephone talks? A. I guess I
did. I have no independent memory.

"THE COURT: We are not interested in your
imagination. If you saw it, say so, and if you didn't,
say no.

"THE WITNESS: I cannot recall.

"Q. Did you regardless of what the conversation was or
when it was, did you at any time see Messman reading any
transcripts of any wire taps? A. Yes, I think of an
Bernstein-redirect illustration. I think when they were playing them in court Messman may have been there that night and I was there. If Messman was in the courtroom during that rehearsal, going over these wire taps, then I saw him, because I was there.

"BY THE COURT:

"Q. Are you able to say whether he was there or not? A. I don't remember whether he was.

"Q. Your answer means he may have been there? A. He may have been there.

"BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Did you go over the Messman statement as to his testimony or of his testimony? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Is it not a fact that in those statements --

"MR. DAILEY: Please fix the time.

"Q. Did you go over with Messman his various proofs of claim with your various clients? A. Yes.

"Q. Now, Mr. Dailey wants the time. During what period did you do that work? A. During the period after Messman's confession and while the Government was preparing for trial, I think I told you. It was several weeks, whenever that was.

"Q. The Government continued to prepare this case for trial from the latter part of May, 1937, until the trial in January, 1938. A. The actual preparation --
THE COURT: Please confine that to relevant matters. Did you go over with Messman various proofs of claim in which he was a party?

"THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

"Q. When? A. Some time after the end of May, 1936."

THE COURT: Shouldn't that be "end of May, 1937?"

MR. DAILEY: Yes, sir.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):

"Q. And before? A. Before the trial started in 1938.


"Q. Did you go over with Messman papers in addition to the proofs of claim that he had signed? A. I think so.

"Q. Were statements of his testimony or expected testimony prepared at any time between May, 1937, and January, 1938, if you know? A. Yes, a number of them.

"Q. Did you see those statements? A. Yes, I did.

"Q. Did you help prepare them? A. To some extent.

"Q. Well, Mr. Bernstein, you were devoting your entire time to this case, weren't you, then? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did you discuss what was the expected testimony with Messman? A. Yes.

"Q. Is it not a fact that in some of those statements either excerpts or references to the intercepted wire taps were present? A. Yes, sir.
"Q. And you discussed those with Messman, did you not? A. I don't recall; I may have.

"Q. As his Honor has said, we have to get your best recollection. Now think back. You helped prepare the statements of this witness, you talked with him a number of times on statements taken with reference to the wire taps. Don't you remember whether you ever talked about any of those statements with Messman? A. I don't recall and I doubt it because the kind of work I was doing had very little to do with the contents of those messages.

"MR. DAILEY: I object to the further continuance of this line of inquiry. I think it has been exhausted.

"THE COURT: The witness says the work he was doing had no relation to the subject matter of the wire taps.

"THE WITNESS: That is right. I may have seen them. They were in court.

"Q. Did you at any time refer to the wire taps when you went over the proofs of claim signed by Messman?

"MR. DAILEY: I renew my objection on the ground that it has already been answered.

"THE COURT: I think the witness has told us all he knows or recalls about this aspect of the preparation of the trial. Is there anything on this subject you haven't fully and completely laid bare. Are you holding
"Bernstein-redirect

anything back?

"THE WITNESS: No, sir. I might add this. I have aided the United States Attorney's office considerably, not only in connection with proofs of claim but in connection with problems of law and in connection with the manner of presenting certain evidence, in any way I could, just as if I were an assistant on the case.

"Q. In view of your last statement is it not practically your best recollection that at some time at least you discussed with Messman some statement that contained or referred to a wire tap?

"MR. DAILEY: I renew my objection.

"THE COURT: I would rather have the witness answer once and for all, because we are not going any further on that. Is your recollection refreshed by the question?

"THE WITNESS: I can say I may have. I cannot do better than that.

"THE COURT: You are not changing your testimony?

"THE WITNESS: No, sir.

"(Recess until 2:00 P.M.)"
"AFTERNOON SESSION

"MR. DAILEY: I am handing to Mr. Stryker twenty-four verbatim transcripts of telephone conversations. These are either Kipnis or Friedman.

"THE COURT: Those are the ones you said you didn't deem important?

"MR. DAILEY: Yes, sir.

"MR. STRYKER: I wonder if I could have these marked as one exhibit for identification. My suggestion would be that these be clipped together and that these twenty-four be marked as one exhibit. If that can be done it is satisfactory to me.

"MR. KIENDL: Are there some that have not been transcribed?

"MR. DAILEY: Yes.

"MR. KIENDL: May they be made available?

"MR. DAILEY: They may have them, but they have never been transcribed. They were so trivial we didn't bother with them.

"THE COURT: Were they read at the former trial?

"MR. DAILEY: No, sir, none of these, except I think here is Exhibit 1.

"THE COURT: This will be Weiss Exhibit L for Identification.
"(Marked Weiss Exhibit L for identification.)

"THE COURT: These are from October 16, 1936, to February 18, 1937.

"MR. KIENDL: Our application is that the records of conversations made in the office by telephone taps, which have not been transcribed, be made available to the attorneys for the defense on the ground that we should not be precluded by the opinion of the United States Attorney that they have no bearing on the case.

"THE COURT: Was any use made of those telephone conversations?

"MR. DAILEY: I intend to take the stand myself, if necessary, after the termination of Mr. Stryker's examination and testify, and at that time I will testify that no use was made of those recorded conversations.

"THE COURT: The application is denied.

"MR. KIENDL: I respectfully except.

"MR. STRYKER: Will the Government agree that an exception taken by one counsel shall inure to the benefit of all?

"THE COURT: I should think that would be proper.

"MR. STRYKER: Then there will be such a rule.

"THE COURT: Yes."

---

MR. KIENDL: I respectfully except.
MR. NATHAN: Same exception.
THE COURT: Same ruling.
(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):
"NAHUM A. BERNSTEIN, resumes the stand:
"BY MR. KIENDL:
"MR. DAILEY: In respect to the application made for the untranscribed records, I have no objection to the attorneys taking them if they will provide their own phonograph machine.
"THE COURT: All right.
"Q. Mr. Bernstein, I understand we now have the transcripts of twenty-four telephone conversations between August 25, 1936, and February 13, 1937, in addition to the ten that had been previously marked, thirty-four in all.
"THE COURT: Those are not the dates. October 6, 1936 and February 18, 1937.
"MR. KIENDL: The last twenty-four?
"THE COURT: Yes.
"Q. The entire thirty-four, the first is August, 1936, and they continue down to February, 1937. Now, Mr. Bernstein, those thirty-four transcripts --
"THE COURT: Your statement is not in accordance with my notes."
Industry, efficiency, education and general adaptability very good.

Chicago 7-23-20

Education - High school, business course - stenography and bookkeeping, 3 mo. mechanical drawing, 3 yrs law school. Practiced law.
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Increase-

Rather youthful appearance. Industry, efficiency and general adaptability, Excellent. Agent is a man of about 5ft. 5 in. and while is one of the best all around investigators in bureau his small stature gives the impression rather of youthfulness and for this reason alone that he was not allowed to argue the case for the government U.S. vs Haywood et al before the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

(Brennan 10-2-20)
MR. KIENDL: I have not seen the dates.

THE COURT: Just eliminate the dates from your question.

Q. Those transcripts you know, Mr. Bernstein, were taken between August of 1936 and some time in the early part of 1937? A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Was it the fact, Mr. Bernstein, that as the conversation was obtained and a transcript made on a certain date, it was submitted to you, or your office representing the insurance companies, complainants? A. Some time thereafter.

Q. And it was done almost simultaneously with the transcript? A. Within a week.

Q. And that continued from week to week for this period of months? A. Pardon. A lot of them were not transcribed. Only the ones we considered of value.

Q. I am talking of the thirty-four. They were given to you when transcribed, or shortly thereafter? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that continued from week to week for this period? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as they were furnished to you you read them or your associates read them? A. That is right.

Q. And as you read the first batch would you take it up with either Kipnis or Friedman and discuss the contents with them or either of them? A. No.
"THE COURT: Please do not repeat questions.
"MR. KIENDL: Question withdrawn.

"Q. As those were furnished to you you did nothing except hand them to the United States Attorney's office or the Post Office Inspector? A. That is right.

"Q. When did you hand over the first batch to the Post Office Inspector, November, 1936? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And those following November, 1936, did you turn them over to Mr. Shea from time to time? A. That is right.

"Q. And you told us of these telephone conversations all they did were to corroborate what you already knew? A. Well, they also contained other facts that came out in the course of the conversations that we didn't know, but we did nothing about them.

"Q. What Mr. Shea did with them and what the Government did with them you don't know further than you have testified? A. That is right.

"BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

"Q. Did you keep any stenographic record of your conversations with Berger, Spitz, Messman or Nelson? A. No, sir.

"Q. Was a stenographer present when you interviewed them? A. No, not as a rule; sometimes if the District Attorney was taking testimony from them and I was there a stenographer was present.
"Q. Were transcripts of that testimony furnished to you? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did you make notes of your interviews with these various witnesses? A. No, sir.

"Q. On how many occasions did you interview each of them approximately?

"THE COURT: Which witness are you speaking of?

"Q. Messman, Nelson, Berger and Spitz. A. It is very hard to approximate. During the period of actual preparation for trial, I saw them whenever they came in from time to time. I would see them there, and sometimes I would participate in discussions and sometimes not. If they came to the United States Attorney's office three or four times a week, I might be there on several of those occasions.

"Q. You saw each one a half dozen times, at any rate? A. No, I saw some much more than others. Berger and Spitz, I didn't see many times.

"Q. On each occasion when you interviewed them you had a number of documents present? A. As a rule.

"Q. Did you question them as to the documents and matters relating to the execution of various forms? A. Yes.

"Q. And you made no record whatever of their answers to those questions? A. No, because as I say as a rule I was doing this with an Assistant United States Attorney.
Statements were being taken and I was there with files, all sorts of papers and exhibits, and as the Assistant would elicit information, I would contribute whatever I thought was of aid.

"Q. And as a rule would a stenographer write down the answers? A. Yes.

"Q. And at those interviews were the transcripts of the telephone taps on hand? A. Sometimes.

"Q. And occasionally reference would be made to them, would they not? A. That is right.

"Q. No doubt about that at all? A. No, I have no specific recollection of any of them, but I know we would on occasions when a telephone call that was relevant came up, the Assistant would talk about that in connection with the testimony.

"Q. They were being used at these interviews to refresh the recollection of the various witnesses?

"THE COURT: I have asked you not to cover matters covered by other counsel.

"MR. FRIEDMAN: I did not believe that was covered.

"THE COURT: It has been asked a dozen times, whether these transcripts were used in interviewing these witnesses.

"MR. FRIEDMAN: May I have an answer to the
THE COURT: No, sir. That is excluded. Go on to the next question.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is all.

RE CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. DAILEY:

Q. Mr. Bernstein, you told us how Mr. Kipnis came into your office and made a confession? A. That is right.

Q. Then you had some arrangement with him about continuing the investigation? A. That is right.

Q. Had he given you his complete confession of everything that had transpired to that time about all the people involved, everybody he knew? A. Yes.

THE COURT: Don't characterize as being 'complete.'

Q. He told you a story at that time when he gave the confession involving a number, if not all, of the defendants in the indictment here?

MR. STRYKER: That is objected to as a conclusion. If it is important we should have the fact rather than his opinion.

THE COURT: I don't think he could know about it.

Q. What was your purpose in installing this dictaphone and this interception on the telephone? A. Well now, the way this whole investigation was conducted was not in the way of going out to obtain further information. A witness would tell us certain conversations he had and he would say
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that he could prove it to us by speaking to this fellow
and he would say, 'You can record the conversation.'

"Q. Will you look at this report headed September 14, 1936, Harry Kipnis, which is one of the papers your Honor entrusted to my care and tell me what that is and perhaps you can illustrate just what your testimony was this morning? A. This illustrates --

"MR. STRYKER: What is it first and may we have it marked for identification.

"(Marked Exhibit 1 for identification.)"

THE COURT: There is some relation between that and Weiss Exhibit A, which is not quite clear to me, but they may be the same thing, or it may be --

MR. DAILEY: No, one is the report and the other is the telephone call, and Mr. Bernstein started to show how that corroborated the information he had from the report.

THE COURT: I see.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):

"THE WITNESS: On September 14, 1936, Kipnis came to me and told me and also gave me a written report which I now have in my hand of a conversation he had that day with Joseph J. Weiss in which Mr. Weiss told him that things were getting hot; there was an investigation - he had a tip there might be an investigation under foot, and Kipnis -
and he said he would discuss with Kipnis what Kipnis would do about it and also the question of getting out new insurance under a false name for Kipnis despite the fact that Kipnis was already called for permanent and total disability. Kipnis gave us this report and said we could corroborate that by calling Joseph Weiss and referring to that conversation. We told him to go ahead and do it, and he made the phone call.

"Q. And that was recorded over this telephone extension? A. That was recorded over the telephone extension.

"Q. And is Weiss Exhibit H for identification the recorded transcript of that conversation? A. It is.

"Q. Tell us what there is in there that corroborates the conversation which Mr. Kipnis said he had had with Mr. Weiss?

"MR. STRYKER: I object to that.

"THE COURT: You have no right to put in the contents of an exhibit not in evidence.

"MR. DAILEY: I will ask that it be marked in evidence.

"MR. STRYKER: It is objected to as an intercepted telephonic communication and immaterial. I am probing the source of the knowledge of this witness and what was done with this evidence.

"THE COURT: Let us have one agreement as we
start in and that is that arguments will not be volunteered. If the Court wishes argument the Court will ask for it. The objection is made to the introduction of this paper marked Exhibit H for identification. I am bound to sustain the objection.

"MR. DAILEY: May I inquire the grounds?

"THE COURT: It is a transcription of a telephone conversation, and the Supreme Court says that may not be received for any purpose.

"MR. DAILEY: This is a preliminary hearing, your Honor.

"THE COURT: The object of your question is to prove that Kipnis was in fact corroborated as he professed that he would be. Isn't that so?

"MR. DAILEY: It is for the purpose of illustrating the system.

"THE COURT: I don't think we need do that. The witness has told us why he went into this system. I would permit him to say whether it accomplished its purpose.

"THE WITNESS: It did accomplish its purpose.

"THE COURT: The objection is overruled and an exception will be noted."

MR. LOEB: May we have an exception?

THE COURT: It was Mr. Dailey who took the exception.
MR. DAILEY: May I have my exception again, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):

"Q. Now, without telling the Court what information you had, can you tell us what information you had—what defendants named in this indictment or co-conspirators named in the indictment you had information about? A. Prior to the arrest of May 18, 1937, we had information concerning all of the defendants from sources having nothing to do with any telephone conversations.

"MR. STRYKER: I could not object to that because I could not foresee the answer, but I move to strike it out as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial and a characterization.

"THE COURT: The objection is overruled. The motion is denied.

"MR. STRYKER: May I have an exception."

MR. NATHAN: Same exception.

THE COURT: Yes. Same ruling.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):

"Q. What about the people mentioned in the indictment as co-conspirators? A. You mean who subsequently became
"Bernstein-recross

government witnesses?

"Q. Yes, and are not named as defendants. A. I had
information as to all the Government witnesses who were
named as co-conspirators.

"THE COURT: Completely divorced from telephone
taps?

"THE WITNESS: Completely divorced from tele-
phone taps.

"Q. When you say all of them you mean who, mention the
names please?

"MR. STRYKER: May I have a general ruling. I
move to strike out that answer as a mere characterization
and expression of opinion as to a matter not competent for
opinion evidence.

"THE COURT: I don't think it is a matter of
opinion that he had information concerning a certain person
at a certain time.

"MR. STRYKER: I should think it would be a
question of what the facts were. This a conclusion.

"THE COURT: For the purpose of this inquiry, I
will take the witness' answer.

"MR. STRYKER: An exception."

MR. NATHAN: Same exception.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as
follows):
Who is Pantiloon?
"Bernstein-recross

"Q. Will you name those other people you have just referred to? A. Yes. Joseph J. Weiss, Alfred L. Weiss, Martin Gross, Benjamin Nelson, Dr. Messman, Herman Berger, Morris Spitz and Dr. Maximilian Goldstein.

"Q. How about Dr. Krupp? A. We knew of Dr. Krupp's participation in the case but not very much about it.

"Q. This morning Mr. Stryker asked you whether or not you were present at any discussions with the United States Attorney or Post Office Inspectors regarding the desirability of placing telephone taps on the telephone of J. J. and A. L. Weiss, and Dr. Messman, and I believe you said you were? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Do you recall whether you expressed your opinion of what should be done in that respect at that time? A. Yes, sir. I was there with Mr. Pantaleoni and Mr. Silver, and Mr. Pantaleoni and Mr. Silver both expressed the views that they thought that tapping telephones was unnecessary in view of the fact that there was a complete case here which would result, should result in the conviction of the defendants without the need of further corroboration. That there was ample corroboration both documentary and the recorded room conversation. I didn't have a view one way or the other. Inspector Shea conferred with Pantaleoni and Mr. Silver. Other men in the United States Attorney's office thought it would be a good thing if additional cor-
Bernstein—redirect

roboration was obtained.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Do you know George J. Mintzer? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did he do any work for you in connection with this Friedman and Kipnis office? A. No, sir.

"Q. Did he do any work for you or anyone working for you during that time?

"THE COURT: Is this relating to telephone taps?

"MR. STRYKER: Yes, it is. It is certainly part of cross examination as to a matter that Mr. Dailey brought out. I think it is proper in view of the question of Mr. Dailey.

"THE COURT: There must be a limit, Mr. Stryker, to this.

"MR. STRYKER: I appreciate that and I am doing the best I know how.

"THE COURT: This witness has said once and for all that he had no part in the hiring of Lefkowitz. You stated you had nothing to do with Lefkowitz going to Weiss?

"THE WITNESS: That is right.

"THE COURT: I am considering that closed.

"MR. STRYKER: So that I may merely have your Honor's ruling, and I will obey it, does your Honor rule that this witness having said that, I am not to cross examine him?
"Bernstein-redirect

THE COURT: Not unless you can indicate to me how far the inquiry would be related to the subject matter of this inquiry.

MR. STRYKER: The United States Attorney has brought out certain matters on cross examination and left them with the conclusion of the witness. That being so, I submit I would have the right to probe this.

THE COURT: Which one are you talking about?

MR. STRYKER: As to his having a complete case and as to what Kipnis told him, and as to having a complete case regarding these various persons.

THE COURT: We went over that this morning and I don't care to go over it any further.

MR. STRYKER: Has your Honor in mind the objections I made a few moments ago?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STRYKER: And you rule that I am not to pursue that?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STRYKER: An exception."

MR. NATHAN: The same exception. I assume that your Honor in this case adheres to the same ruling?

THE COURT: Yes.

(The reading of the testimony was resumed as follows):
"Bernstein-redirect

"Q. In your cross-examination, did you refer to the Yardley Fabrics? A. Yes, I did.

"Q. Will you tell me what that was?

"MR. DAILEY: I think Mr. Stryker is going into the subject your Honor just ruled out.

"THE COURT: What is that expression Yardley Fabrics?

"THE WITNESS: This place at 280 Broadway where the microphone was installed was called Yardley Fabrics on the trial to give the appearance that Kipnis was in the textile business.

"THE COURT: What is the question?

"MR. STRYKER: I think he has answered my question except perhaps one thing.

"Q. Did you have a brother associated with that business? A. There was a genuine business known as Yardley Fabrics which was run by my brother, and we called this place Yardley Fabrics so if they checked in the phone book they could find such a place.

"Q. Mr. Bernstein, your recent cross examination just now by Mr. Dailey you remember you referred to Mr. Kipnis and a confession, I think you called it, that he made to you. Do you remember that?

"THE COURT: You referred to that at length this morning. Mr. Dailey unnecessarily went over the same
"Bernstein-redirect ground. I don't intend to have it gone over a third time.

"MR. STRYKER: I did not intend to do that.

"Q. Did you state that Kipnis had told you or given you a tip-off that Weiss was in some wise planning some further proceeding against insurance companies or presenting some false claims?

"MR. DAILEY: That is objected to your Honor, as having been excluded as not a subject of inquiry.

"THE COURT: I think we have come to the end of that.

"MR. STRYKER: Will your Honor permit my associate counsel to ask a question?

"THE COURT: Provided it has not already been asked.

"BY MR. SHAPIRO:

"Q. Didn't you tell Mr. Dailey a few moments ago that in September, 1936, Mr. Kipnis had advised you that in a telephone conversation he had with Weiss, Weiss had said that Weiss had received a tip-off there was an insurance company investigation? A. No, sir, that is not right.

"THE COURT: That is your only question, sir? All right, step down, Mr. Bernstein. Do you want to finish with Berger?

"MR. STRYKER: No, I would like to finish in the proper order. He was called out of order yesterday.
"THE COURT: Very well."

MR. DAILEY: We have got ten pages here of the testimony of Sylvia Schwartz.
Sylvia Schwartz
(The testimony of the witness Sylvia Schwartz was read as follows):

'S Y L V I A. S C H W A R T Z, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:

"DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. STRYKER:

"Q. Miss Schwartz, you have been sworn? A. Yes, I have.

"Q. I won't go over the figures we have, but how many girls do you remember having on the recording machines?

A. At which place?

"Q. Well, the ones that recorded the Weiss and Messman wires. A. Well, there was one girl operating each recording machine, actually operating the machine.

"Q. Let me start over again: Somewhere there was a place where the girls were on the recording machines to take the Messman talks? A. That is right.

"Q. How many machines there? A. One.

"Q. How many girls? A. One girl at the machine and one girl taking the stuff stenographically.

"Q. What time did the girls go on duty? A. At about 9 in the morning I guess.

"Q. When did they go off duty? A. Well, it varied. We would know from the conversation when, for instance, Dr. Messman would be finished and then we could close up.
"Q. You sort of made your office hours to conform with Dr. Messman's on that? A. That is right.

THE COURT: What would the latest hour be?

"THE WITNESS: Well, anywhere between seven and nine in the evening.

"Q. I am talking about Messman now. Was there also a machine to take the conversations over the Weiss wires, A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Was that in the same place with the Messman machine? A. No, sir.

"Q. That was a different place? A. Yes.

"Q. How many machines were there? A. Two.

"Q. Two different machines? A. Two separate machines.

"Q. Only one as to Messman? A. That is right.

"Q. Would there be two girls, one to operate each of the two machines on the Weiss wires? A. Yes.

"Q. In the place where the two machines to record the Weiss conversations were, was there also a girl to listen in on the conversations? A. Well, there was more than one girl.

"Q. How many? A. I think there were four or five girls.

"Q. Four or five girls? A. Yes.

"Q. And how many on the Messman wires? A. Just one.

"Q. I am going to follow the suggestion his Honor
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has made repeatedly and I will do it this way: I wish you would just take your time and as briefly as you can just tell me exactly what was done with regard to the recording of the conversations on the Messman wire, and then when you get through that we will come to Weiss. First, Miss Schwartz, I am calling your attention to the recording machines. Have you my point in mind? A. Yes.

"Q. Will you tell us what the facts are? A. Well, at the Messman office there was one recording machine --

"Q. You do not mean at his office? A. At the set-up there, and when a call came in the ringing on the phone registered on a machine there so we knew there was a call coming in.

"Q. Pardon me for interrupting. Was that bell on this recording machine? Was that the way it worked? A. Well, no. There was just a separate attachment, a sort of a buzzer. It was connected in some way with the machine but it did not work on the machine.

"Q. When that buzzer rang what did the girl do with the recording machine? A. She started the turn-table going and at the same time the stenographer would listen at the ear-phones and the girl listening at the ear-phones would listen from the beginning of the conversation and then determine whether or not it was to be recorded, and if it was not to be recorded the machine stopped and
the stenographer continued listening until she determined whether it was completely irrelevant or not.

"Q. Now every time the telephone call came - we are talking about Messman, aren't we, first? A. Yes, sir.


"Q. And the girl operating the recording device threw a switch starting the machine working? A. That is right.

"Q. Now then, at the same time the other girl with the earphones would listen and make notes in her stenographer's notebook? A. She would summarize it.

"Q. She took stenographic notes? A. That is right.

"Q. She was a stenographer? A. Yes.

"Q. A person who could take things as people said them? A. That is right.

"Q. Is what you are telling me this: That in some instances after the recording mechanism had been going forward on a call for some time, and then it was stopped - is that what you are telling me? A. Well, not for some time. It could usually be decided almost at once, within the first minute of the conversation whether or not it would be completely recorded.

"Q. Now tell me your method of deciding that. A. Well, you see there were several calls that were of a strictly private personal nature on that wire because
it was also Dr. Messman's home and we were not interested in that.

"Q. I am not asking that at all. If the doctor would call his wife or child or something like that -- A. That is right; not personal calls made by him or any member of his family.

"Q. Now from the start of the conversation by that time I suppose you knew who the family were and what he was talking about? A. Yes.

"Q. And from the start it was a purely personal call such as going to the theatre or going to dinner or not coming home or something of that kind, you could pick up that very soon and not record it? A. Yes, sir, it was very simple to gather that immediately.

"Q. Other than that type of conversation were all other conversations coming over the Messman wire recorded? A. I would say about 99 per cent of them were.

"Q. That I think helps me there. Now was it precisely the same procedure that was followed with respect to the Weiss wires? A. Well, there was one difference.

"Q. Tell me the difference. A. And that was that on the Weiss wires we could not record everything for the reason that there were five trunk lines on that switchboard and we only had two machines and we could not record more than two calls at a time.
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"Q. Of course one machine could only record one call? A. That is right, and we used the same discretion in deciding what would be recorded with respect to any calls, more than two calls which were going on at once. We would use the same judgment as we did on the Messman wires.

"Q. Suppose there were three conversations that seemed to be of a business character and from the start you could not tell whether that conversation might be the interesting one to the Government or not, how would you use your discretion then? A. Well, in that case if two calls that seemed relevant were being recorded and a third one came in--

"Q. And that also seemed relevant? A. And that also seemed relevant, the only thing we could do was take it stenographically.

"Q. And that is what you would do? A. And and that is what we would do.

"Q. And there were how many trunks did you say? A. Five.

"Q. Suppose they were all working at once and all related to business conversations, were there enough stenographers to take the three conversations that could not be recorded on the two instruments? A. Yes, there were enough stenographers.
"Schwartz-direct

"Q. And was it done? A. That was done.

"Q. Other than that was the same procedure followed with respect to the Weiss wire-tapping as was followed with respect to the Messman wire? A. That is right.

"Q. I think that is quite clear. Just one or two other things: Let me have this, are these discs of the type that when the instrument is finished recording the disc is completed or do they have to be subjected to some treatment? A. You mean when the record is finished it can be played instantly?

"Q. You could stick it right on an appropriate type of machine and hear it? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. What did you do with those discs from time to time in both of those instances after they were recorded? To whom were they delivered, if you know? A. Well, we did not deliver them. They were picked up by Inspector Shea.

"Q. Did he personally do it? A. I don't think in every case he personally did it. He might have sent someone.

"Q. Either Inspector Shea or some one of his subordinates, is that right? A. That is right.

"Q. Do you know of your own knowledge what happened to them then? A. No, I do not know what happened to them then.

"Q. That is all you can tell me? A. That is all I knew
"Q. I think that is clear. With respect to those stenographic summaries that were made, of course the first procedure would be to get it on a stenographer's notebook?
A. That is right.

"Q. In stenographic characters? A. Yes, sir.
"Q. Then they had to be transcribed on the typewriter?
A. That is right.

"Q. Was that done right away? A. Yes, sir.
"Q. When that was done what was done with the typewritten summaries? A. The same thing as was done with the records.

"Q. They were likewise given to either Mr. Shea or one of his subordinates? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. That terminated your knowledge of it and that is as far as you know yourself? A. That is as far as I know.

"Q. Now were carbon copies made of those summaries?
A. Yes.

"Q. How many? A. I believe we made an original and three copies.

"Q. What was done with the carbon copies? A. They all went together with the original. They went with the original. They were taken out of the office at the same time.

"Q. Silver & Bernstein were your employers? A. Yes, sir.
"Q. Were they not shown to them? A. No, not by me;
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not by any of the girls in our office.

"Q. Where are these stenographic notebooks that the
girls used in making those notes? A. They are on the
fourteenth floor in this building.

"Q. I am not interested in what floor. Are they in the
United States Attorney's office or in Inspector Shea's
office? A. Well, the offices we use upstairs.

"Q. They are in the hands of the Government somewhere?
A. Yes, sir.

"Q. So, so far as your knowledge goes they have the
discs and the stenographic summaries; they have the
transcripts of such discs as were transcribed, indicating
the persons that talked and they have all the carbon
copies of the summaries? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did you prepare an index or indices of any of those
groups of things that I have talked about; either the
summaries or discs or whatnot? A. Yes, I did.

"Q. Is that in the possession of the United States
Attorney? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And if his Honor were to permit me to see it
would that index tell me this: For instance, how many
discs of talks of Messman were recorded and where they
are filed by some practice so that they could be found?
A. Well, I don't quite understand - how many talks?

"Q. I mean would the index, suppose I were allowed
"Schwartz-direct
to look at it, could I turn to the index and find immediately the Messman discs; so that I could, from the index, lay my hands on the Messman discs? A. Yes.

"Q. And similarly as to all the other parties or persons in this case? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Is that right? A. Yes, sir.

"Q. And would that index also give me, if I were to see it, the dates of the respective conversations? A. Yes, sir, date and time.

"Q. And if I had the index I could very promptly determine what talks there were within a few days before or after some particular talk that was used in the last trial? A. Well, yes, I guess you could. They were all there.

"MR. STRYKER: Miss Schwartz, I am very much obliged. I think you have given me all I wanted to find out.

"(Witness excused.)"

MR. DAILEY: I do not know whether counsel have agreed as to Dr. Messman's testimony.

MR. YOUNG: As to Dr. Messman's transcript, sir, I took upon myself the reading of the transcript. It consists of perhaps 110 pages, but there are a number of pages missing, pages 82 to 89. Those I did not read, of
MR. DANIEL: Just a moment. I have two other small volumes here of testimony. I do not know whether those are the missing pages or not. Those are all I have of Dr. Messman. You realize, it was not all in one volume.

MR. YOUNG: Well, of course I have not read those, so I will have to reserve those for a moment.

Now as to the question of the substance of this testimony dealing with what happened on February 19 or February 20, I find from an examination of the testimony I read that that subject is treated only on pages 13 to 32 inclusive, no more. I carefully checked that. All the rest of the testimony deals with what I think might perhaps be germane in this inquiry, but by conference with counsel we respectfully ask this Court to defer the reading of Dr. Messman's testimony. It may be that we will dispense with it, but we are not quite sure at this moment, and we reserve the right, if the Court please, to be permitted to read it at a later date if we decide we shall want it.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. YOUNG: As for the balance of the testimony just handed to me, I shall read that too, and shall report on that as soon as possible.
THE COURT: Very good. Perhaps you would like to defer what you have to say to see if the missing volumes fit in.

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. DAILEY: Now do you want to call any witnesses?

MR. YOUNG: Yes. We shall call Inspector Shea.

FRANK E. SHEA, called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YOUNG:

Q. Inspector Shea, your testimony that you are about to give is, as it were, a prolongation of the testimony that has been read here given by you in the Weiss case?

A. It is, sir.

Q. And I will proceed from that point on. Now I think somewhere in your testimony you stated that in December, some time in December, 1936, you concluded that your investigation was completed, and that you handed in a report? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell us the first report that you handed in, the date of the first report? A. December 6, 1936.

Q. Is that report in court here today? A. No, sir; that was sent to Washington.
All employees at 280 Bailey were of $^4_0$.
DALEY: No questions.

(Witness excused.)

N A H U M A. B E R N S T E I N, called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. NATHAN:

Q. Mr. Bernstein, the room at 230 Broadway in which this device was installed was paid for by your clients, the insurance companies? A. Yes.

Q. You advanced the money on their behalf? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the stenographers in that room were all either employees of the insurance companies or of Bernstein & Silver? A. They were all our employees, Silver & Bernstein's.

Q. Now in addition to Mr. Kipnis who, I understand, was in the employ or service of your firm for a time, that was also true of Friedmann, was it not? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when these records were made either on a disc or in the shape of stenographic notes, they were immediately transcribed the stenographer --

THE COURT: Didn't Miss Schwartz testify on that subject?

MR. NATHAN: Well, that is just one question that I think I should not have asked, but it is preliminary to the next one. I will withdraw it, though, if your Honor
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thinks that it is in the record sufficiently clear.

Q. After the transcripts were made, were they submitted to either you or your partner, Mr. Silver?
A. Or other members of the joint firms that were associated.

Q. You mean this other firm of attorneys? A. Hodges, Reavis, Fantaleoni & Downey.

Q. They all came to your firm, irrespective of whether they were also submitted to the other firm; isn't that the fact? A. I saw all of them, I should say.

Q. And you read all of them at that time? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you picked out the ones that you deemed important, did you not, and so marked them? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now is it the fact that when you read those transcripts and you saw the name of a person mentioned whose name down to that time you did not know, that you used that name for the purpose of further investigation? A. No, sir.

Q. Do you understand my question? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You made no use of that name? A. Other than to know it and keep records of it.

Q. Did you investigate the files of the insurance company's clients in connection with the names that were in the company so far as a claim or claims of that person
Bernstein-direct
was concerned? A. Not at that time.
Q. You did do that later? A. Yes.
Q. Some time in the course of the investigation?
A. Yes. May I explain that a little further?
Q. Yes.
THE COURT: Yes.
A. You see, we were conducting what we considered an undercover investigation, and our information also led to persons in the employ of the Disability Departments of insurance companies as being involved in these frauds, and it was for that reason that at that time we would not request any files for fear of having people in the departments know that an investigation was on foot.
Q. Tell me, please, when it was that that inhibition was removed? A. The inhibition was partially removed to the extent that members of the committee were presenting --
Q. When, is the question. Give me the month. A. From the period, I think, from December, 1933, until the arrests; during that period after we came to the United States Attorney's office. Around that time.

Q. And then it was that you began to investigate the names and the claims of the persons whose identity had been revealed in the transcripts of the t.s.s; is that correct?

M. DAILY: I object to that. There is no such
Bernstein-direct testimony.

THE COURT: I have not heard a word about identity.

A. When you say "taps," there were room conversations and there were the telephone conversations in both of those offices.

Q. Yes? A. I do not think there were any conversations that I could ever recall with anybody whose names we did not already know, because the method of conducting this investigation was to hold conversations with people whom we knew about, whom either Mr. Kipnis or Mr. Friedman knew about, and called them into the room, and then discussed their situation with them; so we really learned no additional facts from which we could summon these company files. What we did do was to subsequently summon the files concerning claims like Kipnis and the cases Kipnis had told us about, which were quite a number.

Q. Are you telling us that there was no name divulged or learned by you from the transcripts of the telephone taps which you did not know of before? A. I do not know whether there were or were not. There may be. If I were to go over all of them, I might be able to find them, but I do say that we did not just go to work and get files every time we saw a name mentioned.

Q. Is the same thing true of the transcripts of the
"Bernstein-direct

so-called room conversations? A. Yes.

Q. Now after you or your partner, or either of you had read the transcripts that were made by your stenographers, and you had picked out the important ones, the ones that you believed most important, did you hold your conferences with the representatives of the United States Attorney's office? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And did you discuss those transcripts the contents of which you deemed most important with the representatives of the United States Attorney's office? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And can you fix the period when those talks between you and the representatives of the United States Attorney's office began? A. Yes, I think in December of 1936.

Q. And continuing from time to time down to when? A. Now Inspector Shea came to our offices at the end of November, or the beginning of December, and I think it was during that month. We pretty well exhausted the subject during that month, I think.

Q. I take it that those representatives of the United States Attorney's office were Mr. Kaufman and Mr. Dailey and Mr. Noonan? A. And Mr. Hardy and Mr. Powelson.

Q. Did you give at that time either a copy of those transcripts which you deemed most important to the United States Attorney's office, or tell them what you had learned, or give to them the substance of those transcripts?
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A. I think Inspector Shea immediately came down to our office and took most everything with him, brought them down to the United States Attorney's office.

Q. I am asking you what you did with the representatives of the United States Attorney's office, and not what Inspector Shea did. A. What I did was to give them to Inspector Shea when he came down to see us. We turned everything over to him.

Q. Did you investigate any clue or any lead which you got from those transcripts of what I will call, for the sake of convenience, wire-tapping evidence? A. I can't think of any investigation that we conducted, because after December it was in the hands of the Government, from that time on.

Q. Did you work in connection with the Government? A. Yes. We conducted no investigations whatever —

Q. When I use the word "investigation" do you understand that I am referring to the getting of information concerning one or more persons who later became defendants in this case? A. As I recall it, the whole period from the time we began to cooperate with the Government, that is, December, until the arrests, was a period of collating under the headings of the various cases that were being prepared for arrest that material which we already had.

MR. NATHAN: May I have that read?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.
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(Last answer read.)

THE WITNESS: And may I add this. That is best indicated by the fact that the only time I did any work in connection with it was right over here at the United States Attorney's office, going over the material with some of the men and explaining what I knew about the background of this thing --

Q. And that material included the wire-tapping evidence, did it not? A. I do not know of any wire-tapping evidence that existed at that time. You choose to call it that, Mr. Nathan.

Q. Well, I am using the word or term "wire-tapping evidence" as including the so-called room conversations.

THE COURT: Please don't. The room conversations have been ruled upon. Room conversations are not included in the wire-tapping. They do not involve Section 305 of the Federal Communications Act.

MR. NATHAN: May I have the benefit of an exception to that?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NATHAN: Because I do not know that your Honor has ruled that quite as squarely at any preceding time in the course of the hearings.

THE COURT: I had intended to, and I certainly did in the Weiss case.
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MR. DAILEY: I assumed from counsel's questioning that the wire taps referred to communications over the telephone.

THE COURT: Yes, over the telephone, and not the room conversations at all.

MR. DAILEY: Was that the witness's understanding of what Mr. Nathan was talking about?

THE WITNESS: No. Mr. Nathan asked me to assume when he used the term "wire-tapping" he meant both, and I have been making that assumption, although I do not agree with it.

MR. NATHAN: May I proceed, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. NATHAN:

Q. May I ask you if the names of all the present defendants in this case had been revealed to you at the time that you arranged with Mr. Hardy for the installation of the wire-tapping? A. No, sir.

Q. Were those names ascertained by you during the course that the wire-tapping devices were in operation?

MR. DAILEY: No objection to the witness answering if he can speak of his own knowledge.

A. I just want to be clear. Now when you use "wire-tapping" you mean the wire-tapping that the Government --

Q. His Honor has stated very clearly what "wire-tapping"
means, actual wire-tapping.

MR. DAILEY: Well, he stated it very clearly, but I do not think you and the witness understand each other or, at least, I do not think that the witness understands exactly what you are talking about.

MR. NATHAN: I am sorry if he does not.

MR. DAILEY: I would like to have it understood, Mr. Nathan, whether you are talking about wire-tapping with relation to 280 Broadway, or wire-tapping done by the Government, and I think that is what the witness is asking you. If you object to answering, all right.

MR. NATHAN: I do not think the witness asked anything.

MR. DAILEY: I think he meant to say it, but you interrupted him.

MR. NATHAN: I did not interrupt him.

THE WITNESS: I think we can understand it this way: There were three types of recordings: One, room recordings; second, recordings on the telephone at 280 B roadway and at 28th Street, third, there were the recordings of intercepted telephone calls by the Government. Those are the three categories as I understand it. The first two were made by our firm in the course of our own investigation.

Q. How in the course of either of those first two
classes that you have described, did you learn the names of any of the present defendants in this case here on trial? A. I learned of four of the present defendants but not from those recordings. I knew of four of them prior to making the recordings.

Q. Who are the four? A. The four were Dr. Maximilian Goldstein, Herman Rubin, Dr. Schwartz and Irving Lembuch.

Q. When did you first learn of the names of the other defendants? A. Just let me see who they are.

BY THE COURT:

Q. How about Hessenberg? A. Hessenberg? I learned about Mr. Hessenberg from some of the assistant district attorneys after Dr. Messman had confessed about his case.

Q. That would be then after May 19, 1937, is that it? A. Yes, sir.

BY MR. NATHAN:

Q. Can you fix the date more definitely? A. If you can tell me the date when Dr. Lessman made his confession about Hessenberg, I suppose I learned it shortly thereafter.

Q. I can't help you.

THE COURT: No, he can't.

Q. I can tell you this, that Hessenberg was first indicted July 31, 1939. Will that help you? A. I can't possibly tell how long after Dr. Lessman's confession
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Hessenberg was indicted, but it was during the period somewhere after Dr. Messman's arrest, and he proceeded to confess about a great number of cases, and whenever he confessed about the Hessenberg case --

Q. Pardon me. Have you finished?

THE COURT: No, he has not.

A. (Continued) And whenever during the progress of those statements when he confessed about Hessenberg, I probably heard it within a few days.

Q. Was it prior to the Weiss trial? A. I could not remember any more.

THE COURT: Now the next defendant, if you will let me finish this, please, is Schoenberg. When did you hear about him?

THE WITNESS: In exactly the same manner I heard about Hessenberg; only from Government officials after Dr. Messman had confessed.

Q. And at the same time that you heard about Hessenberg, or a different time? A. Probably at a different time, whenever he confessed about Schoenberg.

BY THE COURT:

Q. How the defendant Cooper. A. The defendant Cooper I learned of wholly independently of this whole investigation by the Government. I learned that in this manner --

Q. Can you give us the time, approximately? A. Shortly
after May 18, 1937. On May 18, 1937 the Government sent out a series of subpoenas to innumerable insurance companies asking for all cases, for the files of all cases in which either the firm of J. J. and L. L. Sieg, or the firm of Garrow & Garrow, or Dr. Goldstein or certain other doctors were involved; and then I examined a great many of those files that my clients were preparing for submission to the United States Attorney's office, and in the course of my examination I ran across the Cooper file, and reading the file, it appeared to me to be fraudulent —

Q. All right. That is the way you found out about it? A. That is the way I found out about it, that is the first I heard about it.

MR. NATHAN: Has your Honor finished?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. NATHAN:

Q. Now you saw the transcripts of the wire-tapping that the Government conducted, did you not? A. I did not. I may occasionally have seen one or two, but I did not as a regular thing.

Q. Were you ever refused access to those transcripts? A. I never asked for access.

MR. DAILEY: I think this line of inquiry has been fully covered.
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THE COURT: It seems to me it is fairly repetitious just now.

MR. NATHAN: I am sorry, your Honor --

THE COURT: What is it you want to develop from him that pertains to the Garrow case?

MR. NATHAN: I wanted to ascertain the answers to the questions I am asking him, all of which I think are very material to me and bear very pertinently upon the wire-tapping so far as the Garrow case is concerned.

THE COURT: Perhaps it is due to my stupidity. Now will you tell me what --

MR. NATHAN: No, it may be my stupidity, your Honor.

THE COURT: Will you tell me, please, what facts you are trying to bring to light?

MR. NATHAN: I am trying to bring out from the mouth of this witness the use, direct and indirect, that he made of wire-tapping evidence. I am also trying to prove the use, both direct and indirect, that he made of the so-called room evidence.

THE COURT: I have no objection to your asking him that, if you will point his attention to the Garrow case. I think the witness has been sufficiently examined with reference to all those matters, and that is the ruling, and now from this time forth please direct your
for "famed gold"
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attention to Garrow matters.

MR. NATHAN: May I note an exception?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. NATHAN:

Q. Now so far as the defendant Hessenberg was concerned, did you see the transcripts of the taps to which he was a party? A. I am not quite sure whether there are any taps on Hessenberg. I do not recall ever seeing any.

Q. It has been stated here on this hearing by Mr. Dailey that there were nine such wire taps and transcripts with the defendant Hessenberg. A. Well, if that is so, I never saw them.

Q. In connection with the preparation of this Garrow case for trial, has your firm maintained at its expense representatives in the offices of the United States Attorney?

MR. DAILEY: Is that material to this inquiry, your Honor? I object to it.

THE COURT: The question is directed to the Garrow case. I will allow it.

A. Yes, two girls and Mr. Ball.

Q. Their time was spent exclusively during their working hours in the office of the United States Attorney for the use of the United States Attorney in connection with the Garrow case? A. During the times when things wer
Bernstein—direct

active, yes.

Q. And this Mr. Bell whose name you give is the gentleman who sits at the counsel table alongside of Mr. Dailey now? A. Yes.

THE COURT: Removed three places from him.

Q. In connection with the preparation of this Garrow case for trial, have you at any time since that work began looked over the transcripts of the wire taps?

THE COURT: What wire taps?

MR. NATHAN: Well, the wire taps—I said in the Garrow case, the preparation of the Garrow case—

THE COURT: Well, I mean, have you reference to wire taps of conversations of any named persons? That is what I mean.

MR. NATHAN: Well, I do not limit my question. Any of the wire taps, is my question, without any limit as to names.

A. I don't think so.

Q. Are you sure? A. Let me explain it this way: We decided it long before we began to do any preparation on the Garrow case not to use any wire taps. The reason why I am not completely sure is that there may have been one unusual wire tap or something of unusual interest that may have been shown to be during this whole period, not in the course of preparation of the case regarding any of the
persons mentioned in the indictment. I mean, I can think of one that I may have seen.

Q. What one is that? A. There was one wire tap with a man by the name of Silverman in which there was some discussion as to whether the doctor would coach him or the lawyer would coach him as to his symptoms, and as a matter of interest somebody ran across that and showed it to me. I don't know just who showed it to me.

Q. Who showed it to you? A. One of the assistants. I saw it. That is why I am not certain. In other words, as a regular thing we did not use the wire taps at all in the preparation of the case, but I recall that one.

Q. When were you told so far as the Garrow case is concerned that the wire taps were not to be used in connection with the preparation of the case for trial? A. I think we decided that about during or after the Weiss case; around that time.

Q. After the Weiss case was tried? A. Yes, or during the time the Weiss case was tried; around that time.

Q. Are you sure it was not until after the Weiss case was heard and determined by the Supreme Court? A. No, I know it was before that, for the reason that aside from the decision of the Court, we had long decided that it was completely unnecessary in the Garrow case.

Q. You have used the word "we." How to whom do you
refer by the word "we"? A. Of course, I had no authority to determine. When I say "we determined," I mean we discussed it.

"Q. Who is the "we"? A. Mr. Hardy, I suppose; Mr. Dailey, Mr. Kaufman and Mr. McKnight. We would all gather around and discuss these problems both of law and of fact. When I say "we determined," I mean we all reached a similar conclusion.

THE COURT: Do you mean to say that any group of lawyers as large as that ever agreed on anything?

THE WITNESS: That is one of the few things we agreed on, your Honor.

Q. Did you in connection with the preparation of the Garrow case for trial or prior to the time when that preparation began, confer with any of the persons who are going to be witnesses in this trial?

MR. DAILEY: I do not think that question is susceptible of an answer. I do not think anybody knows who are going to be witnesses on this trial.

MR. NATHAN: You have stated the persons. Possibly I can use your list.

THE COURT: I think your question must be confined to any person connected with the teleph ne top --

MR. NATHAN: That was going to be my next question.
THE COURT: Let us have it and save time.
What is that gentleman's name?
THE WITNESS: Silverman?

THE COURT: Now have you discussed, if you know, with any witnesses anything concerning Silverman's claim or its handling?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now is it your testimony that it is your best recollection that you have not examined or listened to any transcripts or reproductions of telephone taps in connection with the preparation of the Garrow case for trial?

THE WITNESS: That is right.
THE COURT: Very good.

Now I think your examination of this witness is nearly at an end?

MR. NATHAN: Not only is it nearly at an end, it is at an end, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Do any other counsel wish to inquire?

(NO RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Next witness.
(WITNESS EXCUSED.)

MR. DAILEY: Unless counsel have somebody else
they expect to call, shall we go on with the reading?

THE COURT: Is there any of Messrs. testimony that can be omitted as far as you gentlemen know?

MR. YOUNG: As far as I am concerned, sir, I am perfectly willing to waive it, because I have read it; and in this connection may I venture to suggest, your Honor, do not imagine that we are engaged in any sort of dilatory tactics at all. For my part I am perfectly willing to waive it. The others say they have not read it, they have not heard it; they are in a different position.

THE COURT: I wonder if we could save some time by having them look it over, and they could reach a conclusion as to whether they wish to read it all. You can skip through it very quickly, you know, if you choose to.

MR. NATHAN: I may make this suggestion, which may be helpful. It may not. If we are given the opportunity of the rest of the afternoon to go over it, in all probability all of the defendants whose counsel are here will be able to then state to your Honor in the morning that they know what it is, and they are satisfied to have it transcribed into this record by the stenographer at his convenience, instead of being personally read.

Now there is but one reservation that I personally have to make, and that is that I have not yet read it.
It may be that there are one or two questions similar in quantity or number to those that I asked Mr. Bernstein on matters that may not have been brought out. As I recall your Honor's ruling at the beginning of this hearing, we were to have that opportunity if there were any questions.

THE COURT: Oh yes, of course. I do not wish to curtail you in making a satisfactory record, but it occurs to me at least to the extent to which testimony already given needs to be supplemented for the purpose of this hearing, is pretty limited.

MR. NATHAN: I do not know that there will be any. I think if your Honor will adjourn now, and let us stay here and go through that transcript together, that we will be able to save the actual reading of it, taking up your Honor's time and our own.

THE COURT: That is entirely satisfactory.

Now is there any other witness whose testimony you desire to know anything about?

MR. NATHAN: So far as I am concerned, other than the possible calling of Dr. Messman for a few questions, if there are any that I have to ask of him, I know of no other witness. I cannot speak, nor do I speak for any other counsel.

MR. YOUNG: I do not intend to call any other
witness.

MR. LOEB: Nor I.

THE COURT: Now I think that so far as Rosenbaum is concerned, on Mr. Deiley's statement this morning, that it is unnecessary for you to examine him now. If at the trial you think there is anything in his testimony that you think disqualifies him as a witness, you will have ample opportunity then.

MR. NATHAN: That applies to any other Government witness?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FORST: That is satisfactory.

THE COURT: I could not possibly in this hearing foreclose the proper consideration of objections to be made on the trial. In the light of the Supreme Court decision, I should think that would be perfectly obvious.

Then we will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10:30, gentlemen, in the hope that we can dispose of the matter before the noon recess.

MR. YOUNG: May I suggest, your Honor, in the event we decide we do not need to have the testimony read, that perhaps we do not have to come back tomorrow morning? Can we not give you the information today at the end of the day?

THE COURT: I am at your service in any way, but
perhaps it would be more orderly if we had the matter called in the morning, and have some one of you representing all the defendants make a statement as to the disposition of the matter.

(Adjourned to May 30, 1940, at 10:30 A. M.)
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