

Chief Curry tried every way he could, with the national and international importance of this thing, to allow the press to make its coverage of it.

Mr. HUBERT. You never saw any indication of maltreatment of Oswald at all?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir; none whatsoever in the period of some 7 or 8 hours that I was connected with it.

Mr. HUBERT. Oswald made no such accusations in your presence?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir. As I say, the only thing he said was when he was brought in for the arraignment on President Kennedy, and he says to me, "Is this the trial?" I said, "No, sir; I have to arraign you again on another offense." And, there was some seven or eight officer witnesses to that arraignment and an assistant district attorney, and that assistant district attorney at that time was Mr. Maurice Harrell [spelling] H-a-r-r-e-l-l.

Mr. HUBERT. I believe that is all, sir. I'm obliged to ask you these questions to end it up: I don't think that we have had any conversation that has been off the record?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Nor any conversation prior to the beginning of this deposition?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. So that all that has passed between us has been recorded?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Thank you very much. I appreciate your coming down.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I hope that some of it might help shed a little light.

Mr. HUBERT. I'm sure it will. I'm sure they have copies of the affidavits?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir; I'm sure they have. Those were turned over to the FBI, however, no one from the Commission has ever asked for those.

Mr. HUBERT. Could we make copies of those affidavits?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Then, I will mark the copies for identification. Mr. Johnston, you will furnish for me certified copies—you have shown me the originals of the affidavits, F-153, F-154 and F-155. We are going to have photostatic copies made of those. The originals will be returned to you, and when the photostatic copies are brought back to me, I will mark them for identification as follows, to wit: F-153 will be Exhibit No. 3 of the deposition of David L. Johnston, F-154 will be Exhibit No. 4 of the deposition of David L. Johnston, and F-155 will be Exhibit No. 5 of the deposition of David L. Johnston, which will be marked by me for identification after you leave, but these will be photostatic copies of the originals which will remain in your possession.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I could do this—make copies now?

Mr. HUBERT. Let's discuss this a little bit more before you leave—you think you can get the copies made and just bring them to the office here and hand them to me this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, sir; and I will take these affidavits over to the company across the street myself and bring them back for you.

Mr. HUBERT. All right. That will be fine.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I'll do that now.

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY M. KAUFMAN

The testimony of Stanley M. Kaufman was taken at 9 a.m., on June 27, 1964, in the office of the U.S. attorney, 301 Post Office Building, Bryan and Ervay Streets, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Leon D. Hubert, Jr., assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. HUBERT. This is the deposition of Stanley M. Kaufman.

Mr. Kaufman, my name is Leon D. Hubert. I am a member of the advisory staff of the general counsel on the President's Commission. Under the provi-

sions of Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, and the joint resolution of Congress No. 137, and the rules of procedure adopted by the President's Commission in conformance with the Executive order and the joint resolution, I have been authorized to take a sworn deposition from you. I state to you that the general nature of the Commission's inquiry is to ascertain, evaluate and report upon the facts relative to the assassination of President Kennedy and the subsequent violent death of Lee Harvey Oswald.

In particular as to you, Mr. Kaufman, the nature of the inquiry is to determine what facts you know about the death of Oswald and any other pertinent facts you may know about the general inquiry and about Jack Ruby and his operations and associations and so forth.

I think you have appeared here today by virtue of a letter written to you by Mr. J. Lee Rankin, general counsel of the staff of the President's Commission, asking you to come, isn't that correct?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HUBERT. The rules of the Commission provide that every witness is entitled to a 3-day written notice prior to the taking of their deposition, to commence from the date of the letter of request. It's probable that the letter request was dated the 22d and therefore the 3 days have passed, and on the other hand, you may not have received it until later, and therefore I want to say to you that the rules also provide that a witness may waive the 3-day notice in the event the 3-day notice has not actually been given, and so I ask you if you are willing to waive, in the event that technically the 3-day notice has not elapsed.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. Hubert, I don't know when the notice was received. I do know that I did talk to Mrs. Stroud of the U.S. attorney's office, who helped rearrange the appointment which originally was scheduled at 1 o'clock. If there was not sufficient notice, we would certainly agree to waive it.

I would like to point out probably another error in your notice and that was in the name. It was addressed to Stanley F. Kaufman. The correct name is Stanley M. Kaufman, and as far as that notice is concerned with respect to the name being incorrect on the notice, we would likewise waive that.

Mr. HUBERT. What does the "M" stand for?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mike.

Mr. HUBERT. Would you stand and raise your right hand and I will administer the oath?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I do.

Mr. HUBERT. Will you state your full name?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Stanley Mike Kaufman.

Mr. HUBERT. Where do you reside?

Mr. KAUFMAN. 6831 Northport.

Mr. HUBERT. What is your occupation?

Mr. KAUFMAN. An attorney.

Mr. HUBERT. You are admitted to the bar of the State of Texas?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I am admitted to the bar of the State of Texas; yes.

Mr. HUBERT. How long have you been practicing law?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Actually, I graduated from SMU in 1942 and was admitted to practice law in 1942. I immediately went into the service and was discharged in October 1945, and have been in active practice since a little after October 1945, when I returned to Dallas.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Kaufman, do you know Jack L. Ruby?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes; I am acquainted with Jack Ruby.

Mr. HUBERT. How long have you known him?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Actually, Mr. Hubert, it has been difficult in my own mind to really go back, but I did go back into my files some time ago and I believe that the statement you have here that I knew him since 1954 is pretty accurate. It may be a few years difference either way.

Mr. HUBERT. Mr. Kaufman, on several occasions in the past you have been attorney or lawyer for Mr. Ruby, is that not so?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I have handled some matters for Mr. Ruby; yes.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you have any connection as an attorney for Mr. Ruby with reference to the homicide of Lee Harvey Oswald?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, in the course of this examination, Mr. Kaufman, it may be that some of the questions that I would ask would require answers which may invade or violate in some way the lawyer-client privilege which might exist between you and Mr. Ruby. I might not know that. On the other hand, I think you are in a position to know it. I want to state to you that it is not my purpose or the Commission's purpose to cause you to violate or to jeopardize or compromise that lawyer-client relationship or privilege in the slightest way whatsoever. Therefore, I invite you to state to me at any time that you think the questions I ask require an answer that may violate or jeopardize or compromise that lawyer-client privilege. I assure you we will drop the matter immediately. Perhaps you wish to state your position on that problem now.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Hubert. I would make this statement that you inquired about my contact with Jack Ruby regarding the homicide. I did not visit or see him prior to the trial of his case other than seeing him in the courtroom when I testified in the change of venue hearing and also on the date I testified as a defense witness.

I saw him on three occasions subsequent to that, all within a week. Other than that, I have had no immediate contact with Jack Ruby or discussed his case with him, and I give you this so that, not able to anticipate what you might ask, I can outline this to you and this would be the relationship—the only relationship that I have had with him since the date of this homicide.

I have had a number of contacts with him on civil matters and if any of these encroached upon the privilege, I personally believe that if Jack were asked, and if he is mentally able to, he would waive the privilege. Had we known that you wanted this done, we probably could have arranged it as time permitted. However, I don't feel that there is anything that I could add or give the Commission that he would hesitate about or want me not to give, and I would like the record to reflect that even if we take advantage of the privilege at this time, that I would like the record to reflect that we would like at that time to present this matter to Ruby so that he could waive the privilege and that we could give you this information in the event we encroach upon the privilege at any time during the taking of the deposition.

Mr. HUBERT. Let me commence then by asking you this. I have previously handed to you and I think you have read, a document which I have marked for identification as follows: In the margin of the first page "Dallas, Texas, June 27, 1964, Exhibit No. 1, Deposition of Stanley Kaufman" and I have signed my name below that and on the second page, and the document consists of two pages only, I have marked my initials in the lower right-hand corner.

This document, Mr. Kaufman, purports to be a report of an interview of you by FBI Agents Neeley and Rice on November 26, 1963. I think you have read it and I now hand it back to you and ask you if it's correct or if you have any changes or modifications to make in that document.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. Hubert, I would say that there are a number of inaccuracies in this report, probably not of a major concern.

Mr. HUBERT. All right, I wish you would point them out, identifying them, so that a person reading the record later can know what you're talking about.

Mr. KAUFMAN. First, let me explain how the statement was taken. It's not a statement as you correctly stated. It's a report. Whether or not Neeley and Rice were the agents who talked to me, I wouldn't know because I didn't take their names down. I was called by the Dallas office of the FBI one evening and asked if they could make an appointment to see me regarding the Jack Ruby case and I advised them that they could and that I was available then and there, so they told me in about 15 minutes they would come over. Both of the agents came by my office at 1520 Mercantile Securities Building, identified themselves, and sat down and asked me a number of questions, most of which are, I would say, covered in the third paragraph here.

Mr. HUBERT. That's Exhibit No. 1?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes; of Exhibit No. 1. Now, three of the—I mean—there were three basic concerns that they talked to me about. They didn't just ask

questions and write anything down. We just conversed similar to a conversation that you and I might have with a person in our office. Their main concern seemed to be (1) whether or not I knew Ruby, and (2) whether or not I knew him to be a Communist, and (3) whether or not I knew of any connection or relationship with Lee Oswald.

Thereafter, we had a lot of other discussions which are not reported here. Primarily, the concern that I had that was called to my attention by a lot of people who called me and seemed concerned that the name Rubenstein had been invoked in this case, and we probably spent a greater part of the discussion on the prejudices that had been invoked, rather than the things that are reported in the statement.

Mr. HUBERT. Were you interviewed by the agents more than once?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No; just once. As I say, the statement does not cover—this report does not cover all of that, and I think they've got some of the facts confused by virtue of our discussion, so I'll go by this paragraph-by-paragraph, and when I say "this," I'm talking about this exhibit which I am holding in my hand at this time and I think you identified it as Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. HUBERT. Yes.

Mr. KAUFMAN. In the first paragraph the name is stated. It should be "Stanley M. Kaufman". The rest of the paragraph is substantially correct.

In paragraph 2, reference is made that I was acquainted with Jack Ruby and was not familiar with his activities in Chicago, which is true. I knew nothing about his background and in fact I never knew that his name was Rubenstein. In the years that I knew him and in the years that I represented him, his name was Jack Ruby. Every legal instrument that I have in my file has always referred to Jack Ruby, and this is what disturbed me. In all the years that I knew Jack, I never knew his name was Rubenstein, not that he withheld it from me, but he was known in Dallas as Jack Rubenstein.

The conclusion that the agents have in their report that "he considered Ruby one of the most active Jewish bachelors in the synagogue" is something that I don't know exactly what this meant, and I've put a question mark by the side of this line. I indicated and so indicate at this time that Jack Ruby was a bachelor to the best of my knowledge. Mention is made in the third paragraph about Alice Nichols—

Mr. HUBERT. Before you leave the synagogue, I wanted to ask you something more on that.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, I'll come back to it. I just wanted to say that I did know that he and Alice were quite friendly and at times I think Jack had mentioned to me that he wished he could be worthy enough to marry Alice, but apparently he did not marry her. As far as his activities in the synagogue, the only time that I knew Jack Ruby was active in the synagogue, he did go for a period of time to recite memorial services for one of his deceased parents, which was commendable, because many people today don't do those things. I mean, it's a voluntary thing, but as far as other activities, I wouldn't know what would be meant here. I have served on the board of my synagogue for over 7 years.

Mr. HUBERT. Is that Shearith Israel?

Mr. KAUFMAN. It is Rabbi Silverman's synagogue. So, when this document says "active," I wouldn't know what they meant because frankly I don't know the facts on which they base this conclusion.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you characterize his attendance or his relationship to the synagogue as "active" when you were interviewed by the FBI?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. Hubert, as far as the actual words used, I wouldn't recall. I do say that he attended services more than usual during that period of time. As far as other activities are concerned, I don't recall that he has been active. To that extent, though, that's what disturbs me a little when they put this in their report.

Mr. HUBERT. Were you one of the officials—a member of the board of trustees of the synagogue?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I have been. I'm not at this time, but I have been. In other words, in our synagogue we have an autonomous group which is—actually, we are a nonprofit corporation. We have a president and other officers and we have a board of directors, and I have served on two occasions as a director 3 years each.

You cannot succeed yourself as director, and I was also secretary for a year in between my term.

Mr. HUBERT. What I'm getting at is did you have occasion to observe whether Ruby was active in the normal sense of that word, with respect to religious activities?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Actually, that's what disturbs me, Mr. Hubert. As far as I know, he's never been on any committee, he's never been an usher during the services—these things—so when you use the word "active", he attended services.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he attend regularly—there is a regular service, isn't there?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Oh, there are services every day and there are services on Friday and there are services this morning, and in fact, if I wanted to have been very technical, I could have advised you I didn't want to testify today, that it was in violation of my Sabbath.

Now, whether I myself could be one who could tell you this would be unfair, because frankly, I can't say that I'm in attendance every day, and as a result I believe there is only one person that I know who could give you such an opinion and that would be a person such as a rabbi, a person who is in daily attendance, and I personally am not in that category and therefore I would rather not pass on it.

Mr. HUBERT. There were services on Friday, November 22, the night of the President's death, and I ask you if you were present at that service?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No, sir; I was not present.

Mr. HUBERT. There were also services on Saturday morning, November 23, and I ask you if you were present at those services?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No; I wasn't present then. I was supposed to go to Abilene, Tex., to take a deposition on that Saturday and I recall having to cancel my taking of the deposition because I felt so bad about the assassination, but I do recall that I had a plane reservation to leave Dallas at that time.

Mr. HUBERT. All right, will you continue with your comments on Exhibit No. 1?

Mr. KAUFMAN. All right, getting down to paragraph (3). The statement in regard to trips by Ruby are substantially correct. The comment about a visit to Cuba to visit an acquaintance who works in a casino there—now, I don't recall that I made any statement that the man worked in a casino. It was my recollection that I felt or thought that the man was supposed to be a gambler, and I think prior to the taking of the deposition, this morning, you and I commented about this when you gave me an opportunity to examine it, and I believe this man's name was McWillie, if I'm not mistaken, but whether he worked at the casino or not, I don't know. I didn't know then and I don't know now. I wouldn't make the statement that he worked in the casino.

Mr. HUBERT. In any case, the only thing you would know about it would be what Ruby told you?

Mr. KAUFMAN. What Jack had told me, correct.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you remember when that was?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. Hubert, I wouldn't even try to guess. I don't believe Castro was in office at that time. As I recall—of course—it might have been right at the time when the takeover took place. I would rather not even try to venture a guess.

Mr. HUBERT. Are you aware from any source, including Ruby, whether he took more than one trip to Cuba?

Mr. KAUFMAN. If he took more than one trip, I am not aware of it. Actually, I couldn't even swear he took this one, except he told me he was going and I assumed he went, but he sent me no postcards, I got no souvenirs or anything that would actually put me in a position where I could tell you definitely he was in Cuba.

Mr. HUBERT. Could you tell us why he would inform you that he was going to Cuba?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I think Jack liked me. I think we discussed a lot of things that were not lawyer-client conversation. I think that over the period of years we discussed many subjects from physical education—taking exercises, to his nightclub business, the changeover from one type of operation to another, and these matters in my opinion don't relate to law, Mr. Hubert.

Mr. HUBERT. I was just wondering why he told you and I think you've given me the answer.

Mr. KAUFMAN. All right, continuing with paragraph (3)—the report is correct that I did not know and do not know, and never did know Lee Harvey Oswald. I have never heard Oswald's name mentioned by Ruby and have no knowledge or information that Ruby ever knew Oswald.

This portion that "Kaufman stated he heard over TV Ruby had asked for three attorneys"—this is correct. My first acquaintance with the case, that my name was attached to the case was when Judge Pierce McBride was interviewed after talking with Ruby and he indicated that Ruby had asked for Fred Brunner, Tom Howard, and Stanley Kaufman, and at times I feel that knowing Jack like I did know him that the only reason he even did this is probably he thought he would offend me by not mentioning my name, but if you knew Jack, you would know he's very sensitive and he's very, very thoughtful, and I at times feel that that was his reason for mentioning my name.

Although, I must confess that if I could practice criminal law I wouldn't hesitate to represent Jack, that I do feel that he respected my legal ability, and I'm not flattering myself or not trying to be modest, but I do feel that if I could have helped him, and I want the record certainly to reflect this, that had I felt capable, I certainly would not have hesitated to have been his lawyer.

Mr. HUBERT. All right.

Mr. KAUFMAN. About the bank-account business—this is correct. I don't recall Jack having any bank accounts. I didn't make any big money off of Jack over the period of years. I did represent some ventures that might have been referred to me through him. I remember one of the girls that worked for him was involved in an automobile collision and he was kind enough to—when she needed an attorney—to recommend me, and I might have made money in that direction from different people, but as far as Jack himself, he just didn't have, Mr. Hubert, that kind of legal business.

We had some problems with some bands and we did go to court on one or two occasions. I think at one time we tried a case in the presence of the present U.S. district judge here for the Northern District of Texas, Judge Sarah T. Hughes, down at the State court. We had an injunctive matter before her.

We do have or did have at the time this was pending, a case in which we filed an answer in a case which he had been involved in, and I did offer my files to the FBI, and they were in my office, which they didn't want.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you incorporate the S&R Corp.?

Mr. KAUFMAN. The S&R Corp.—I believe I handled the incorporation on that, but Jack Ruby, to the best of my recollection there was someone who opened a club up there at the same location where Jack was and Jack was not involved, to the best of my recollection, and S&R was supposed to have been a management company or something of that type, and I don't believe that Jack had any financial interest in the S&R Corp. Now, I believe I was asked about this and I don't know whether the FBI asked me about it or not, but I'm sure I had been asked about it.

I know Jack's name was not involved as an incorporator, and I don't believe he was ever an officer. He may have been an officer, but as far as owning any stock in the S&R, I am very, very doubtful about that.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you know who did own the stock in S&R initially?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I would rather not guess. Frankly, if I had the papers before me—if I have the papers. Now, there were some of his papers, and when I say "his papers," I have all of my file, I believe, but as far as these corporations were concerned, I don't remember whether the bookkeeper had this or whether the bookkeeper had custody of some of these matters, but as far as Jack Ruby's having a financial interest in S&R, I would say to the best of my recollection Jack Ruby did not and does not have such an interest.

Mr. HUBERT. Do you remember whether it was a part of your function as attorney handling the incorporation to supervise the issuance of stock certificates?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I can't even tell you if we ever issued stock certificates in the corporation. Ofttimes, Mr. Hubert, a person will come to the office, and we

form many, many corporations and we have even served as dummy incorporators in these incorporation matters and I'm sure you likewise have. I don't believe there were dummy incorporators on this incorporation, as I recall, but that the actual owners of the stock had signed the application for a charter, but oftentimes instructions are never forthcoming as to whom the stock would go to. Now, if we did have such instructions, I'm sure that the stock was issued. I'm inclined to recall and believe that Earl Ruby at one time might have been a stockholder. This is a brother of Jack's, and whether Ralph Paul was one of the stockholders or not, I don't recall.

Mr. HUBERT. Well, the records would reflect that.

Mr. KAUFMAN. The records would reflect that and I'm sure there should have been franchise taxes which were filed which would likewise show who the officers and directors were.

Mr. HUBERT. All right, sir; would you continue?

Mr. KAUFMAN. All right, going back here to this third paragraph—I don't think it's fair to report, "He states he knows only two persons who might be able to furnish pertinent information." I think the question that was asked me was who would know the most about Jack and I told them that I thought that Ralph Paul was probably the closest friend that Jack Ruby had and that I thought Ralph Paul would be probably the best informant that they could get, and further, that Alice Nichols, who was secretary for a very fine lawyer who used to be associated with my father-in-law, Bob Dillard. They shared offices in the old Southland Building and Bob is general counsel for Southland Life, and Alice was his secretary, and Jack and Alice had gone together for many, many years and it was my feeling—it's not a question of the only people, it's a question of who were best qualified to furnish them some information and I did say that I thought Jack's acquaintance with Ralph Paul and with Alice would qualify them more than anyone I knew to give them any information. Now, in regards to this next paragraph relating to Jack calling me at home.

Mr. HUBERT. That is on the 23d day of November?

Mr. KAUFMAN. The 23d of November, the day after the assassination of the President. I don't think this correctly reflects what took place, and I would like to modify it to this extent.

Mr. HUBERT. All right; go ahead.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Jack called me at home and I'm pretty sure that the hour was somewhere between 3:45 and 4 o'clock and as I recall, I gave this information to the agents, and the reason I'm sure about the time——

Mr. HUBERT. That's in the afternoon?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes, sir; and the reason I'm so sure about the time, I was sleeping and I was awakened, and we do have a clock on our nightstand and I recall Jack calling and he was very upset, and the nature of our conversation was in regard to this Bernard Weissman or Wiseman and the ad that he had run in the Dallas Morning News.

Mr. HUBERT. What manifestations of his being upset did you observe?

Mr. KAUFMAN. It wasn't observing, I was talking to him on the phone and you could just tell the way he was talking and the manner in which he was rambling on that this man was just real—really concerned about this business.

Mr. HUBERT. That is to say, about the Bernard Weissman ad?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Oh, definitely. He told me how he went down to the post office and sat in front of this man's box and watched, trying to find out who he was if he came to get his mail.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he tell you when he had done that?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I didn't ask him. In other words, apparently it had taken place from the time he called me back to the time the President was assassinated—it had to be within 24 hours, I would assume.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he tell you how long he had stayed watching to see who would come?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No; he just told me that he thought it was terrible that this man had run this ad, and when I say "this," I'm not quoting him verbatim, I'm sure, but this was his sentiment. He was just upset about it and he wanted to know how he could locate him. This was the reason he called. He wanted to know if I could help him—give him some information where he could find

Bernard Weissman. He felt, I guess, as an attorney that I had some power of investigation or ability or know-how, and frankly, I told him the best I could recommend was that he go over to the city library and look at the city directory, that I had no knowledge of where he could be located.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he indicate to you what he wanted to do if he did locate Weissman?

Mr. KAUFMAN. He didn't say what he wanted to do. I think the nature of his discussion was that he was trying to be helpful to either the FBI or the police in locating him. I mean, as far as his talking about he was going to go out and bodily harm him or beat him up or something like that, there was no indication in this conversation that that's what his intent or motives were.

Mr. HUBERT. You gathered rather that he was trying to be helpful to the police authorities?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes; and I felt that he felt maybe they were overlooking this and that maybe this fellow—at that time, as I would feel, he was trying to see if Weissman had anything to do with the assassination of President Kennedy.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words in his own mind, as you gathered it, he did associate the Weissman ad with the assassination?

Mr. KAUFMAN. There's no question about that. Now, this is correctly pointed out in the report. He made special emphasis about this black border. Frankly, I went back, after talking to him and looked at it and it didn't really mean that much to me when I first looked at it. I mean—I was upset about it—about the ad. Frankly, I talked to a number of people about the ad and a number of people talked to me. I happened to talk to the Jewish Welfare Federation that very day that the President was killed in the afternoon, and the secretary I talked to asked me if I had any idea who Bernard Weissman was. It so happens that I have been active in the community, in the Jewish community as well as the non-Jewish community and we were having some discussions back and forth at that time on a matter that had nothing to do with this, and in our conversations, and this was before the assassination of the President. It was that morning before the President even arrived, that we were queried by one of the secretaries over at the Federation as to who in the heck was Bernard Weissman. So, it was not unusual that we would talk about this subject because there were a lot of people that were concerned about it, but Jack was particularly impressed with the border as being a tipoff of some sort—that this man knew that the President was going to be assassinated and that probably in the advertising field, perhaps in Jack's knowledge of the entertainment world, and knowing something about setting up advertising, this had impressed him.

Mr. HUBERT. That black border?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That—when he saw that black border, this was a key. Now in the conversation Jack had gone through, and he rambled on maybe for, oh goodness, 10 or 15 minutes, talking about how he had closed up his clubs and how some of his competitors didn't do so and how this provoked him and how the Dallas News—he gave them hell about running this ad. I mean—don't think that this brief statement of summary that is reported by the agents by any means covers the entire conversation, because Jack just—well he just was upset. It was just the most upsetting thing that I've ever heard with him and in all my conversation, this seems to have really stirred him up.

Mr. HUBERT. You mean the Weissman ad?

Mr. KAUFMAN. This Weissman deal.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he make any comments about Oswald during this conversation?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Jack?

Mr. HUBERT. Yes?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No. All that this conversation was directed to was at Bernard Weissman, and the closing up of his club and the refusal of his competitors to close up, and the attitude of the Dallas Morning News.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he associate Oswald in anyway with any kind of a group, be it leftist, rightist, middle, or any kind of "ism"?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Jack had never mentioned the name Oswald at that time,

and I'll say this, without in any way I think violating any client or attorney relationship, the three times that I saw Jack he never mentioned the name Oswald. He referred to him but never referred to him by name. He called him "the deceased" when I talked to him in his cell. I say "cell," but I've never been in his cell. I saw him in a little visitation or conference room, but he didn't even mention him by "deceased" when I talked to him. I mean, of course, he wasn't deceased at that time—when we talked on the phone—the name "Oswald" was never used by Jack.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he seem to think that the Weissman ad and its possible relationship to the assassination would hurt the Jewish community or the Jewish people?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No, sir. No; this wasn't even discussed. There was no mention even of whether this Weissman may or may not have been Jewish. We didn't even discuss this. Actually, the Jewish subject did not come up at any time in our conversation.

Mr. HUBERT. In any aspect?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he indicate that he was concerned about the death of the President, because of the effect it might have on business in general in Dallas and in particular with reference to his operations?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No; this wasn't discussed. Incidentally, I forgot one thing that he did also point out and that was that he had taken some pictures of this sign "Impeach Earl Warren." He also mentioned that.

Mr. HUBERT. Did he say what he proposed to do with those pictures?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No; he did not say. He just asked me if I had seen the sign. I drive by that place every day and never noticed it, but he had asked me whether I had seen the sign and told me he had taken some pictures but did not indicate what he was going to do with them.

Mr. HUBERT. All right; will you go on then?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Now, as far as the rest—"Kaufman stated that Ruby wanted to know who Weissman was and how he could get in touch with him"—as I say, he did want to know the means or methods of how a person could locate him. As I say, I did indicate that he might consider looking at the city directory.

Mr. HUBERT. All right.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Now, they go on, "and if Mr. Freedman of the Anti-Defamation League could furnish him any information as to the whereabouts of Bernard Weissman." Now, this is, I think, an inaccurate statement. Now, during the course of our conversation with the agents, we told them—

Mr. HUBERT. When you say "we," who is that?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Me—I should say—I told them that I had been active with B'nai B'rith and that one of our children, so to speak, is the Anti-Defamation League, and that I had been called, when my name was mentioned, by people all over the country who knew me—I had calls from Peoria, Ill. and from New York—regarding the Rubenstein being invoked into this and whether it was a matter of antisemitism. I had been called by Mr. Ted Freedman of the Houston, Tex., Anti-Defamation League, who came to see me to see whether or not antisemitism had been invoked into this and whether I personally felt that the name Rubenstein had been injected here for prejudicial purposes, and I think that someone is confused in the reporting of this.

I don't even recall Jack and I talking about the Anti-Defamation League. I know that Jack was not a member of B'nai B'rith, not that he didn't want to be or not that they wouldn't have had him, I don't think he had the money to join. I'm sure he would have liked to have belonged to a lot of things that he was not able to afford, and it's not that expensive an operation, but notwithstanding that, I think that there is some confusion in this report as to conversations going on between Jack and myself. Actually, when I was on the witness stand, Mr. Alexander interrogated me about this very point and I just couldn't imagine what the report said and he had the report in his hand, and he asked me whether or not Jack didn't want to know or ask me how to get in touch with the Anti-Defamation League. I don't remember the exact question, but this is not correct.

Mr. HUBERT. In other words, what you are saying is that you don't recall that you spoke to Jack about that?

Mr. KAUFMAN. About the Anti-Defamation League, although I do say I talked to the agents about it, but not in connection with a conversation with Jack. I do admit that the agents and I, in talking about that, they were very kind and they stayed there and they related to me how they had Jewish agents in the FBI, Bob Strauss of Dallas had been an agent, and I mean that they spent a lot of time discussing this matter with me, and I'm sure they had a lot of things on their mind, Mr. Hubert, and they were not sitting down taking notes although I think they did take names down maybe on the back of an envelope or a scratch pad, but I mean, they didn't sit down such as the reporter is doing here this morning and take notes of the things that we were saying. In other words, I don't believe that it's that significant, but I do want the record to be correct, because I don't think that Jack Ruby and I ever discussed the Anti-Defamation League. That's the point I'm trying to make.

Now—"He stated Ruby had also told him he had tried to locate this Weissman through the Post Office Department"—that's correct—"but was not able to do so." Now, I think I've elaborated on what he did attempt to do, but whether he had conversations with the Post Office and I don't know, but he did tell me that he did locate the box and that he did put it under surveillance, so to speak, and told me that he saw lots of mail in the box and that the box was loaded with mail.

Now—"Kaufman stated that Ruby told him he had been to the Dallas Morning News and had raised 'hell' with the ad department for accepting such an ad." I would say that's correct, and he went into great details about this.

"Kaufman stated that from his contacts with Ruby and the civil matters he had handled for him that he is aware that Ruby is quick-tempered," and that is correct, "and that in his opinion Ruby had no assistance or guidance in connection with the shooting of Oswald." I would say that is a correct statement.

I will say Jack not only is quick-tempered, and I tried to explain to these people, and that's the two agents, that Jack was this type of person—he would do things and then come ask you for advice, and I related to them and showed them, Mr. Hubert, that he had been in my office maybe a few days before all this with a little twistboard that he had seen for sale, and he was going to take this twistboard and have the Goodwill Industries make it so they would have a good deal, and they were going to go out and sell twistboards. I mean, he just thought this was a tremendous thing, and I got the twistboard out and showed it to the agents. I still had it in my office at that time. I've given it away since that time. Somebody wanted a twistboard so I let them have it. Now, he had copied, practically without exception, the instructions that someone else had on their twistboard. He had already gone to the expense of having it printed and here he was coming to me to say, "Was this all right?" Now, this is the type of a boy Jack Ruby was. He would do things on impulse and then he would come back and say, like a child, "Daddy, did I do right or did I do wrong?" This is the matter that I tried to convey to them, that he is not only quick-tempered, but his mentality—Jack is a smart boy, but Jack a lot of times would want you to give him assurance that he was doing right, and I'll say this—the more I think about his telephone call to me, I think that maybe he would like to say, "Well, Stanley, am I doing right?" I mean—this is the way I would interpret it—"Pat me on the back and tell me I'm doing something to help," and unless a person knew him and had talked to him and had been associated with him, you would have to have that relationship before you could have this feeling.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you talk to him or see him after this conversation and until the homicide?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No, sir.

Mr. HUBERT. The conversation lasted, you say, about 15 or 20 minutes?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I would say it was extensive—it was longer than usually people talk on the telephone. I'm sure you as a lawyer know that there are times when you get bored listening to people on the telephone.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you know Louis McWillie at all?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Never—I just knew him by reputation. Actually, I don't

know him by reputation. If I saw the man—I mean—I would never know him. I wouldn't know what he looked like.

Mr. HUBERT. So, you got the name "McWillie" from Ruby really, when he told you about him?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That's right.

Mr. HUBERT. I think you've covered some of this and it may be repetitious, but I think you are in a good position to tell us, if you will, what do you know about Jack's thoughts or attitudes towards the various "isms" that exist in the world today, "rightism," "leftism," and so forth?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. Hubert, to be very honest with you and to be very candid with you, I have never discussed it with Jack, so it would be presumptuous again on my part to express opinions as to any political philosophies, as far as any philosophies or doctrines he might have toward any "isms." I certainly would classify him—I think this—I think I am certainly in a situation, having served in the Armed Forces and having served in China and having been active in my community supporting them financially as well as with works, I would certainly classify Jack as to what I knew about him as a loyal American.

Mr. HUBERT. From what you knew of him as a person, would he be the type of person that would be interested in international politics or international ideological philosophies and so forth?

Mr. KAUFMAN. If he was, I had never discussed it with him. Actually, as I explained to you, I'm sure that many of us even in the course of legal conversation will digress somewhat and talk about sports or talk about women or talk about a multitude of subjects. To the best of my recollection I never had talked politics with Jack. I had never talked anything that would give me any background where I can express an opinion on that subject.

Mr. HUBERT. Would you express your opinion as to what his desires and ambitions in life were?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, that covers a multitude of sins. I can say that in the field of his business venture, I really think that Jack would liked to have been a success in the field of entertainment. He had tried many, many ribbons, and when I say "ribbons," I mean they've changed methods of operations.

I didn't know Jack when he was in some other nightclub businesses. I think he was being represented by some other attorneys. In fact, before coming here this morning I tried to just recollect how I first met Jack, and the best I could recall, I had talked to him a few times in the lobby of the Mercantile Bank and who had introduced Jack to me, I was trying to find out that, and I recall that he at that time used to wear a short-sleeved sport shirt and a pair of trousers and a bunch of keys on the back of his hip, and reminiscing how he had improved his dress and all through that period of time, that Jack when he would come to my office I would say generally would be dressed and attired well. He would have on a tie and a suit, and I think he wanted to elevate himself where he would be a success financially. I think honestly he would have married Alice Nichols. For example, when we discussed this, he didn't think he was worthy of her, being a nightclub operator and she a very fine legal secretary for a very fine attorney.

Mr. HUBERT. Did you detect any sensitivity toward his background?

Mr. KAUFMAN. We never talked about his background. Not that he would avoid it—naturally, there would be a time or occasion that certain events would come up and he might say, "Well, it was pretty rough in Chicago." Jack had a finger off—I don't know if you have seen Jack, but he did tell me once that someone bit it off in a fight he had with him. Now, whether that was in Dallas or Chicago, I don't even know, and whether that was true or not, I don't know.

I was at the Worth Food Market, they have a kosher delicatessen up there and I was checking out—I'd been up there buying some stuff and I was up at the counter checking out and a little boy had his little portable radio and all of a sudden I heard this kind of a report, as I recall, "They are bringing Oswald down," and the next thing is this boom, and as I recall the news reporter said, "My goodness, one of these trigger-happy detectives has shot Oswald" and they wouldn't identify who it was, and then they straightened it up and they said, "No, it wasn't a detective" but they wouldn't identify him, but then I get in the car and turn on the radio in the car and all of a sudden they say it was Jack Ruby

who was the person who had shot Lee Oswald, and I liked to have died. I was going home, and my wife had heard it, and she couldn't believe it. She just talked about "what went wrong with that crazy Jack?" She said, "He just must have been nuts," but it just was the most shocking thing I ever heard in my life when I heard on the radio that Jack Ruby had gone to the police station and shot Lee Oswald.

Mr. HUBERT. Did anyone contact you to represent him? I think it was mentioned that he said that you would be one of his three lawyers?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I think he said he wanted any of these three—yes.

Mr. HUBERT. He never contacted you about it?

Mr. KAUFMAN. He personally?

Mr. HUBERT. Yes?

Mr. KAUFMAN. He didn't call me, but I had a call right after that from some lady saying she was calling for his sister, and at that time Oswald was still living, and they called me and they said "We know you don't handle these matters and maybe you could refer someone to us?"

Mr. HUBERT. Did she identify herself?

Mr. KAUFMAN. At the time she did, but I gave no significance to it.

Mr. HUBERT. You don't know who it was?

Mr. KAUFMAN. No.

Mr. HUBERT. But she represented to you that she was calling on behalf of Eva Grant?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That's correct, and at that time I recommended Fred Brunner, not that I recommended him on just this case, but we have had other clients who have had problems. In fact, I have recommended one to Fred within the last 2 or 3 weeks. I didn't call him. I said, "To me, I think Fred Brunner is a very able lawyer who could probably help them," and the next thing I get a call from Sam Daugherty who is in Fred Brunner's office and Sam says that the lady had called and that Fred was out on his farm and said for me to call back and tell them that Sam Daugherty was going to help them. Well, I tried to call back but their phone was so busy I never was able to get back in touch with them, but I was informed that Sam Daugherty and Fred Brunner went down, but there was so much confusion down at the police station that they left and that they went over to that office across the street where Colley Sullivan has his office and watched it on TV. They figured—"we can't find out anything going on over here, but we can through this news." Now, we've talked about it since that time, in fact, I talked to Mr. Brunner when I got my subpoena. I asked him if he wanted to come over and relate any of this to me, and I'm sure if anybody wanted to talk to him, Brunner would be happy to relate what the situation was, but all the lawyers were trying to get in on the act, that he just felt, "Boy, this thing is so confusing, I'm taking off" and he apologized to me about it, Mr. Hubert. He, as I say, is a very fine attorney, and to him, he just didn't know what was going on and neither did I nor did anyone else, and so I just dropped the thing.

Mr. HUBERT. You never were contacted by anybody further as a matter of fact?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, Tom Howard, I think, talked to me several times about this Rubenstein deal. I would call Tom Howard and say, "The Jewish community is in an uproar about this, I had a call from so-and-so," and this was true—this is true. In fact, I had a call from Julius Schepps and some of the most responsible and influential people we do have in Dallas too, and they said to me, "I hope you are not going to get involved in this case," and to Julius I remember I said, "Well, Julius, you know—" he heard my name mentioned, and I said, "Julius, if I were able to represent the man I would" and I told him how I felt, and in my conversation about it he indicated that the whole country was concerned about it. So, I would keep on to Tom Howard about this—I said, "Man, this is just wrong that these people here in Dallas feel that someone is trying to just incite a bunch of prejudice into this and that's not right." I told him that Jack Ruby should be tried as Jack Ruby and not anything else. So, I would get in touch with Tom and did on many occasions, and I'll say to you this quite frankly, that I talked with Tom and when they cited him to go before the Grievance Committee, that I would personally appear

voluntarily to tell them that there had been a great deal of pressure put on about this Rubenstein deal and I so advised the FBI at the time and told them that I had been bothered, molested, called and so on about the Rubenstein part, and that people didn't like it and they didn't know why it was injected into it, and that Chief Curry apparently had started it when they made this announcement on TV when he told them that his name was Rubenstein, alias Jack Ruby, and that this was not a reflection on Henry Wade and it was not a reflection on anybody that I knew, except somewhere along the line someone had either in error or either intentionally started this business about Jack Rubenstein.

Now, the reason I say this—later, if you recall, there were a number of TV stories on a Jack Rubenstein who is supposed to have been, and these are things that I didn't even know about but I read about it in the paper, and heard it on TV that he was supposed to have been a questionable character that had been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Tom Howard even indicated to me that he had gone to the trouble of going to the public library and looking it up or had someone do it, of checking all the Jack Rubensteins in all the major cities, that there were many, many Jack Rubensteins, and where they got this business he didn't know and why they were trying to do this, he didn't know.

Yes, sir; I was contacted and contacted by others and I will say this: Mr. Ted Freedman from the southwestern regional office of ADL came up to Dallas and he was in my home and he wanted to know whether or not I felt that the antisemitism had been injected into this case and I told Ted that as far as I knew it had not been, that this was not intentional, that it was an accident perhaps, and in talking with Tom Howard, he had talked to some of the major newspaper writers who were in Dallas at the time and some of the major magazines that had been here at the time, and they felt likewise that there was no antisemitism that had been purposely injected into the matter, but the damage was already done, Mr. Hubert.

Mr. HUBERT. Yes.

Mr. KAUFMAN. If there was any damage, it was already done, and there was no way of erasing it, and believe me, this was a great concern of many, and I could go on and on and on and tell you the concern that many had for it.

Mr. HUBERT. I have one final matter I would like to ask you about. I have been advised that you represented an individual who happened to be in jail on the day the President was shot and had a view through the window?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes; this was an interesting development, Mr. Hubert. As I told you before we took the deposition, I represent a number of insurance companies and when I say a number, I maybe have three or four that we do defense work for, and when I talked to Mrs. Stroud of the U.S. attorney's office, I told her that—

Mr. HUBERT. That was just a couple of days ago?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes, sir; when I received the notice from the Committee. I had a case styled *Lowe versus Mitchell* that was in the 44th Judicial District Court and I was representing this, as I say, on behalf of an insurance company, and this boy, Willie Mitchell, a colored boy who we incidentally had a great deal of trouble getting into a defendant's case. He felt that he had already served his term in jail and that he didn't owe any debt to society moneywise or otherwise, and there was a serious question of whether we were going to continue to defend him or whether or not he had any coverage, but notwithstanding that, we did settle his case, and I did get him to come by the office one day for an interview, and in the course of my conversation he let me know that he was in the jail serving a DWI offense at the time the President was killed, and I sat back and forgot about the automobile accident and just let him talk, and he related how all of these prisoners up in jail had been advised by the jailers and that they had read in the newspapers that the President was coming to town, and they looked in the papers and they saw the route, how the President was coming to town, and the jailers told them where and that they were coming and they congregated at this window—I mean—this side of the jail. Apparently they had a good view of

what took place, and he described to me exactly, and when I say "exactly," he didn't see anyone in that window, but I did tell Mrs. Stroud that I thought it might be helpful to the Commission to know that there were people in jail who saw the actual killing.

He described the President as having been hit from the rear and he said there was no question in his mind that the bullet came from the window. He said when the President's head was hit, it was just like throwing a bucket of water at him—that's the way it burst. He said it made him sick and everybody else sick up there.

I felt that Mrs. Stroud should know this and would want the Commission to know it for the reason that there seems to have been some question as to what I've read in the newspaper as to whether or not there was more than one bullet and whether or not the bullet came from the back or came from the front.

I was a small-arms instructor myself over in China, having been trained in the infantry school in Fort Benning, and I certainly feel I would love to, if I could, volunteer anything that would be helpful to the Commission, and if that information were helpful, I will be glad to get Willie Mitchell's address and furnish it to you.

Actually, I don't know who else was in jail. I do know that Willie Mitchell was, and I had even suggested that he get in touch with the Warren Commission, but he just has as many people have this "I don't want to get involved" attitude. I mean, he felt that he had already been too much involved with that DWI and didn't want to get involved with anything else.

Mr. HUBERT. Does Mitchell live in Dallas?

Mr. KAUFMAN. He's a construction worker and lives in Dallas.

Mr. HUBERT. I would ask you to do this, would you address a note to Mr. J. Lee Rankin, general counsel of the Commission?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I have his address on the letter of transmittal.

Mr. HUBERT. Would you advise him that in the course of this deposition the question of Willie Mitchell came up and that I asked you to furnish the address that you have for him?

Mr. KAUFMAN. All right.

Mr. HUBERT. And that you are doing it at my request?

Mr. KAUFMAN. I will be happy to, and incidentally, I did mention this to Sheriff Decker. This is no surprise, and I did tell Sheriff Decker—because I had asked Willie Mitchell how many people had talked to him about this, whether or not anyone had come up to the jail to discuss this with any of the prisoners, and he did indicate that there were some people but he thought they were probably just people from the jail office rather than anyone else.

Mr. HUBERT. When did you tell Sheriff Decker about it?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Right after I found out about it.

Mr. HUBERT. And when was that?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, the case was settled, I guess, about 5 or 6 or 7 weeks ago. It's been within the last 2 or 2½ months, maybe. I believe I was down there one Saturday afternoon and was talking to him about it.

Mr. HUBERT. Is there anything else you wish to say, Mr. Kaufman?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, that's very kind of you to turn the record loose to me here where I could go ahead and make any statements. I would like to say this, Mr. Hubert, that frankly I certainly would give any additional information that you would want to know now or at any time, whether by interrogatories by letter, and I assure you that you have my utmost full cooperation. I know what the function of the Commission is—I have read it. I know that it's a difficult task that you have and whether you can ever come up with the conclusions that the American people want, I don't know. I certainly feel that many people won't believe the findings of the Commission, that they've already prejudged this thing. I think what you are attempting to do is a worthy project of the President, the Chief Justice, and all I'm sure they are doing is trying to get to the root of it.

I won't go into my feelings about the trial of Jack because I know you know I am rather prejudiced about it. I do feel that a great injustice has been done. I wouldn't tell a story for him, though, or tell a lie. I am here to tell the truth,

the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I think that Jack, notwithstanding what I read in the Dallas Morning News today, was acting on impulse. I think that he did something that many, many Americans—good red-blooded Americans would have done. I don't justify it. I don't condone it. I don't say it is the right thing to do. I have had a number of calls where people thought he should have gotten a medal.

I think there is certain testimony that should have been brought out that wasn't. I have questions about the defense of Jack Ruby as a lawyer. I have some feelings about statements that have been made about the oligarchy of Dallas. That's why I say to you, when you asked me if there is anything else I could say, I could certainly lend a lot of thought that I'm sure would have no bearing on it, but the only reason I'm making this statement is that I do feel that it's very difficult in reviewing depositions to get the same feeling you do when you look a person in the eyes; when you get to sit across from them you get to feel the warmth of a person, that notwithstanding the good work of a reporter, these things cannot be reflected in a written deposition, and in the Commission's later reading this—I'm just trying to reflect a little of my personality so that they would know that I am not a vicious person and I am not a person who has any malice towards anyone. I mean, I personally as a lawyer and trained as a lawyer, think that the facts should be brought out, and I think that the things that have motivated people in their testimony, whether it's before the Commission or otherwise, certainly is worthwhile. I think there have been tremendous pressures put on people involved in this case, whether it's me or anyone else. As I pointed out, the tremendous pressures that were put on me those first few days because my name was mentioned, is what I refer to. I think that there was tremendous pressure put on the lawyers who tried this case.

I think the Ruby family were not treated fairly in the opportunity of getting fair counsel. I think they had a very difficult time employing counsel locally. I think the fact that they had to go out of the State to get counsel is not because they wanted to go out of State. I think that they had many, many problems that I can't discuss with you because perhaps the relationship of client-attorney is involved. I believe there are many people who have been involved as lawyers who have had tremendous pressure put on them. I think that even the district attorney's office has been put under tremendous pressures, and this is an unfortunate situation, because if you believe in justice, if you believe in truth, if you believe in righteousness, you would say certainly that these things—you have to get these pressures taken off of you.

I have had many, many people tell me about the future of this appeal, that they feel that the pressures will have more to do with it than the law. I think this is wrong. I think that this case should be decided as a matter of law, not as a matter of prejudices or pressures, and I certainly think that the Commission should let the chips fall as they will, that they shouldn't be subjected to pressures. I don't think that those who are on it probably would be, but they are human beings and we all have human frailties. I think we can only take so much and I think this is what happened to Jack Ruby.

In closing, I would like to say this—that one of the things I have alluded to is this point about Jack not walking into a police station to make a sacrifice of himself with the money in his pocket. I think that the physical facts—you can see premeditation on a man like Lee Oswald, but the fact that he had a planned method in this whole thing. In my opinion he had a plan not only of accomplishing his mission but of a getaway.

You take a man such as Jack, as I see this situation and as I have found from information that has been told to me, not by Jack but from outsiders, Jack could never have known the plan of removing Lee Oswald from the jail, that it had to be something that just happened. These physical facts are there and I'm sure the Commission has them.

Mr. HUBERT. I think you've mentioned to me that it is your opinion that as you knew Jack Ruby, he would not walk into jail—

Mr. KAUFMAN. With several hundred dollars in his pocket.

Mr. HUBERT. Intending to shoot somebody with the certainty of being caught?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That's right. Knowing Jack Ruby as I did, knowing his financial situation, I feel that if the story that I read in the paper this morning

was correct, that he considered himself a sacrifice, I just can't believe this, because I would say that if he did do this, Mr. Hubert, I feel, knowing him, that Jack would have taken his money and left it with his sister or left it with his bartender or left it with someone, but I don't believe Jack Ruby would have walked into the jail with his money, and leaving his dogs elsewhere, with the understanding he was going to make a sacrifice out of himself and be caught, because this does not demonstrate to me the actions of a sane person—to walk into a place with your money, with your dogs here, and without any plan of getting away or a plan of getting out of it.

Mr. HUBERT. And you say that's inconsistent of what your estimate of Jack Ruby as a human being was?

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUBERT. You made reference to what you read in the paper this morning, and I take it you are referring to the front page story of the Dallas Morning News by Carl Fruend?

Mr. KAUFMAN. By Mr. Fruend.

Mr. HUBERT. Who writes a story concerning the interview of Jack Ruby with the Chief Justice, is that correct, that's the story?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That's correct.

Mr. HUBERT. I wanted to identify it.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Yes, sir; in other words, the story you refer to is a story that purports to be a copyrighted story regarding the testimony of Jack Ruby before the Chief Justice and other members of the Commission or whoever was present, and in which the story relates that Jack said he went down there for a twofold purpose. One was to send a telegram and the "other"—referring to the elimination or assassination or the killing of Lee Harvey Oswald, and I say that I believe that's inconsistent with the man's personality and with his actions—with the man that I know.

Mr. HUBERT. Now, prior to the commencement of this deposition, we did have some conversation, and in order that the record can be clear on the point, as I now look back, we have covered in the deposition everything that we spoke about prior to the deposition, isn't that correct?

Mr. KAUFMAN. That is correct, Mr. Hubert.

Mr. HUBERT. So that there is nothing that has passed between us that has not been recorded.

Mr. KAUFMAN. There is nothing that has passed between us that has not been recorded, and I believe further that we had a further conversation prior to that in which you had indicated, just as you did in the deposition, that we could invoke our privilege, and I had indicated to you that if necessary I would go off the record and give you the information, and you further requested that I do not go off the record because there would have to be other explanations, and we have not gone off the record, that all of our conversations before and after have now been, I believe, correctly reported.

Mr. HUBERT. Thank you very much. You have been very helpful indeed.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, I hope so.

Mr. HUBERT. We are trying to get the picture of the man.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, that's what I tried to give you and that is all I can do.

Mr. HUBERT. I might state to you, too, you know that we are far more interested in this man just from the newspaper standpoint. We are building this record so that in a hundred years from now, a person reading it can make sense of it.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Well, I wish that I were an artist, but I'm not that articulate, but you see, this is what's wrong, and our good reporter knows that many times when we see these depositions, we say, "Do we sound that bad?" Sometimes a reporter will edit them, but they are not supposed to. I mean, they may make us sound a little better.

I will further say frankly, that the worst part of this is that it is impossible for the Commission when they read all this and try to digest it, to see the people and how they feel, and if they could see the people I think it would be so much more helpful to the Commission.

Mr. HUBERT. Yes; I can understand that. And again, let me say how much we thank you for coming today.

Mr. KAUFMAN. All right, thank you.