The original documents are located in Box 15, folder "Intelligence - Interception of Non-Verbal Communications by FBI and NSA: Hearings Transcripts (4)" of the Loen and Leppert Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Digitized from Box 15 of the Loen & Leppert Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

TENOGRAPHIC MINUTES Inversised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Duplication

Stenographic Transcript Of

HEARINGS

Before The

Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THE INTERCEPTION OF NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS BY THE FBI AND NSA

MARCH 11, 1976

Washington, D. C.

COURT REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 1911 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Suite 300-A Arlington, Virginia 22202 (703) 920-6155

| 1 | TABLE OF CONTENTS | |
|----------|---|------|
| 2 | TESTIMONY OF: | PAGE |
| 3 | George F. Knapp President ITT World Communications, Inc. | 3 |
| 4 . 5 | George E. McMullen Operations Supervisor Washington, D.C. | 3 |
| 6 | ITT World Communications, Inc. | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | , | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | · | |
| 14 | i | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

•

| HEARING ON THE INTERCEPTION OF NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS BY THE FBI AND NSA THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1976 |
|--|
| |
| THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1976 |
| |
| — — — |
| House of Representatives |
| Subcommittee on Government |
| Information and Individual Rights of the Committee on |
| Government Operations |
| Washington, D.C. |
| The Subcommittee met at 10:15 a.m., in Room 2154, |
| Rayburn House Office Building, Honorable Bella S. Abzug |
| (Chairwoman of the Subcommittee) presiding. |
| Present: Representatives Abzug and McCloskey. |
| Also present: Robert S. Fink, Professional Staff |
| Member; Eric L. Hirschhorn, Subcommittee Counsel; Timothy H. |
| Ingram, Subcommittee Staff Director; and Anita Wiesman, |
| Clerk. |
| |
| Ms. Abzug. The hearing is called to order. |
| Is Mr. George Knapp here? |
| Mr. Knapp. Yes. |
| Ms. Abzug. Mr. George McMullen? |
| Mr. McMullen. Yes. |
| Ms. Abzug. We resume our inquiry this morning into the |
| interception of non-verbal communications by Federal agencies |
| () 41 C |

This investigation began late last summer and this is our fifth day of hearings on this subject.

Yesterday we received testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Richard E. Wiley, and from officials of RCA Global Communications, Inc.

Today we will hear from Mr. George Knapp, President of ITT World Communications, Inc., and from Mr. George McMullen, an operations supervisor with the ITT Worldcom office in Washington.

We proceed under several areas of this Subcommittee's jurisdiction: Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission, which is responsible for the administration of the Communications Act of 1934; oversight of the Justice Department and its Federal Bureau of Investigation; government policies as to the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of information, including intelligence data; and individual rights, particularly the right of privacy.

Under the House Rules, the Government Operations Committee is directed to examine government activities generally, and to conduct investigations into any and all matters coming within the legislative jurisdiction of the House under Article I of the Constitution.

In the present investigation, we are considering allegations that the FBI, the National Security Agency, and perhaps other Federal agencies or their agents have for

1

2

3

| 1 | many years intercepted some or all of the wire and radio |
|----|--|
| 2 | traffic being transmitted to or from this country by various |
| 3 | communications companies. |
| 4 | We are also interested in interceptions of communications |
| 5 | which were both sent and received in the United States. |
| 6 | I now call our witnesses for this morning, Mr. Knapp and |
| 7 | Mr. McMullen. |
| 8 | Will you please come forward? |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

| 1 2 | TESTIMONY OF GEORGE F. KNAPP, PRESIDENT, ITT WORLD COMMUNICA- TIONS, INC., AND GEORGE E. McMULLEN, OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR, WASHINGTON, D.C., ITT WORLD COMMUNICATIONS, INC. |
|--------|--|
| 3 | Ms. Abzug. Mr. Knapp and Mr. McMullen, would you please |
| 4 | raise your right hands? |
| 5 | Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about |
| 6 | to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but |
| 7 | the truth, so help you God? |
| 8 | Mr. Knapp. I do. |
| 9 | Mr. McMullen. I do. |
| 10 | Ms. Abzug. Mr. Knapp, would you please state your name |
| 11 | and address for the record? |
| 12 | Mr. Knapp. My name is George F. Knapp. I reside at 661 |
| 13 | Shawnee Drive, Franklin Lakes, New Jersey. |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. Mr. McMullen, would you please state your |
| 15 | name and address for the record? |
| 16 | Mr. McMullen. My name is George E. McMullen. I live at |
| 17 | 7008 - 23rd Place, Hyattsville. |
| 18 | Ms. Abzug. If you are accompanied by counsel, as is |
| 19 | your right, would you have him state his name and address |
| 20 | for the record? |
| 21 | Mr. Sifton. Charles P. Sifton |
| 22 | Ms. Abzug. Would you speak up, please? |
| 23 | Mr. Sifton. Charles Sifton, 120 Broadway, New York City. |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. You represent both Mr. Knapp and Mr. McMullen? |
| 25 | Mr. Sifton. Yes. |

| 1 | Ms. Abzug. Mr. Knapp and Mr. McMullen, have you been |
|----|---|
| 2 | supplied with a copy of the Rules of this Subcommittee and, |
| 3 | of course, Rule 11 of the Rules of this House? |
| 4 | Mr. McMullen. I have. |
| 5 | Mr. Knapp. I have. |
| 6 | Ms. Abzug. Did you hear my opening statement this morning |
| 7 | in which I summarized the jurisdiction of this Subcommittee |
| 8 | and the nature of the present inquiry? |
| 9 | Mr. Knapp. I did. |
| 10 | Mr. McMullen. I did. |
| 11 | Ms. Abzug. Have either of you opening statements? |
| 12 | Mr. Knapp. I do not. |
| 13 | Ms. Abzug. Mr. Knapp, how long have you been with ITT |
| 14 | Worldcom and in what capacities? |
| 15 | Mr. Knapp. I have been President of ITT Worldcom since |
| 16 | September of 1975. |
| 17 | Ms. Abzug. What was your occupation before you joined |
| 18 | ITT? |
| 19 | Mr. Knapp. I was employed by Bell Telephone Company, |
| 20 | the New York Telephone Company unit. |
| 21 | Ms. Abzug. Have you been served with a subpoena duces |
| 22 | tecum by this Subcommittee? |
| 23 | Mr. Knapp. I have. |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. And were all the latest documents supplied |
| 25 | this Committee on or before February 18, 1976? |
| 1 | |

| , | |
|----|---|
| 1 | Mr. Knapp. To the best of my knowledge they have been |
| 2 | supplied with the exceptions as noted in two specific letters |
| 3 | by counsel to the staff. |
| 4 | Ms. Abzug. Are you certain in your mind that you |
| 5 | supplied all of the documents to the inquiry we are con- |
| 6 | ducting here today? |
| 7 | Mr. Knapp. To the best of my knowledge, yes. |
| 8 | Ms. Abzug. How long were you employed by ITT? |
| 9 | Mr. Knapp. I have been employed by ITT for 10 years. |
| 10 | Ms. Abzug. In what capacity? |
| 11 | Mr. Knapp. In the capacity in telephone operations in |
| 12 | Puerto Rico; for the past six years I was President of the |
| 13 | Puerto Rico Telephone Company. |
| 14 | Prior to that I was in telephone operations in Latin |
| 15 | America. |
| 16 | Ms. Abzug. What was your occupation before joining ITT? |
| 17 | Mr. Knapp. I was an executive with the New York Tele- |
| 18 | phone Company of the Bell System. |
| 19 | Ms. Abzug. Where? |
| 20 | Mr. Knapp. In the New York Telephone Company and in |
| 21 | the Bell Telephone laboratories. |
| 22 | Ms. Abzug. In New York? |
| 23 | Mr. Knapp. In New York City. |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. Can you tell us the step-by-step process of |
| 25 | ITT's involvement in making communications entrusted to its |
| | |

care, telegrams as well as telex, available to agencies of the United States Government?

Mr. Knapp. While I have no personal knowledge of the matters of which you speak, I have attempted to familiarize myself with the various stories which have appeared in the press as well as the Church report on Operation Shamrock. From these I have deduced the method whereby messages could have been transmitted to various security agencies of Government.

Ms. Abzug. I am pleased to hear that you took the trouble to find out what happened. Would you tell me what the method for finding that out was?

Mr. Knapp. As I indicated, I have read everything that was available on the subject to me, either in the press or in the Church Committee report.

In addition to that, I have had direct conversations with an executive of ITT Worldcom who did testify before the Church Committee.

Ms. Abzug. Who is that?

Mr. Knapp. I beg your pardon? I didn't hear the question.

Ms. Abzug. Who is that executive?Mr. Knapp. Mr. Tower.Ms. Abzug. Mr. Tower?Mr. Knapp. Bertram Tower.

24

25

1

2

3

Ms. Abzug. What is his capacity?

Mr. Knapp. Chairman of the Board of ITT Worldcom.Ms. Abzug. Mr. Tower is Executive Vice President?Mr. Knapp. No, he is Chairman of the Board.

Ms. Abzug. Chairman of the Board. How long has he been Chairman of the Board?

Mr. Knapp. For at least, to my knowledge, the last 10 years.

Ms. Abzug. And he was with the company before then? Mr. Knapp. Yes. He has over 35 years of service. Ms. Abzug. What was the nature of the information you received from Mr. Tower?

Mr. Knapp. Mr. Tower indicated to me that when he joined the predecessor company of Worldcom in 1943 that there was a system in operation of censorship during the wartime period.

Following the war, Mr. Tower indicated to me that at varying times, occasionally through his direct knowledge and occasionally through his subordinates, he was aware of the fact that certain telegraphic messages were being copied and access to these copies was given to security personnel of the United States Government.

Ms. Abzug. How many conversations did you have with Mr. Tower?

Mr. Knapp. I had two conversations, and these were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

basically conversations that I undertook at the urging of 1 your staff in order to familiarize myself with the details 2 of the operation. 3 Ms. Abzug. When were these conversations held? 4 Mr. Knapp. These were held the earlier part of this 5 week. 6 Ms. Abzug. You never talked to him before that? 7 Mr. Knapp. No, I did not. 8 Ms. Abzug. Since when have you been president of this 9 company? 10 September of 1975. Mr. Knapp. 11 Ms. Abzuq. When did you first read about this operation? 12 Mr. Knapp. I believe it was approximately July 21 or 13 July 22. 14 Ms. Abzug. You didn't speak to anybody about it when you 15 found out about that? 16 Mr. Knapp. Yes, I did. 17 Ms. Abzug. That was not at the urging of the staff but 18 your own instance? 19 Mr. Knapp. Yes. 20 It is assuring to know there is some Ms. Abzug. 21 initiative left in American enterprise. 22 Did you speak to anybody at that time about what the 23 newspaper stuff was all about? 24 Mr. Knapp. Yes, I did. I spoke to both house counsel 25

and my own administrative people.

Ms. Abzug. Did you ask for an internal investigation? Mr. Knapp. As far as my inquiry to my administrative personnel is concerned it was whether this practice was still in existence. I was informed that it was not.

I discussed with in-house counsel the matter from a legal point of view, a legal exposure point of view. House counsel considered the matter and shortly thereafter we sought the advice of outside counsel in order to protect our position with respect to possible future litigation.

Ms. Abzug. Why did you expect future litigation? Mr. Knapp. I think from the reading of the materials in the newspapers, since I am not an attorney, I had some concern as to what reaction there would be as a result of the disclosure of this information.

Ms. Abzug. What kind of litigation would you expect as a result of this disclosure?

Mr. Knapp. Well, as a matter of fact, as a result of it we are currently engaged in a class action brought by, I believe, -- may I consult with counsel?

Ms. Abzug. Yes.

Mr. Knapp. The 17 individuals have brought a class
action against Worldcom and the other record carriers on this
matter.

25

Ms. Abzug. What is the nature of this action?

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Mr. Knapp. It is my understanding that this action has been brought on behalf of a substantial number of individuals seeking certain types of damages related to the matter of the transmission of telegraphic information to the security agencies of the United States Government.

ΤT

Ms. Abzug. What internal memoranda have you produced to this Committee after your investigation of this matter? Mr. Knapp. In the original letter from Mr. Sifton, outside counsel, I believe we provided the Committee with several of the forms provided to our employees at the time of their hiring which acquaints the employees with the matter --

Ms. Abzug. Rules on conduct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

Mr. Knapp. That is correct. I believe in subsequent correspondence certain information has been made available to the staff --

Ms. Abzug. What about your investigation of this allegation that communications were intercepted by Government agencies without the consent of the sender?

Mr. Knapp. When I determined that the practice was no longer being followed, when I determined, also --

Ms. Abzug. When did you determine that? You first
had these conversations and investigation.

Mr. Knapp. I determined that shortly --Ms. Abzug. Did you have an investigation?

Mr. Knapp. I investigated to satisfy myself that the

| 1 | practice no longer existed. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Ms. Abzug. You didn't investigate as to what the practice |
| 3 | was? |
| 4 | Mr. Knapp. Not at that time. |
| 5 | Ms. Abzug. Did you subsequently? |
| 6 | Mr. Knapp. I |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. What was that time? |
| 8 | Mr. Knapp. In discussions with Mr. Tower, as a result |
| 9 | of the request of your staff to familiarize myself to the |
| 10 | maximum extent possible, I had a discussion earlier this week |
| 11 | with Mr. Tower. |
| 12 | Ms. Abzug. But you talked to somebody when you first |
| 13 | became president you said. |
| 14 | Mr. Knapp. I talked with several persons in my |
| 15 | administrative staff as well as house counsel. |
| 16 | Ms. Abzug. On matters which might lead to litigation |
| 17 | and others of that kind. Do they normally get transmitted? |
| 18 | When you have an investigation do you have any you know |
| 19 | do you have somebody send you a note on it or memorandum? |
| 20 | Mr. Knapp. No. |
| 21 | Ms. Abzug. It comes out orally? That is the normal |
| 22 | practice at ITT. Right? You never have interoffice |
| 23 | memos when you ask for investigation or investigations. |
| 24 | Is that right? |
| 25 | Mr. Knapp. There are certain cases in which I do, yes. |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| i | • |
|----|--|
| 1 | Ms. Abzug. But not in this case? |
| 2 | Mr. Knapp. I did not. |
| 3 | Ms. Abzug. No. This was a rather unimportant matter |
| 4 | where you said you expected litigation. |
| 5 | Mr. Knapp. I considered it quite important. I wanted |
| 6 | to assure myself the practice was no longer in existence. |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. How would you know that if you didn't bother |
| 8 | to find out in detail what the practice was? |
| 9 | Mr. Knapp. Since the practice was no longer in existence, |
| 10 | and I had asked counsel to examine the matter from the point |
| 11 | of view of future legal exposure, I felt satisfied. |
| 12 | Ms. Abzug. Who besides Mr. Tower did you talk to? |
| 13 | Mr. Knapp. House counsel, Mr. White. |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. Who else? |
| 15 | Mr. Knapp. My Director of Administration, Mr. Toomey. |
| 16 | Ms. Abzug. And who else? |
| 17 | Mr. Knapp. I believe those are the two principals |
| 18 | involved. |
| 19 | Ms. Abzug. When and where did you have these conversa- |
| 20 | tions, dates and places? |
| 21 | Mr. Knapp. I would say they were in the week following |
| 22 | disclosure in the press and they took place at 67 Broad |
| 23 | Street, very likely in my office. |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. That would be sometime in August? |
| 25 | Mr. Knapp. The last week of July, the first week of |
| | |
| | |

August; that is correct.

| 2 | Ms., Abzug. Then what subsequent conversations did you |
|----|--|
| 3 | have with them on this matter? |
| 4 | Mr. Knapp. Subsequently Mr. White and I discussed the |
| 5 | matter sometime after that point. It was determined to be |
| 6 | an appropriate action to seek outside counsel on the matter. |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. You did talk to somebody who testified before |
| 8 | the Committee in the other body, did you not? |
| 9 | Mr. Knapp. That is correct. I believe that took place |
| 10 | may I consult counsel? I don't recall the date. |
| 11 | That was in October. |
| 12 | Ms. Abzug. You talked to whom? |
| 13 | Mr. Knapp. Mr. Tower. |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. You had no conversation up to that time with |
| 15 | Mr. Tower? |
| 16 | Mr. Knapp. No. |
| 17 | Ms. Abzug. How did it come about that Mr. Tower was |
| 18 | selected to testify? |
| 19 | Mr. Knapp. I believe in the judgment of outside counsel |
| 20 | it was deemed appropriate that Mr. Tower should testify. |
| 21 | Ms. Abzug. Who did outside counsel talk to? |
| 22 | Mr. Knapp. Outside counsel would have been working with |
| 23 | my house counsel, Mr. White. |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. I beg your pardon? Who in the company made |
| 25 | a decision that it should be Mr. Tower? |
| | |

Mr. Knapp. Mr. White is an officer of Worldcom. Mr. White is my counsel. He was working with outside counsel on the subject.

Ms. Abzug. He never told you or asked you who should testify for the company?

Mr. Knapp. I knew that Mr. Tower was going to testify. Ms. Abzug. Didn't he ask you about who it should be or suggest to you who it should be?

Mr. Knapp. I believe --

Ms. Abzug. It is remarkable how you presidents who come before this Committee suddenly have no authority internally although you are presidents of companies. People are doing things, lawyers are carrying on and making decisions, and suddenly when it comes to this matter none of you seem to have had anything to say about what goes on in your company. Do your stockholders know about this?

I mean you are the president. Usually a president is consulted on vital matters concerning a company.

Mr. Knapp. Mr. White --

Ms. Abzug. Is that not so?

Mr. Knapp. Yes. In this case I was aware Mr. Tower was going to testify.

Ms. Abzug. What do you mean you were aware? You were not asked whether it was okay, whether you approved it, whether it should be somebody else? Did you not make a

| 1 | decision on that matter? |
|----|--|
| 2 | Mr, Knapp. It was recommended to me by counsel that Mr. |
| 3 | Tower testify. I agreed with him. |
| 4 | Ms. Abzug. What else was told you at the time that |
| 5 | recommendation was made? |
| 6 | Mr. Knapp. I don't recall. |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. Nothing? |
| 8 | Mr. Knapp. I don't recall. |
| 9 | Ms. Abzug. You don't recall? |
| 10 | Mr. Knapp. We undoubtedly had discussion about it but |
| 11 | I don't recall the discussion. |
| 12 | Ms. Abzug. How long ago was this? |
| 13 | Mr. Knapp. It must have been in October. |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. And nothing happened. What time of the day |
| 15 | was this recommendation made to you and when and where? |
| 16 | Mr. Knapp. I have no idea. |
| 17 | Ms. Abzug. You don't know. |
| 18 | Mr. Knapp. At 67 Broad Street |
| 19 | Ms. Abzug. How old are you, Mr. Knapp? |
| 20 | Mr. Knapp. I am 44 years old. |
| 21 | Ms. Abzug. And on this day in October you had a |
| 22 | conversation but you don't remember where, when, how. Do |
| 23 | you know with whom? |
| 24 | Mr. Knapp. With Mr. White. |
| 25 | Ms. Abzug. You don't know where it took place? |
| | |

ļ

Mr. Knapp. I would have to guess my office. I don't 1 recall the specifics of it. 2 Ms. Abzug. What was the nature of it? What did he say 3 to you and what did you say to him? Was it before lunch or 4 after lunch? 5 Mr. Knapp. I don't recall the details of either question. 6 Ms. Abzug. You don't recall anything about it? 7 Mr. Knapp. I recall that Mr. White --8 Ms. Abzug. Since October. This is November, December, 9 January, February, March. 10 Mr. Knapp. I recall I agreed with Mr. White that Mr. 11 Tower should testify. 12 Ms. Abzug. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Tower 13 about his testimony? 14 Mr. Knapp. I did not. 15 Ms. Abzug. Have you ascertained who made the original 16 arrangement with Secretary Forrestal in 1947 for the 17 transmittal of this information to various agencies of 18 Government? 19 I have no knowledge of that. Mr. Knapp. 20 Ms. Abzug. Have you read the Shamrock report? 21 I have. Mr. Knapp. 22 Ms. Abzug. You have? 23 Mr. Knapp. Yes, I have. 24 Ms. Abzug. Did you notice that in there? That Mr. 25

Forrestal met with various representatives of the inter-1 national record carriers? 2 Mr. Knapp. I noticed that, yes. 3 Ms. Abzug. You didn't ascertain who represented your 4 company then? 5 Mr. Knapp. When I read the Shamrock report, and 6 having asked Mr. White, house counsel, to examine the 7 matter, he indicated that there were no records within our 8 files to indicate who had represented the predecessor 9 company to Worldcom in this matter. 10 Ms. Abzug. How long has Mr. White been with the company? 11 Mr. Knapp. Mr. White has been with the company for, 12 I would estimate, the last five to seven years. 13 Ms. Abzug. Did you try to ascertain who represented 14 the company at the time? 15 Mr. Knapp. I asked Mr. White to work with outside 16 counsel in order to determine our legal exposure on this 17 entire matter. 18 Ms. Abzug. Do you know anything about that agreement? 19 Mr. Knapp. Nothing more than what I have read in the 20 newspapers or in the report of the Church Committee. 21 Ms. Abzug. Did Mr. Tower know about it? 22 Mr. Knapp. Mr. Tower, in my conversation with him 23 earlier this week, indicated that in 19 -- after the war, 24 sometime after the war -- he was aware of the fact that 25

certain telegraphic information was being copied and access was being given to certain representatives of the security agencies of this country.

Ms. Abzug. How often was traffic handed over? Mr. Knapp. Mr. Tower was unable to tell me that. "Occasionally", "from time to time," I believe was his phrase.

Ms. Abzug. Was it stated to you over the years as to when it started?

Mr. Knapp. Mr. Tower had indicated to me that from the 10 period after the war until roughly the early 1960's that 11 the method of copying the hard copy telegram had been 12 employed. As automation increased within our facilities this information was no longer copied in the hard copy print but was made available through punched paper tape. 15 This, Mr. Tower indicated to me, he was not necessarily 16 aware from a personal point of view but he was aware of 17 it because of his involvement in the organization. 18

Ms. Abzug. Did he tell you what was handed over? 19 Mr. Knapp. He indicated that simply from time to time 20 access was made to these tapes. 21

Ms. Abzug. Were telex communications made available? Mr. Knapp. No, it was not to my personal knowledge. Ms. Abzug. Has ITT Worldcom made communications entrusted to its care available to authorities in any other

8 9

13

14

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

| , | 20 |
|------------|--|
| , 1 | country other than the United States? |
| 2 | Mr. Knapp. Not to my personal knowledge. |
| 3 | Ms. Abzug. Have you heard it was made available to |
| 4 | any other government? |
| 5 | Mr. Knapp. No, I did not. |
| 6 | Ms. Abzug. When you say punch tapes were made, does that |
| 7 | mean everything was on those tapes? |
| 8 | Mr. Knapp. The telegram message is on those tapes, yes. |
| 9 | Ms. Abzug. I am sorry? |
| 10 | Mr. Knapp. Yes. The content of the printed page is |
| 11 | encoded in the punches on the paper tape. |
| 12 | Ms. Abzug. Do you happen to know whether communications |
| 13 | of private citizens appear on these tapes? |
| 14 | Mr. Knapp. No, I do not. |
| 15 | Ms. Abzug. You would tape everything, would you not? |
| 16 | You testified that the punch tapes were handed over so I |
| 17 | assume it is all on one tape. |
| 18 | Mr. Knapp. There are tapes generated virtually every |
| 19 | minute of the day. From time to time, I am told by Mr. |
| 20 | Tower through his understanding of the method employed at |
| 21 | the time, that periodically a representative of a security |
| 22 | agency would be granted access to those tapes. |
| 23 | Ms. Abzug. To all of the tapes? |
| 24 | Mr. Knapp. That is my understanding. |
| 25 | Ms. Abzug. So that it could include private citizens, |
| | |
| | |

.

| `1 | corporations, organizations, whoever sent a cable. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Mr. Knapp. Conceivably, yes. |
| 3 | Ms. Abzug. Did you find out whether any steps were |
| 4 | taken to ensure that Government was not reading communica- |
| 5 | tions having nothing whatsoever to do with foreign |
| 6 | intelligence? |
| 7 | Mr. Knapp. I am sorry, Mrs. Abzug. I don't understand |
| 8 | the question. |
| 9 | Ms. Abzug. Everything was on one punched out tape. |
| 10 | Mr. Knapp. Yes. |
| 11 | Ms. Abzug. Communications of private citizens, |
| 12 | businesses, organizations, et cetera. |
| 13 | Mr. Knapp. That is right. |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. Those are supposed to be private communica- |
| 15 | tions sent by a sender and to be received by a receiver |
| 16 | at the other end without interception. |
| 17 | Did you ever find out in your conversations with members |
| 18 | of your company whether ITT took steps to ensure that the |
| 19 | Government was not reading these private communications? |
| 20 | Mr. Knapp. I guess I must rely upon the content of the |
| 21 | Shamrock report and the understanding of Mr. Tower as to |
| 22 | how the system was functioning, and it was my understanding, |
| 23 | based upon these conversations and the readings of the |
| 24 | Shamrock report, that tapes were provided in bulk to |
| 25 | representatives of the security agencies of this country. |
| 1 | |

Ms. Abzug. Do you know of any steps taken to ensure that the tapes were given to persons who said they were the persons that they were?

Mr. Knapp. I wonder whether you would clarify the question because I truly don't understand it, Mrs. Abzug.

Ms. Abzug. There are two questions. One is that I did not get from you who it is that Mr. Tower explained to you came in and got from time to time this information and what was done to ascertain who these people were, where they were from, whether any steps were taken to make sure that there was no further dissemination beyond at least what you thought you were doing.

I am trying to get you to speak out and tell me what you really know. It would make it much easier for me, the Committee, and for you if you would just elucidate as to exactly what you were told about the process. It is difficult, you see, for you, I realize, because you have to rely upon information that you really didn't want to get but that apparently did get.

I would like you to give us the information that you got without my having to pull at you.

Mr. Knapp. I am relying on information which comes to me from Mr. Tower and also the Shamrock report and also printed publications.

Ms. Abzug. That is a nice way to run a company.

1

2

3

4

5

6

Mr. Knapp. In response to your first question, Mr. Tower indicated to me that while he at this date did not recall those representatives of the security agencies of this country who made periodic visits to our locations, that he did, however, have a general idea that the people having this access had it over a period of time.

I did not ask Mr. Tower whether he ascertained whether these people were the truly authorized persons designated to receive the information, so I cannot answer that question.

Ms. Abzug. Would you produce Mr. Tower and Mr. White for our Committee hearings so we can get it from them directly?

Mr. Knapp. I certainly will take that under consideration, Mrs. Abzug, and will get back to you.

Ms. Abzug. What procedures have you taken to prevent the content of customers' messages from being presently available?

Mr. Knapp. What procedures have I undertaken?

Ms. Abzug. In the matter which was not part and parcel of their contract. When people send a message under auspices of your firm they intend the message to go to one place and not be intercepted by others. What steps have you taken to be certain that is not occuring now?

Mr. Knapp. As I indicated, at the time that I became aware that a system in the past had been functioning, and I

1

2

3

4

| | ascertained specifically within Worldcom that it no longer |
|----|---|
| 1 | |
| 2 | was functioning, I instructed our administrative people to |
| 3 | reissue to all the employees the form that we use, which |
| 4 | the employee signs, that he understands the confidentiality |
| 5 | of communications within the context of the Federal |
| 6 | Communications Act. |
| 7 | This was done in early August. |
| 8 | Ms. Abzug. What is your system of monitoring? |
| 9 | Mr. Knapp. Monitoring what, ma'am? |
| 10 | Ms. Abzug. Your instructions. |
| 11 | Mr. Knapp. Since I had determined that the system was |
| 12 | no longer in operation, since I had also renewed with each |
| 13 | of the employees their understanding of the security of |
| 14 | communications, I would presume |
| 15 | Ms. Abzug. How many employees do you have? |
| 16 | Mr. Knapp. Approximately 1500. |
| 17 | Ms. Abzug. And you reviewed this personally with each |
| 18 | of the 1500 employees? |
| 19 | Mr. Knapp. Of course not. |
| 20 | Ms. Abzug. I didn't want to misunderstand your |
| 21 | testimony. |
| 22 | Mr. Knapp. I requested that they all sign this certifi- |
| 23 | cate of confidentiality of communications. |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. Mr. McMullen, how long have you worked for |
| 25 | ITT? |
| | |
| | |

~ 7

Mr. McMullen. Thirty-six years.

Ms. Abzug. How many years?

Mr. McMullen. Thirty-six.

Ms. Abzug. In what capacity?

Mr. McMullen. I started as a messenger boy and a postal telegram and teletype operator, radio operator and super-visor.

Ms. Abzug. By what procedures were the communications of ITT customers turned over to Government agencies during your 36 years with the company?

Mr. McMullen. Well, when I was involved during the period that I was there we were subtracting the cables from the daily business and placed them in an envelope to which the next day's business was transferred to the accounting department.

Ms. Abzug. Were all communications made available? Mr. McMullen. No. There was a typewritten list from which certain countries were subtracted.

Ms. Abzug. Did those procedures change from time to time?

Mr. McMullen. Yes, ma'am. Different countries were added and subtracted.

Ms. Abzug. How often were communications turned over? Mr. McMullen. Well, during the periods when I was there, maybe once or twice a week or three times. I did

1

2

not work all the time in the same place. 1 Ms. Abzug. What was turned over, the copies? 2 Mr. McMullen. The envelope was turned over to the 3 accounting department. 4 Ms. Abzug. Who decided what to make available? 5 Mr. McMullen. A certain list of countries which were 6 subtracted. It was just a list; that's all. 7 Ms. Abzug. Who decided when you were superintendent 8 handling this operation? 9 Mr. McMullen. Supervisors, operators. They were 10 responsible for subtracting the traffic and putting it in 11 the envelope and the next day send it to the accounting 12 department. 13 Ms. Abzug. What security classification clearance do 14 you have? 15 Mr. McMullen. Secret. 16 Ms. Abzug. How about all the operators? 17 Mr. McMullen. They have no classification. 18 Ms. Abzug. They have none? 19 Mr. McMullen. No. 20 Ms. Abzug. So that they handled this material without 21 a classification. 22 Mr. McMullen. That is right. 23 Ms. Abzug. I beg your pardon, without a security 24 clearance. 25

Mr. McMullen. I doubt whether any teletype or radio operator has security clearance.

Ms. Abzug. I beg your pardon.

Mr. McMullen. I do not believe that any teletype operator or radio operator would be required to have a secret clearance to send telegrams or cablegrams.

Ms. Abzug. I know, but you described the fact that quite a few people handled these interceptions.

Mr. McMullen. They transmit these cables every day. It is the daily traffic that is transmitted to the foreign countries from the Washington office.

Ms. Abzug. I understand that. Who set aside these lists?

Mr. McMullen. They came from the superintendent's office.

Ms. Abzug. And people then just set aside these lists? Mr. McMullen. They supplied us with the addresses and the countries.

Ms. Abzug. They supplied you with the information.

Mr. McMullen. Countries which were subtracted.

Ms. Abzug. Are you familiar with the New York operation as well?

Mr. McMullen. No, ma'am.

Ms. Abzug. Did you at any time, were you aware at any time of just having all the communications in the Washington

FOR

24

25

1

2

3

office being delivered for scrutiny?

Mr., McMullen. There was never all of the business transmitted to the security agencies.

Ms. Abzug. When were these communications picked up? Do you have any knowledge of that?

Mr. McMullen. When I worked the day shift they would usually be between ten o'clock and two in the afternoon. Ms. Abzug. Ten o'clock and two in the afternoon? Mr. McMullen. Ten o'clock in the morning until two in the afternoon, sometime between that period.

Ms. Abzug. I see. How many times a week was that? Mr. McMullen. I couldn't say, only when I was available. Ms. Abzug. Roughly?

Mr. McMullen. Sometimes I was there two or three times a week, maybe once. I had other duties besides the operations.

Ms. Abzug. I know, but the operation itself, did it take place every day, two or three times a week?

Mr. McMullen. I can only say when I was there that it was done.

Ms. Abzug. For how long a period did this take place to your personal knowledge?

Mr. McMullen. It was stopped sometime in 1975.

Ms. Abzug. And it went on starting when? Do you remember?

1

Ms. Abzug. Mr. Knapp, I direct your attention to a letter dated January 30, 1976, addressed to Bernard Krisher of <u>Newsweek</u> magazine, Tokyo office, signed by one Agatha Modugno, an attorney with ITT World Communications. In addition to promising that messages will not be intercepted in the future unless by lawful authority, the letter states, "We believe that any such monitoring and transmission that might have occurred in the past was pursuant to lawful authority."

You testified that messages entrusted to your company were turned over to the Federal intelligence agencies in a wholesale fashion apparently without regard as to whether they were to or from American citizens or whether they might , contain any specific information relative to national security.

Does this letter accurately set forth the position of ITT World Communications with respect to these interceptions?

Mr. Knapp. Within the context of the methodology described in the Shamrock report and to the best extent from conversations with Mr. Tower and within the context of the Federal Communications Act relating to the section on other authorized sources, I believe that the actions in the past were lawful as falling under the purview of Section 605 of the Act.

1

2

3

4

| | 31 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Ms. Abzug. What do you cite as lawful authority? |
| 2 | Mr. Knapp. What is the lawful authority? |
| 3 | Ms. Abzug. Yes. |
| 4 | Mr. Knapp. Not being an attorney, on a personal opinion |
| 5 | basis I believe that the wording of Section 605 of the |
| 6 | Federal Communications Act is that authority. |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. Section 605, as far as I know, has not been |
| 8 | amended since the Shamrock program was allegedly terminated |
| 9 | in May of 1975. |
| 10 | Is it your position that if someone came in without |
| 11 | a subpoena or court order and asked for wholesale delivery |
| 12 | of traffic he would be entitled to receive it under Section |
| 13 | 605? |
| 14 | Mr. Knapp. On the assumption that that representative |
| 15 | of the Government would be contacting me directly, I would |
| 16 | obviously have a difficult decision. |
| 17 | I would request of this Committee and the Congress that |
| 18 | they make that situation somewhat clearer as far as the |
| 19 | wording of the Act and other acts are concerned with respect |
| 20 | to communications of communications carriers on this whole |
| 21 | matter of national security. |
| 22 | Ms. Abzug. I don't understand. If it was lawful before, |
| 23 | why should it be a problem now? |
| 24 | Mr. Knapp. I think because I am the individual con- |
| 25 | cerned and I would not want to speculate on what my decision |
| | |
| | |

would be. I obviously would consult with counsel on the matter.

Ms. Abzug. That is very interesting. The company proceeded for about 30 years to turn over data, including data of private citizens, corporations, businesses, without any check as to whether this in any way affected anything that you might have presumed or assumed you had a right to turn over, obviously in violation of your contract or in violation of the law --

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Mr. Knapp. It is not.

Ms. Abzug. When you decided that obviously there was something wrong with this because you made very clear in your testimony here today that you made one effort to make certain that this operation no longer continued.

Now I ask you by what authority did you proceed. You explained it was Section 605.

I say to you if the same request were made of you today would you turn over communications wholesale, including communications of private citizens, organizations, corporations under the same statute? The statute is identically the same.

In between there has been a revelation of your activities. In between there has been action taken by you to stop this activity.

25

I ask you again why should you need any additional

authority?

| 2 | Mr. Knapp. I think within the context of the Forrestal |
|----|---|
| 3 | meeting in 1947 the company acted within the lawful purview |
| 4 | of the Federal Communications Act. That continued down |
| 5 | to the point where the National Security Agency, on May 15 |
| 6 | of 1975, discontinued the practice. This was reported |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. Has technology progressed to a point that |
| 8 | NSA does not have to come to you directly to intercept |
| 9 | all your communications? |
| 10 | Mr. Knapp. I have no knowledge as to what NSA's |
| 'n | Ms. Abzug. Who is the technological expert in |
| 12 | your company? |
| 13 | Mr. Knapp. On what subject? |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. Subject of communications, security and |
| 15 | interceptions. |
| 16 | Mr. Knapp. To my knowledge I have no expert on this |
| 17 | subject. |
| 18 | Ms. Abzug. You have a technology division, I am sure, |
| 19 | a technology expert, I am sure. |
| 20 | Mr. Knapp. I have an entire engineering department. |
| 21 | Ms. Abzug. Who is acquainted with new technology? |
| 22 | Mr. Knapp. Basically we are a service company. We |
| 23 | do not do research on new technology but we utilize |
| 24 | technology. |
| 25 | Ms. Abzug. We have to address ourselves to the area |
| | |

with which we are primarily concerned. You have to be thinking in those terms. If not, what we are confronting is a whole breakdown of the communications system in this country.

We must deal with this. You must open up your mind and hear what we are trying to say in these hearings.

You used the words here, broadly, "national security." I have very carefully said to you a number of times in the course of some of my questions that the communications of individuals, private citizens, in a wholesale manner were intercepted and turned over to an authority.

Would you agree with me that in the communications turned over not all matters, even with whatever your concept of it is, affect national security?

Mr. Knapp. Mrs. Abzug --

Ms. Abzug. I mean if I want to buy two dozen boxes from some other place, some other country, that doesn't necessarily affect national security, does it?

Mr. Knapp. Mrs. Abzug, within the context of when this request was made at the highest levels of the United States Government in 1947, and continued down, I presume according to the Shamrock report until May 15, 1975, Worldcom was operating on the basis that there was a matter of national security involved.

Ms. Abzug. That every communication entrusted to you

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

by every sender affected national security?

Mr. Knapp. I have no idea that every communication entrusted to Worldcom in that intervening 30 years was of that nature.

Ms. Abzug. Mr. Knapp, how many communications a year do you handle?

Mr. Knapp. Several million.

Ms. Abzug. I just want you to deal with this. You are now suggesting that certain amount of illogic. I am trying to understand what you are saying.

You have been using the words "national security" as an excuse for allowing the interception of communications. Those several million communications, I am certain, you must realize, include many communications.

Are you suggesting that all of them affect national security?

Mr. Knapp. Because I have no specific knowledge of what communications were made available I cannot answer that question.

Ms. Abzug. In other words, you want the record to read that of the millions of communications that come through your company there is a possibility that every one of those communications affects national security.

Mr. Knapp. I have no idea. I have no way of knowing.Ms. Abzug. All right. I would suggest that you give me

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

| - 1 | the basis of why you have no idea or have no way of knowing |
|-----|--|
| 2 | that of the millions of communications it is possible that |
| 3 | all of these communications affect national security. |
| 4 | Mr. Knapp. I don't understand your question, Mrs. Abzug. |
| 5 | Ms. Abzug. You don't understand my question? |
| 6 | Mr. Knapp. No. |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. You do handle commercial business. Right? |
| 8 | Mr. Knapp. Yes, ma'am. |
| 9 | Ms. Abzug. An individual orders goods from another |
| 10 | company in another country is that a question of national |
| 11 | security? |
| 12 | Mr. Knapp. I don't |
| 13 | Ms. Abzug. I want to find out what you think national |
| 14 | security is. You are attempting to suggest that the lawful |
| 15 | conduct of ordinary business by people is national security, |
| 16 | and if the chief of the communications and common carriers |
| 17 | believes everything that goes through him is national |
| 18 | security his stockholders and his customers as well as the |
| 19 | world at large should be aware of the fact that it is very |
| 20 | likely that there is a paranoid sitting at the head of that |
| 21 | company. |
| 22 | Mr. McCloskey. Madam Chairman? |
| 23 | Ms. Abzug. I don't believe we should insult this |
| 24 | Committee by such nonsense. |
| 25 | Mr. McCloskey. Madam Chairman? |
| | |

Ms. Abzug. Yes, Mr. McCloskey.

1

Mr. McCloskey. I don't think we are obeying the Rules 2 of the House when you refer to the witness as a paranoid 3 based on the conversations I have thus far heard. I want to 4 draw the Chairlady's respective attention to Rule 3 of the 5 House. As far as we pursue ordinary rules there is nothing 6 this witness has said in his testimony to justify an accusa-7 tion of paranoia. 8 Ms. Abzug. I will take the gentleman's statement under 9 advisement. 10 Have you ever done an analysis of the kind of business 11 you have in your company, Mr. Knapp? 12 Mr. Knapp. What type of analysis? 13 Ms. Abzug. Any kind. 14 Mr. Knapp. We do analyses every day. 15 Ms. Abzug. Do you break it down into the kind of business 16 that you are getting and where the sources are and the 17 volume? 18 Mr. Knapp. We know the volumes of telegram messages to 19 the various points around the world that we serve, yes. 20 Ms. Abzug. What else? 21 Mr. Knapp. I fail to understand the question. What else 22 besides what? 23 Ms. Abzug. Beg your pardon? 24 Mr. Knapp. I don't understand the guestion: What else? 25

Ms. Abzug. What other analysis do you do?

Mr. Knapp. The quality of the transmission, the deliverability of the messages, the error rate of the messages. Whether --

Ms. Abzug. The kinds of customers?

Mr. Knapp. Do we have the -- the entire population of the United States is our customer in that respect for transmission of telegrams overseas.

Ms. Abzug. I think we should make your customers aware of the fact that you think all of their communications may affect the national security of this nation.

Mr. Knapp. I don't think I said that, Mrs. Abzug. Ms. Abzug. I tried to ask you whether in your opinion all of the communications that you handle affect national security. What was your answer?

Mr. Knapp. Mrs. Abzug, in a document supplied to your Committee we provided you with a copy of the tariff we have filed before the Federal Communications Commission. That tariff very specifically addresses itself to the question of the security of the communications, specifically, with respect to Section 605 of the Act. That is the basis upon which we do business.

I have in no way suggested that every piece of communication that comes through Worldcom is involved in national security, but I have no way of making that judgment. I presume

1

2

3

my Government may.

Ms, Abzug. You have a way of making a judgment that some of the material that comes through you, the millions that come through you, do not affect it?

Mr. Knapp. I have no way of knowing whether it does or does not.

Ms. Abzug. Did you ever ask or did you find out whether you ever asked the Government representatives whether all the tapes they got affected national security?

Mr. Knapp. Following the request of the Government in 1947 at the highest levels of this Government we proceeded to provide access to this information.

Ms. Abzug. How do you know about that? I asked whether you ascertained anything about it and you said you did not. You said you did not ascertain anything from the highest levels of Government. Which is the truthful answer?

Mr. Knapp. I read it in the Shamrock report.

Ms. Abzug. You know nothing about it personally? Who might it have been? It might have been Mr. Bucky Loomis. Is that right?

Mr. Knapp. Madam, I must respectfully say this is a report of the Senate of the United States I am referring to.

Ms. Abzug. I appreciate that. I appreciate your respect for a report. I really do.

1

2

1 I ask you whether you yourself ascertained whether or not indeed there was a request from the highest levels of 2 3 Government. You read a report that said there was. Did you ascertain yourself whether there was such a request? 4 Mr. Knapp. We made a search of the files and came up 5 with nothing on the subject. 6 Ms. Abzug. Did you make any search whatsoever as to who 7 these names were turned over to? They could have been 8 turned over to some person without identification, some 9 person who was misleading you. Did you ever find out how 10 your company functioned? 11 How do the customers today know whether or not their 12 communications are being turned over to some persons 13 unknown? 14 Mr. Knapp. Based upon --15 Ms. Abzug. To some competitor in business. 16 Mr. Knapp. Based upon the report --17 Ms. Abzug. How do they know whether or not their 18 economic information is national security so that it may 19 be turned over to somebody else to be used against them 20 unfairly? How do your customers know that? 21 Mr. Knapp. It is very clear in our filing before the 22 Federal Communications Commission as to how we do business. 23 This information has been provided to your Committee. 24 Ms. Abzug. You have a serious problem. You have a 25

4 V

lawsuit pending against you.

1

2

3

4

Mr. Knapp. That is right.

Ms. Abzug. You will have to try to prove that you didn't do anything that was unlawful. You are going to have to bring some information into court in order to demonstrate the lawful authority under which you proceeded and also what steps were taken.

The question I have is very simple. You are talking about a vague situation about which you did not bother to inform yourself.

I want to know what was done to protect the interest of your customers. How do they know that under the guise of national security you did not turn over, and may yet turn over because you are not certain yet what you would do? You just testified if a request were made of you today you would turn over economic information, turn over private information that might violate various acts on the books. How do they know that when they give you a message today? Your testimony today is you do not know what you would do if you got a similar request and your testimony is, further, that as president of a very important communications company, a common carrier, you did not ascertain by what authority this material was turned over or to whom it was turned over.

Mr. Knapp. Mrs. Abzug, if this Congress would clarify for me personally and Worldcom and carrier business the

specific meanings of Section 605, it might be helpful. It might be helpful not only to us should future decisions be required, but also helpful to our --

Ms. Abzug. Would you require a court order of any kind before you turned over communications given to you by your senders?

Mr. Knapp. That is one of the conditions.

Ms. Abzug. Have you ever required that in this whole period of time as far as your investigation indicates?

Mr. Knapp. Not to my personal knowledge.

Ms. Abzug. What do you mean it is one of the conditions? Mr. Knapp. Because there is another condition under the 605 rule which says other lawful authority.

Ms. Abzug. How do you interpret that? Did you secure information as to how to interpret other lawful authority? Mr. Knapp. It was interpreted by the management of Worldcom or its predecessor company in 1947 at the request of Mr. Forrestal, who indicated the Attorney General and the President of the United States were making the request.

Ms. Abzug. How do you expect to prove this in court?
Mr. Knapp. I would have to refer that to counsel.
Ms. Abzug. You would refer what to counsel?
Mr. Knapp. The requirement to provide the proof.
Ms. Abzug. If you say to me today that you would require
a court order, is that what you are saying? Is that what you

1

say -- before turning over anybody's communications?

Mr. Knapp. If I were presented with a court order by a duly constituted authority, judicial authority, a court authority, I certainly would comply with it.

Ms. Abzug. If you were not given a court order -suppose the cop on the beat came in and said, "I want some information concerning this sender who I think is a criminal who may be engaged in matters affecting national security."?

Mr. Knapp. Are you asking me does the cop on the beat come to my office and ask for information?

Ms. Abzug. I don't know. I said supposing. For all I know he does.

Mr. Knapp. I don't understand the question.

Ms. Abzug. For all I know he does. There has been no establishment of any authority --

Mr. Knapp. Authority was apparently established in 1947. Ms. Abzug. You didn't even bother to find out whether that was an accurate statement or anything. I know you read it. It is like you read something in the <u>New York Times</u> or daily news and you became aware of the problem. Then it is true there was a Shamrock report which alleged this took place. But you really don't know and you have not informed yourself as to what was in it.

After that agreement was made you did not ascertain whether it was made again, whether it terminated, or what the

1

2

3

terms of the agreement were?

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

23

24

25

Mr. Knapp. No, ma'am, but I suspect that reading the
Shamrock report that the Department of Defense or the NSA
would have the information in their files.

Ms. Abzug. I don't recall the terms of the agreement. Do you?

Let me read to you what it says, and I quote: "At meetings with Secretary of Defense James Forrestal in 1947, representatives of the three companies were assured that if they cooperated with the Government in this program, they would suffer no criminal liability and no public exposure, at least as long as the current Administration was in office. They were told that such participation was in the highest interests of national security.

"Secretary Forrestal also explained that the arrangements 15 had the approval of President Truman and his Attorney General, 16 Tom C. Clark. Forrestal explained to the company, however, 17 that he could not bind his successors by these assurances. 18 He told the companies, moreover, that Congress would consider 19 legislation in its forthcoming session which would make 20 clear that such activity was permissible. In fact, no such 21 legislation was ever introduced." 22

I quoted from this report.

Mr. Knapp. May I read the next paragraph? Ms. Abzug. Yes.

"In 1949, the companies sought renewed assurances from Forrestal's successor, Louis Johnson, and were told again that President Truman and Attorney General Clark had been consulted and had given their approval of these arrangements. As I will explain later in this statement, neither the Department of Defense nor any of the participating private companies has any evidence that such assurances were ever sought again."

You have relied upon this agreement in 1947. You know nothing about any subsequent renewals. You know nothing -as a matter of fact, this states that no assurances were sought. Therefore you do not even have that assurance, nor do you have that authority to proceed under it because according to this report -- it is a report which you allege is your authority -- there is no evidence of anything further having been renewed on these levels.

I wonder by what authority you thought you were proceeding under and how you would not have tried to ascertain by what authority you were proceeding and what it is that enables a common carrier and the office of the common carrier to believe they can do anything they want just because someone from the Government might have at one time said they should do it.

I mean you proceed at your peril. You certainly proceed at your peril when I ask you today, in 1976, whether you

ł

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

would claim lawful authority again should you be requested again 'to turn over the communications of millions, millions, of senders who rely upon you as a common carrier for a certain kind of privacy that you obviously have paid absolutely no attention to under what I consider to be a very preposterous suggestion that you have no idea whether or not all of these millions of telegrams might affect national security. You leave these people defenseless against you, giving you messages which should be provided to other people, on the ground that the president of this great common carrier says it is possible that your private communication could affect national security.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I ask you, what would you do today should a similar request be made?

Mr. Knapp. I would be faced with a very difficult decision. I request of this Congress to help me make that decision by clarifying the various acts involved related to this matter of security of communications.

Ms. Abzug. I am glad some people in this country appreciate the Constitution and try to live by the laws that exist. Obviously we have a long way to go with those who do not regard the law or Constitution to affect their behavior or their thinking.

Mr. Knapp. As far as I am concerned, Mrs. Abzug, Worldcom does abide by the Constitution. Ms. Abzug. Have you requested any opinion from your attornéy with respect to whether or not your answer to that question might have to be that you cannot or that you can give this information under similar circumstances? Have you requested your attorneys to give you a legal memorandum on this subject?

Mr. Knapp. I have asked my counsel to investigate the matter and they are still in the process of investigating the matter. They have provided me with no memorandum on the subject.

Ms. Abzug. When do you expect to get information? When did you request this of your counsel?

You made a decision and sent out a memorandum to all of your employees suggesting that this practice should be stopped. What was that based upon?

Mr. Knapp. I requested the employees to sign the form on the security of communications which specifically delineates the verbage in Section 605 of the Federal Communications Act, which specifically provides for the revelation of information in the case of a lawfullyauthorized subpoena.

Ms. Abzug. In other words, at this time an operation could be taking place even though they signed this form and you would not necessarily regard that as unlawful?

Mr. Knapp. I have read in the Shamrock report that NSA

1

2

| X | 48 |
|----|---|
| | |
| | ceased the operation on May 15, 1975. |
| 2 | Ms. Abzug. I know. I am asking a different question. |
| 3 | You may have read that in the report, but since you know |
| 4 | nothing of your own knowledge it is possible that an |
| 5 | arrangement can be made with somebody else. They would |
| 6 | not necessarily talk to you. You operate your company |
| 7 | in a very interesting way. |
| 8 | I mean, you don't make these decisions and other |
| 9 | people make them. |
| 10 | Mr. Knapp. Mrs. Abzug |
| 11 | Ms. Abzug. I am basing it on your own testimony. Is it |
| 12 | possible that this operation can take place without your |
| 13 | knowledge today? Answer that question yes or no. |
| 14 | Mr. Knapp. I am trying to answer it. |
| 15 | Ms. Abzug. Yes or no. |
| 16 | Mr. Knapp. It is necessary for me to explain the nature |
| 17 | of how international telegrams come to Worldcom. |
| 18 | The entire United States, the entire citizenry of the |
| 19 | United States, has the ability to pick up the telephone, |
| 20 | call Western Union, walk into a Western Union office, or in |
| 21 | the case of the international gateways come into Worldcom |
| 22 | or Globecom or whatever and place a telegram. |
| 23 | If these telegrams are being transmitted via the facilities |
| 24 | of Western Union or via the telephone facilities of the Bell |
| 25 | System, it is entirely possible that any place along that line |
| | |
| | h in the second s |

that interception can take place. This is a technological 1 fact. It can happen. 2 Ms. Abzug. How? 3 Mr. Knapp. How? 4 Ms. Abzug. Yes. 5 Mr. Knapp. The facility that the customer uses to 6 identify to Western Union or the internationl record 7 carriers, in one case let's assume it is a telephone. A 8 telephone has a pair of wires attached to it in connection 9 with the Bell System network. They have physical locations 10 in existence and they can be monitored. 11 And? Ms. Abzug. 12 All I am saying is that it is entirely Mr. Knapp. 13 possible, far outside of Worldcom's control, far outside 14 of anyone's control, these facilities could be monitored. 15 Ms. Abzug. And you would not know about it? 16 Mr. Knapp. That is correct. 17 Ms. Abzug. But it is also possible that somebody can 18 come in and have a conversation with McMullen. 19 Mr. Knapp. Since I am advised by the Shamrock report 20 that the NSA no longer engages --21 Ms. Abzug. Forget what they are doing. Tomorrow they 22 may decide the hell with the Shamrock report. They will 23 do it and see McMullen. This is not unusual. 24 I want you to know we have heard a lot of testimony from 25

...

a lot of agencies, okay, who have talked about these operations.' I want to educate you a little.

3 The CIA came before this Committee and said they were 4 not conducting mail openings. Subsequently some mail 5 openings were discovered to be continuing.

The FBI indicated to other committees that they have 7 discontinued certain activities, surveillance in the Army, et cetera. Then it was subsequently discovered that they were continuing surveillance in the Army.

You have to understand we are trying to change that. 10 But in the meantime these things do happen. Therefore don't keep quoting the Shamrock report to me because any person in your position who reads about his company and does not bother to find out what is behind it really indicates to me he is not seeking to be completely credible before this Committee.

You speak of a meeting. You say you have to stop it. They come to McMullen and they say, "Mr. McMullen, we are back in business. Please give us this data."

Then what?

Mr. Knapp. Mr. McMullen --

It could happen, couldn't it? Ms. Abzug.

Mr. Knapp. Mr. McMullen is fully aware of his obligations under the Federal Communications Act, as I have reinforced with Mr. McMullen.

25

1

2

6

8

9

51 Ms. Abzug. What about the Federal Communications Act? 1 Mr. Knapp. His obligation to maintain the security of 2 communications. 3 Ms. Abzug. What does that mean? Tell me what that 4 I don't really know. You are in the communications means. 5 business. Educate me. 6 Mr. Knapp. I could read Section 605. 7 Ms. Abzug. I have read it many times. What in your 8 interpretation does that mean, that he has to make a 9 security decision? Tell me what that means. 10 Mr. Knapp. That he has to comply with the provisions 11 of Section 605 of the Act. 12 Ms. Abzug. What does that mean specifically? If Mr. 13 McMullen is confronted by somebody from NSA and asked for 14 the communications, what does it mean? When you say he has 15 to comply with security, what does it mean? 16 Mr. Knapp. Except under conditions as laid out in 17 Section 605 that all communications are secure. They are not 18 to be transmitted --19 Ms. Abzug. What is the statement in 605? You were 20 told this has to stop because it is not legal, because it 21 is wrong. That is why the operation was stopped. You 22 stopped it. 23 You then sent out a communication and said you made

sure it was stopped.

24

| 1 | Mr. Knapp. I did not stop it. NSA stopped it. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Ms. Abzug. You made sure that practice was not going |
| 3 | on in your company. You stated that. I am only quoting |
| 4 | your testimony. |
| 5 | Mr. Knapp. That is correct. |
| 6 | Ms. Abzug. Then when you were asked what you would do |
| 7 | if you were asked to do it again, you said you didn't know. |
| 8 | Mr. Knapp. I didn't say that. |
| 9 | Ms. Abzug. Yes, you said you would be confused, you |
| 10 | would have to |
| 11 | Mr. Knapp. I said I would have a difficult decision. |
| 12 | Ms. Abzug. That is right, you said you didn't know. |
| 13 | It was a difficult decision. It is the same thing. |
| 14 | Mr. Knapp. No, magam. |
| 15 | Ms. Abzug. You would have a difficult decision. If |
| 16 | you had a difficult decision and you do know, what would you |
| 17 | do? |
| 18 | Mr. Knapp. If I were presented with a lawfully-drawn |
| 19 | document from a court requesting a piece of information I |
| 20 | would provide it. |
| 21 | Ms. Abzug. If it was a court order. Is that right? |
| 22 | Mr. Knapp. Yes. |
| 22 | Ms. Abzug. Without a court order what would you do? |
| | Mr. Knapp. I think we would have to be very specific |
| 24 | for me to speculate. |
| 25 | |
| | |

Ms. Abzug. Then it is the same kind of thing. If the same thing was requested as went on with NSA, which you stated was no longer going on, not only from the Shamrock report but you said it was not going on, and if you were asked to do it again today, what would you do given the present situation?

53

Mr. Knapp. Are we assuming that the President of the United States is making this request?

Ms. Abzug. There is no evidence that the President of the United States made the request. It wasn't renewed after 1947, 1948 or 1949. Just NSA. No President ever came to you. You don't even know who he spoke to in your company.

Mr. Knapp. If somebody came to me supposedly representing lawful authority I would consult with counsel and then make a decision.

Ms. Abzug. You said that before. What would you do? Mr. Knapp. I don't know the circumstances so I cannot speculate.

Ms. Abzug. The President -- I will tell you -- through the Attorney General made a request of you in this particular hearing --

Mr. Knapp. All right.

Ms. Abzug. -- not to testify. Yet you are testifying. Mr. Knapp. I don't think the question is what I do. The question is how can Congress clarify the situation.

1

The President of the United States through 1 Ms. Abzug. his Attorney General made a request that you not testify 2 here today. 3 I know of no such communication to me. Mr. Knapp. No, 4 ma'am. I do not. 5 Ms. Abzug. I beg your pardon. It was two other com-6 panies who are common carriers. Forgive me. I am sorry 7 about that. It was the other two common carriers who 8 received such a request from the President and Attorney 9 General claiming executive privilege, which is something like 10 you are trying to claim here -- that four million messages 11 might well involve national security. 12 It is mind-boggling. I hope all your customers read it. 13 Mr. Knapp. Read what, ma'am? 14 Ms. Abzug. Read your statement today. 15 Mr. Knapp. That all the messages Worldcom handles 16 involve national security? 17 Ms. Abzug. Could involve national security. 18 Mr. Knapp. As I said earlier several times, I have no 19 way of knowing whether they do or not. 20 Ms. Abzug. You have no way of knowing. They could, 21 therefore, you said. 22 Mr. Knapp. That is your conclusion, not mine. 23 Ms. Abzug. I can't help it. I couldn't get you to make 24 a rational statement so your irrational statement is on the 25

record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Mr. Knapp. Mrs. Abzug, you understand that during periods of wartime all messages are sensitive.

Ms. Abzug. I am not talking about any war.

Mr. Knapp. Then I can't make a generalization of what you are talking about.

Ms. Abzug. We are not talking about war. Thirty years' history in this country was a despoiling of the democratic rights of your customers. That is not war. That is a war against the Constitution and private rights of the people of this country. That is the kind of war it is. If you want to justify it you can, but I would suggest to you, you look at this carefully and look at some of your statements because you might want to correct the record.

Does your attorney have anything to say? I notice you like to talk.

Mr. Knapp. I am available to respond to your questions. Ms. Abzug. Mr. McCloskey?

Mr. McCloskey. I have no questions, Madam Chairman.

Ms. Abzug. Mr. McMullen, are you aware of any authority beyond that which you described here today that you had as an employee of this company? Was there at any time a conversation that you had with any representatives of Government other than the two persons you mentioned? Mr. McMullen. No.

| 1 | Ms. Abzug. Did you discuss any of this over the 30-year | |
|-----|--|--|
| 2 | period that you were familiar with this matter with any | |
| 3 | other members in your company, any of the officials? | |
| 4 | Mr. McMullen. Yes, I spoke with the Vice President of | |
| 5 | the Worldcom. | |
| 6 | Ms. Abzug. Who is that? | |
| 7 | Mr. McMullen. Mr. Joseph Gancie. | |
| 8 | Ms. Abzug. What was the nature of your conversation with | |
| 9 | him? | |
| 10 | Mr. McMullen. When this service was discontinued in 1975 | |
| 11 | I asked him the reason why. He said it was no longer | |
| 12 | necessary for us to put these messages up for pick up. | |
| 13 | Ms. Abzug. Why? What reason did he give you? | |
| 14 | Mr. McMullen. It just wasn't required anymore. | |
| 15 | Ms. Abzug. Before that time was there ever a time when | |
| 16_ | you spoke with any of the officials of your company with | |
| 17 | respect to this operation? | |
| 18 | Mr. McMullen. Just to receive the additions and sub- | |
| 19 | tractions of the list. That is all. | |
| 20 | Ms. Abzug. Who did you speak to about that? | |
| 21 | Mr. McMullen. The agent who usually gave us | |
| 22 | Ms. Abzug. Just the person from the Government? | |
| 23 | Mr. McMullen. That is right. | |
| 24 | Ms. Abzug. The two agencies you mentioned? | |
| 25 | Mr. McMullen. Subtract or add. | |
| | | |

.

Ms. Abzug. Did you ever speak to anybody in your own 1 company? 2 3 Mr. McMullen. In regard to this? Ms. Abzug. Yes, regarding this operation. 4 5 Mr. McMullen. No. It was strictly within the office. It was not spoken to anyone outside. 6 Ms. Abzug. How did you first come in touch with this 7 situation? 8 Mr. McMullen. I was the operator. I worked on the 9 4:00-to-12:00 shift. At the end of the shift at twelve 10 o'clock we took the business and bagged it, as you say, and 11 closed out the circuit to New York City, and we would take 12 the traffic from one to three hundred, whatever the numbers 13 would be, and subtract the ones that were on the list and 14 put them in the envelope. 15 Ms. Abzug. This was at night? 16 Mr. McMullen. Yes, ma'am. 17 Ms. Abzug. In Washington it was done in the morning 18 and New York at night? 19 Mr. McMullen. We subtracted the business at the mid-20 night shift, in other words, twelve o'clock each day, the 21 end of our day's business. 22 At twelve o'clock, the 4:00-to-12:00 shift took these 23 cables from the daily business, put them in the envelope, 24 and the next day they would be picked up if they were to be 25

5/

| * | 58 |
|-----|---|
| . 1 | picked up. |
| 2 | Ms. Abzug. That is how it was done in Washington, too? |
| 3 | Mr. McMullen. Yes, ma'am. |
| 4 | Ms. Abzug. You never talked to you testified you |
| 5 | did this when you were an operator. Is that right? |
| 6 | Mr. McMullen. That is correct. |
| 7 | Ms. Abzug. And then what other contact did you have with |
| 8 | it as you went along in your different capacities? |
| 9 | Mr. McMullen. With the supervisor of the maintenance |
| 10 | operation. I was in and out of the office. It was not done |
| 11 | on an operators' basis. They subtracted the messages and gave |
| 12 | them to the agents when they came in. That was not during |
| 13 | my eight-hour period seven days a week. |
| 14 | Ms. Abzug. Who first spoke to you about these people? |
| 15 | Mr. McMullen. There was no speaking at all. It was |
| 16 | a format that was laid out. |
| 17 | Ms. Abzug. When was the first time that you became |
| 18 | familiar or aware of this format? |
| 19 | Mr. McMullen. When I first when to work at McKay Radio. |
| 20 | I worked for All-American Cables and we transferred from |
| 21 | 1346 Connecticut to 8 DuPont Circle. We combined into one |
| 22 | group which was later changed to American Cables and Radio. |
| 23 | At that time the McKay Radio used this system for sub- |
| 24 | tracting traffic from the daily business. As an operator |
| 25 | I was required to take it and place it in the envelope. I |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

did not know what was being done with this because it vas being sent to the accounting department.

Ms. Abzug. Then later on?

Mr. McMullen. I became a supervisor. I was introduced to the people who came and picked it up and received the identification that they were to receive the envelope if I was there. If not, the operators would recognize the agent.

Ms. Abzug. No further questions.

If you will be good enough to discuss with counsel we
would like you to talk to him about producing Mr. White,
Mr. Gancie, and Mr. Tower.

I am recessing this hearing subject to recall of the
witnesses by the Chair at the Chair's convenience.

Mr. Knapp. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the hearing adjourned.)