

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI

DATE: June 7, 1949

FROM : SAC, MILWAUKEE

SUBJECT: JAY DAVID WHITTAKER CHAMBERS, WAS., ET AL
PERJURY; ESPIONAGE - R; INTERNAL SECURITY - R

W/S

*ASB
Brent
J. L. Jones*

Rebulet May 24, 1949.

Mr. THOMAS F. GRADY, 2126 Menominee River Parkway, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was reinterviewed concerning the Woodstock typewriter he sold to HARRY MARTIN and his partner FANSLER in Philadelphia in the year 1927.

In again relating his recollection of the sale of a typewriter to FANSLER and MARTIN, GRADY pointed out that the sale must have been in the year 1927 for the reason that after GRADY left the employ of the Woodstock Typewriter Company in December 1927 he never again was in the business of selling typewriters and, furthermore, it could not have been prior to 1927 for the reason that HARRY MARTIN was not in business for himself selling insurance until about the middle of 1927, and GRADY is sure that he made the sale shortly after FANSLER and MARTIN became associated in the insurance business. He stated that while his recollection is that he dealt with MARTIN, it could very well be that FANSLER signed the order but he has no recollection regarding this.

It was pointed out to GRADY that ANN COYLE did not go to work for FANSLER and MARTIN until the fall 1928 and that she could, therefore, not have tried out the typewriter before it was sold, if he sold it in 1927. GRADY stated that he never was positive that ANN COYLE had tried out the typewriter he sold to FANSLER and MARTIN and that he could very well be confused on this matter for two reasons, the first being that he was acquainted with MARTIN over a period of several years, including the two years he, himself, sold insurance for Northwestern Mutual and does not believe that he recalls the period of ANN COYLE's employment. The second reason for his confusion in this regard was a practice they had in selling typewriters where a "junior salesman" would go around various offices and leave a typewriter on trial with a stenographer in that office. A week or so later one of the salesmen would follow up and attempt to sell the typewriter. It was his original recollection that this procedure was followed in the case of the sale of the typewriter to FANSLER and MARTIN, but he is not at all sure on this point.

GRADY had been following the events of the HISS trial in the newspapers and remarked he noticed HISS had produced a typewriter. It was pointed out to him that the typewriter produced by HISS, according to company records, was manufactured in the year 1929 and was a Model 5N.

CEL:EH
65-786
ANSD

*best to refer to
submit in report*

RECORDED - 116

INDEXED - 116

74-1233-3322
JUN 10 1949

He stated that he could not have sold this typewriter as he sold no typewriters subsequent to leaving the employ of Woodstock in December 1927. His only conjecture on this point was that if the typewriter produced by HISS was a typewriter originally in the office of FANSLER and MARTIN, it must have been one purchased by these men from some other person. He pointed out that in those days Woodstock typewriters were relatively new on the market. They usually undersold the other old line typewriters and the other typewriter companies would not take them on trade under as good terms as the Woodstock Company. It was customary in those days for people in offices to trade their typewriters quite often and he pointed out it was possible MARTIN or FANSLER had traded the typewriter he sold them in 1927 for a new one subsequent to 1929. If this was done, GRADY believed it would probably have been a sale made by JACK CAROW who was manager of the Philadelphia Office of Woodstock, when GRADY left in 1927, and for several years thereafter.

GRADY has not contended, except on the original interview, that his commission on the sale of the typewriter to FANSLER and MARTIN was applied upon an insurance policy sold by MARTIN to GRADY. Upon second interview, previously reported, when the dates of GRADY's policies with Northwestern Mutual, together with the names of the agents selling them, were available he then recalled that he had also sold a machine to J. O. BATTERSBY, H. B. STAVERS, and W. L. COATES in 1927 when these men associated themselves together in the sale of insurance for the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, and that it was on this policy that his commission upon the sale of a typewriter was applied to the premium on a policy. Therefore, since that time, the application of a commission on the sale of a typewriter has not entered into his recollection of selling FANSLER and MARTIN a typewriter.

It was suggested to GRADY that perhaps in January 1930 he might have sold MARTIN a typewriter even though he was no longer in that business but may have relied upon his former connections. He denied that this was possible, stating he never sold a typewriter after he left the employ of Woodstock.

Recapitulating GRADY's recollection of the sale of a typewriter to FANSLER and MARTIN resolves itself in the following. He sold a Woodstock typewriter to FANSLER and MARTIN. The only bases of his recollection as to the time of the sale are the termination of his connection with Woodstock in December 1927 and his recollection that FANSLER and MARTIN had only recently associated for the sale of insurance. If the typewriter produced by HISS, bearing serial number 5N#N230099, did, in fact, come from the office of FANSLER and MARTIN it could not have been the typewriter GRADY sold to that firm for the reason that it was manufactured in 1929 and GRADY never sold a typewriter to anybody after 1927. RUC.

FRANKLIN H. PRICE has advised that he received a letter signed by JOHN X. MCGOHEY, bearing the initials "TJD," which letter advised that a subpoena duces tecum would be served him in the near future by the U. S. Marshal, calling for his appearance on May 23; that he should disregard the date May 23 and not report to the SDNY until he had received a telegram advising him of the exact time his presence was desired. Mr. PRICE advised that the actual subpoena has been received from the U. S. Marshal. It was suggested to him that when he reports as a witness to New York that he take with him the entire personnel file of DAISY FANSLER, as maintained at the Free Library of Philadelphia. Mr. PRICE agreed to do this. It should be pointed out that Mr. PRICE has been very cooperative with the FBI in other matters in the past.

Specimen K35, concerning which Mr. PRICE will testify, was furnished to the Bureau by letter on March 2, 1949 in accordance with instructions in Bureau teletype dated March 1, 1949. It is assumed that the Bureau has forwarded Specimen K35 to the New York Office for trial purposes.

HARRY L. MARTIN was re-interviewed on May 27, 1949, at which time he was asked if he could furnish any information concerning discrepancies noted in the facts surrounding the purchase of the Woodstock typewriter by the FANSLER-MARTIN partnership. It was pointed out to MARTIN that the Bureau was in possession of information that this typewriter was believed to have been manufactured in 1929, whereas other facts concerning the purchase of the typewriter indicate definitely that the machine was purchased in 1927. Mr. MARTIN was unable to explain any discrepancy in these circumstances, and upon complete review of the entire situation in his mind he re-stated that it is his definite opinion that the Woodstock typewriter purchased by the FANSLER-MARTIN partnership was purchased sometime during 1927, and that so far as he is concerned, this is the only typewriter purchased by the partnership.

MARTIN was also questioned concerning his knowledge of selling an insurance policy to THOMAS GRADY, at which time GRADY applied his sales commissions to part payment for the policy. Bureau letter to Milwaukee dated May 25, 1949 points out that the application for policy of GRADY was dated January 29, 1930, at which time GRADY listed his occupation as "Salesman for Disinfection Company." MARTIN advised that he can recall having sold an insurance policy to THOMAS GRADY; that he believes the amount of this policy was \$2,000.00. He said that he, however, has absolutely no independent recollection of having been advised by GRADY, or in any other manner, that the initial premium for this policy was paid for, in whole or in part, by the