

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# Memorandum

TO : Mr. Belmont *abu*

FROM : A. Rosen *Rosen*

SUBJECT: JACK L. RUBY, AKA;  
LEE HARVEY OSWALD - VICTIM  
CIVIL RIGHTS

DATE: June 10, 1964

- 1 - Mr. Belmont
- 1 - Mr. Rosen
- 1 - Mr. Malley
- 1 - Mr. McGowan
- 1 - Mr. Hines

Tolson \_\_\_\_\_  
 Belmont \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mohr \_\_\_\_\_  
 Casper \_\_\_\_\_  
 Callahan \_\_\_\_\_  
 DeLoach \_\_\_\_\_  
 Evans \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gale \_\_\_\_\_  
 Rosen \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sullivan \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tavel \_\_\_\_\_  
 Trotter \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tele. Room \_\_\_\_\_  
 Holmes \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gandy \_\_\_\_\_

*Handwritten initials and signatures:*  
 [Signature]  
 [Signature]  
 [Signature]  
 [Signature]

Memorandum of 6-8-64, Rosen to Belmont, recommended that Mr. J. Lee Rankin be advised that in view of the scheduled sanity hearing for Jack Ruby, the appeal of the death sentence, and the difficulties involved in obtaining a satisfactory polygraph examination where a man is under great emotional strain, the Bureau did not desire to afford Ruby a polygraph examination. - Jack Ruby

This matter was discussed with Mr. Rankin on June 10, 1964, at which time Mr. Rankin indicated he would like for the Bureau to reconsider this matter. He advised that during the interview with Ruby in Dallas by the Chief Justice on June 7, 1964, Ruby specifically requested that he be afforded a polygraph examination and the Chief Justice told Ruby that this would be done. At the time this promise to afford Ruby a polygraph examination was made, Mr. James Bowie of the Dallas District Attorney's Office was present, as was Attorney Thornhill who represents Jack Ruby. Neither Bowie nor Thornhill made any comment of any kind indicating objection to affording Ruby such an interview.

Mr. Rankin stated he had discussed in detail with the Chief Justice the manner in which the polygraph examination was to be given and the Chief Justice did not desire a commercial firm to be used inasmuch as he felt such a firm would utilize such a situation to their advantage and publicize the fact that the firm had been selected by the President's Commission for this work. He stated military polygraph examiners had been considered as had local polygraph operators, and the Chief Justice did not feel they would be satisfactory in view of recent developments concerning polygraph examinations.

Enclosure

JRM:hw  
) 6 (

501-13

2 JUL 8 1964

REC 18 44-2476-1680

[Handwritten signature]

Memorandum to Mr. Belmont  
RE: JACK L. RUBY, AKA;

Mr. Rankin stated that the Chief Justice had commented concerning his recent discussion with the Director relative to polygraph examinations and was very much impressed with the Director's views and the fact that the Bureau did not rely on polygraphs except for investigative leads. For this reason, the Chief Justice and Mr. Rankin would appreciate the Bureau handling this polygraph examination.

Mr. Rankin stated the polygraph interview would be confined to the information set forth in the deposition which had been taken from Ruby on 6-7-64, and if the Bureau would handle this polygraph interview, full information would be made available so that the necessary preparation for the polygraph interview could be made.

Mr. Rankin stated that it was the view of the Chief Justice that a representative from the District Attorney's Office in Dallas, as well as the defense attorney, should be present during the polygraph interview of Ruby.

RECOMMENDATION:

It appears that the sole reason for this request for a polygraph examination stems from the fact that Chief Justice Warren committed himself on 6-7-64, to Ruby that he would be afforded such an interview. This does not change the picture insofar as the Bureau is concerned, i. e., that it is still an undesirable interview for the Bureau to handle.

It is recommended that the attached letter be sent to Mr. Rankin setting forth the reasons why it is undesirable for the Bureau to handle this interview.

*Handled 6/11/64*  
*6/11/64*  
*R* *OK but if Warren really wants it we will do it.*  
*X*