

HW
MORE ON JACK RUBY AS AN FBI INFORMANT

See my memo of January 8, 1969. Here I record some subsequent activity by the Commission.

At the time of that memo, the last word on this which I knew of was CD 732, Hoover's letter of April 7 to Rankin. The relevant paragraph is as follows:

"As you were previously advised in my letter of February 27, 1964, Ruby was contacted by an Agent of the Dallas Office on March 11, 1959, in view of his position as a night club operator who might have knowledge of the criminal element. He was advised of the Bureau's jurisdiction in criminal matters and he expressed a willingness to furnish information. (I bet he did - but about what? PH) He was subsequently contacted by an Agent (the same one? -PH) on April 28, June 5 and 18, July 7 and 21, August 6 and 31, and October 2, 1959. He did not furnish any information and further contacts with him were discontinued (why? Why not earlier?)? These contacts were recorded only by date along with notations indicating Ruby had not furnished any information. There is no information recorded that was furnished by Ruby in connection with any of these contacts. (My emphasis, of course. Was any furnished otherwise?) Ruby was never paid any money and he was never, at any time, an informant of this Bureau."

From a letter drafted May 28 by Griffin, sent June 1 by Rankin:

Finally, an enclosure in your letter of April 7, 1964 shows that Jack Ruby was contacted on March 11, 1959 by Special Agent Charles W. Flynn, who obtained a personal description and added the observation that Ruby was a "known Dallas criminal." Please advise us as to the purpose and other results of Agent Flynn's contact on that date and request Agent Flynn to indicate whether his comments about Ruby's criminal reputation was based on conversations with local law enforcement officers or any other information not then in your files." (My emphasis.)

Hoover's reply is CD 1052. He provided an affidavit showing that the remark "known Dallas criminal" was added by SA Louis Kelley when CD 4 was being prepared. (I guess I believe this. No reason for the FBI to lie about it - it would not have been incriminating if Flynn had recorded that fact in 1959. He certainly should have been aware of it.)

In reply to Rankin's question about the purpose and other results, Hoover said:

"As you were advised by my letter of February 27, 1964, Jack Ruby was contacted by Special Agent Charles W. Flynn of the Dallas Office on March 11, 1959, in view of his position as a night club operator who might have knowledge of the criminal element in Dallas. The purpose of this contact was to determine whether or not Ruby did have such knowledge (what in particular, Edgar?), and if so, if he would be willing to furnish information to this Bureau. Ruby was advised of the FBI's jurisdiction in (some? what kind of? -PH) criminal matters, and he expressed a willingness to furnish information. (Does that mean he had some?) A personal description of Ruby was obtained by Special Agent Flynn on the occasion of this contact on March 11, 1959, but no information or other results were obtained. Between March 11, 1959, and October 2, 1959, Ruby was contacted on eight other occasions, but he furnished no information whatever and further contacts with him were discontinued."

Moral: Griffin failed to be specific enough about what he wanted. If he had questions like mine - and I assume he did - he should have set them forth in detail. Since he didn't Hoover of course said nothing new - and even tried to make Griffin look like an idiot for asking when he already knew the answer. This is not the only case where Hoover simply didn't answer a question.

This whole business may be of interest directly in connection with Ruby, for various reasons. (See previous memo. E.g., what was said on October 2? 'Hi, Jack, I missed seeing you last month.' 'Well, Chuck, I was in Cuba.}') However, I think the most striking thing is that Hoover could call someone who was contacted 8 times and almost certainly was a PCI (Potential Criminal Informant) a non-informant. This makes his denials about Oswald - especially in connection with the absence of an affidavit from DeBruys - even less credible.

Paul L. Hoch
June 20, 1971