

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

No. 9643

6 July 54

TO: 250  
FROM: 829  
SUBJECT: PARKER Case  
RE: Meeting of 2 July 1954, and proposed questions submitted by 250 on 6 July 54

1. We have read the questions which you propose to ask PARKER and we have the following comments.

2. Based upon our discussion of 2 July 54, it was our understanding that you intended to cite certain questions raised by the Polygraph test of 12 Oct 52 as the basis for your interrogation, but that the subject of Polygraph was not otherwise to be mentioned. Although we certainly agree (and so stated on 2 July) that the previous test must inevitably be mentioned and discussed during your interrogation of PARKER, we would like to point out the following. The total sum of the questions which you intend asking PARKER in your PART I add up to an attempt to re-run the Polygraph test without hooking PARKER up to the machine. We must state for the record that we believe this procedure will prejudice the outcome of your interrogation, since PARKER will already have been informed by Dr. SCHNEIDER that he is under suspicion, and may, therefore, be expected to answer questions about the test in what he considers to be his own interests. We further feel such a procedure is unfair to PARKER, who should be offered the opportunity to clear himself through use of the same device which originally brought him under suspicion. As stated by 801 in our last meeting, we do not consider the question of the legality of the use of the Polygraph relevant to this case.

3. A large number of questions which you ask in PART I attempt to elicit PARKER's opinion concerning the circumstances surrounding the original test. Even if it could be assumed that PARKER's recollections after two years, likely to be either accurate or unprejudiced, we must point out that there is no qualified Polygraph expert available who would undertake to give an opinion concerning validity of a test on the basis of the two year old recollections of the interested party in such a case. All appropriate notations and considerations of possible extraneous influence were carefully and objectively noted by the examiner according to accepted

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2006

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

-2-

No. 9643  
6 July 54

practices at the time of the test. We therefore question the advisability of including questions which by context and direct implication attack the validity of the original test upon technical grounds and invite PARKER to make the sum total of his answers tend to discredit a test already evaluated by several experts as probably reliable. Assuming that, contrary to your stated expectations, discussion of the test may later appear advisable, we nevertheless object to discussion of the test itself prior to completion of interrogation based upon your PART II. Please coordinate this point with us before the beginning of actual interrogation.

4. We concur in the questions which you have included in your PART II. They are thorough and to the point. Such questions as occur to us which might be added will undoubtedly arise during the course of an intensive amplification of details.

5. We assume that you may want to add certain questions based upon the written calendar of suspicious items which we are forwarding this date, if so, may we ask that you let us see these questions before you use them?

6. Please inform us of the time and place of interrogation. Confirming our verbal agreement of 2 July 54, we will be glad to provide you with recording machinery for the interrogation, and in any event will expect to receive a complete transcript as soon as possible after the initial interrogation.

7. Kindly inform us of any other facilities or services we can provide you in connection with this case.

829

Encls 2:  
• Teil I, II