

NR_key_name: A90DF578D0B9FCBE8525638B0055F829

SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 08/19/1996

DisplayDate_Time: 11:40:16 AM

ComposedDate: 08/19/1996

ComposedDate_Time: 11:39:01 AM

Subject: Mr. Scelso
I wanted to share this e-mail from a creative researcher. Please advise me of your thoughts and, more importantly, any way to articulate why we are not in a position to do what he suggests.Thanks.To: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrr.gov @ Internetcc: (bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB)From: SWexler666 @ aol.com @ Internet @ WORLDCOM Date: 08/18/96 04:29:44 PM CDTSubject: Mr. ScelsoDear Mr. Samoluk: I first want to commend the board on what has been a very good jobthus far. I receive your newsletter and have recently attended your meetingon the segregated HSCA collection, and am thoroughly impressed. My concern is with the decision not to release the real name of Mr.Scelso, but while I'm interested in the reasoning behind the decision, I'mmore interested in making a suggestion. To be brief the only good Scelso isone who could be questioned live. His testimony before the HSCA, whileinformative, will not answer the big question(s), the one that the HSCA couldnot ask him because they didn't have the necessary documents on which to basethe question(s). As you know from John Newman's book, Mr. Scelso was one ofseveral (and the highest ranking) CIA officials to sign of on a cable whichthey knew to be false, and it was to their own people!. When the only knownsignee (Jane Roman) read those documents 30 years after the fact her comments(to the Washington Post) were astounding-- she said she was knowinglysigning off on something she knew to be false and offered as an explanationthat Lee Harvey Oswald was part of a high-level, need-to-know operation. Newman could reveal what the HSCA couldn't because the HSCA did not haveaccess to certain signing sheets. These sheets showed that Mr. Scelso andco. were reading numerous documents with very valuable (to the Mexico CityStation) information that they later denied having. The questions remain:was there an opeation? If so, what kind? How did this operation affectScelso's investigation of the crime after the assassination? There are manymore. BUT INSTEAD OF JUST LETTNG THE MATTER REST TO PROTECT SCEL'SO'SIDENTITY, WHY NOT HAVE HIM ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM A SELECT GROUP OFRESEARCHERS (NEWMAN,PAUL HOCH, PETER DALE SCOTT) BY WAY OF ON-LINE COMPUTERCHAT? This way he can answer without being known, except to the ARRB memberswho put him on-line. Make the protection of his identity contingent upon hiswillingness to do the chat session. This seems fair considering theimplications of a possible Oswald-CIA operation and the documents you mightfind as a result. Furthermore, you can ensure honesty from Scelso by usingthe board's subpoena power. By that I do not mean granting that power toNewman, Scott and Hoch. Rather the board can act as an intermediary, bothreviewing the questions that the researchers ask (eliminating those thatcould lead to a true identity) and by asking the questions of Scelsodirectly, thereby keeping the subpoena power. In this vein, the researcherswould be like consultants. PLEASE RESPOND!! Sincerely, Stuart Wexler

Body:

recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: