

**NR\_key\_name:** F515C108C83581FB8525647B00695A83

**SendTo:** CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

**From:** CN=Thom Wilborn/O=ARRB

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 04/16/1997

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 3:10:58 PM

**ComposedDate:** 04/16/1997

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 3:10:45 PM

**Subject:** Review of Rankin Papers Folder Lists and Sample Documents  
TO: LEO SCHEINKOPF/ARRBCC. DAVID MIAI WEIL/ARRB, THOM WILBORN/ARRB FROM: THOM SAMBORN/ARRB Date: 04/15/97 02:47:51 PM  
Subject: Review of Rankin Papers Folder Lists and Sample Documents  
I received the Rankin Papers Folder List and your Sample Documents. It appears that there are some interesting documents, although no "show stoppers." The key elements of finding documents that could be "flagged" for reporters in conjunction with a news release on the Board acquiring and making available the Rankin papers at the Archives:  
1. They are "new;" that is they are not in the Warren Commission collection or records that have already been available to the public. This means that we have to find a way to check the Warren Commission collection and ensure that something we find to be interesting in the Rankin papers has not been available to the public all along.  
2. They are interesting. The document we flag for the media must show: a. some insight into the operation of the Commission; b. a change between what was in a draft and the final report; or c. some conflict over a key point in the case.  
3. They are not too complicated. We may find something interesting that is simply too complicated or "trivial" for a reporter who does not have the background in the case and no time to learn too much about it. Given this "criteria," the documents with the most potential for a news "hook" are ones that do not have cc's, went directly and only to Rankin, went from Rankin to only one person, are more informal and do not appear to have been written to be included in the official final record, and perhaps contain handwritten notes and edits. With the above mentioned "criteria" in mind, here are my thoughts on the documents you copied:  
March 23, 1964 letter from Gerald Ford to Rankin  
I thought that the March 23, 1964 letter from Gerald Ford to Rankin was particularly interesting because Ford raises many of the very same questions that continue to linger today for some people, nearly 34 years after the assassination. In addition, I found questions 5 and 6 in the letter regarding the possible monitoring or taping of Oswald in jail to be intriguing. Of course, the irony is that Ford is suggesting these questions that have not been answered to the satisfaction of some critics and he would become one of the most vocal defenders of the Commission's conclusions.  
Question: Is this document in the JFK Collection already?  
June 24, 1964 memo from John McCloy to Rankin  
I found this memo interesting because McCloy mentions two important areas. First, on page one, paragraph two, he talks about too much time being spent on proving that the first shot that hit the President was also responsible for all Connolly's wounds. Obviously, this is a crucial point for the Warren Commission's shooting scenario and conclusion that there was one shooter. Second, on page 7, he discusses the "stretcher bullet" and the fact that "there is no indication that the 'stretcher bullet' was in fact the bullet which caused the wrist wound." An interesting statement about a critical part of the Warren Commission case. In addition,  
Record  
**Body:**  
**recstat:**  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**