

NR_key_name: 1B201E9AB3AA77118525668200488CA6
SendTo: CN=Laura Denk/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R econd/O=ARRB
From: CN=Irene Marr/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/17/1998
DisplayDate_Time: 9:13:24 AM
ComposedDate: 09/17/1998
ComposedDate_Time: 9:12:26 AM
Subject: Chapter 6 quotes

Goodness!To: Laura Denk/ARRBcc: Irene Marr/ARRB From: Michelle Combs/ARRB Date: 09/17/98 08:51:12 AMSubject: Chapter 6 quotesI just looked at the quotes suggested for Chapter 6. I believe we are giving the wrong impression to quote members of the research community, particularly their conspiracy theories. Since these quotes will be highlighted in sidebars, it will look to the casual reader as if we are giving credence to particular theories or points of view. This will be particularly be evident where the "quotes" contrast with the textual explanation. It will look as if we don't believe the results of our own work. Many people will not bother to ready the text thoroughly. They will glance at the sidebars and assume our work supported the theories/ points of view we quote. Given that in the history of this agency, we have avoided making substantive judgments as to the "truth" or "falsehood" of different conspiracies, we should avoid any appearance of substantive evaluation of theories about the assassination in the final report. Similarly, Russ Holmes handled the records on the assassination for years but he was not involved first hand. It is misleading to quote him as an expert on what might or might not have happened in Moscow, Mexico City or anywhere else. Joan Higdon was an administrative person on the Church Committee staff. She generally would not be considered an authority on the issues. It is my opinion that we should use quotes which support our own work. or which document material which is actually discussed in the text.

Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: