

NR_key_name: E0FF49D032EB260F8525638B00553FD6
SendTo: SWexler666 @ aol.com @ Internet @ WORLDCOM

CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/19/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 11:37:53 AM
ComposedDate: 08/19/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 11:31:09 AM

Subject: Re: Mr. Scelso
 Thank you for your e-mail and suggestion. I will pass it along to the appropriate members of the Board staff for their review. I will advise you of the Board's position after receiving their input. Again, thank you for contacting us. To: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrb.gov @ Internet cc: [REDACTED] bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB) From: SWexler666 @ aol.com @ Internet @ WORLDCOM Date: 08/18/96 04:29:44 PM CDT Subject: Mr. Scelso Dear Mr. Samoluk: I first want to commend the board on what has been a very good job thus far. I receive your newsletter and have recently attended your meeting on 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'm more interested in making a suggestion. To be brief the only good Scelso is one who could be questioned live. His testimony before the HSCA, while informative, will not answer the big question(s), the one that the HSCA could not ask him because they didn't have the necessary documents on which to base the question(s). As you know from John Newman's book, Mr. Scelso was one of several (and the highest ranking) CIA officials to sign off on a cable which they knew to be false, and it was to their own people!. When the only known signee (Jane Roman) read those documents 30 years after the fact her comments (to the Washington Post) were astounding-- she said she was knowingly signing off on something she knew to be false and offered as an explanation that 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 have access to certain signing sheets. These sheets showed that Mr. Scelso and co. were reading numerous documents with very valuable (to the Mexico City Station) information that they later denied having. The questions remain: was there an operation? If so, what kind? How did this operation affect Scelso's investigation of the crime after the assassination? There are many more. BUT INSTEAD OF JUST LETTING THE MATTER REST TO PROTECT SCELSO'S IDENTITY, WHY NOT HAVE HIM ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM A SELECT GROUP OF RESEARCHERS (NEWMAN, PAUL HOCH, PETER DALE SCOTT) BY WAY OF ON-LINE COMPUTER CHAT? This way he can answer without being known, except to the ARRB members who put him on-line. Make the protection of his identity contingent upon his willingness to do the chat session. This seems fair considering the implications of a possible Oswald-CIA operation and the documents you might find as a result. Furthermore, you can ensure honesty from Scelso by using the board's subpoena power. By that I do not mean granting that power to Newman, Scott and Hoch. Rather the board can act as an intermediary, both reviewing the questions that the researchers ask (eliminating those that could lead to a true identity) and by asking the questions of Scelso directly, thereby keeping the subpoena power. In this vein, the

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