

**NR\_key\_name:** 09D3C67007F29D338525638E005258A1

**SendTo:** CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB

**CopyTo:** CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

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

**From:** CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 08/22/1996

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 11:04:08 AM

**ComposedDate:** 08/22/1996

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 10:59:26 AM

**Subject:** Re: Mr. Scelso  
 Jeremy has already interviewed Scelso. He was completely aware of the research community's concerns and interest. I have discussed with Jeremy the possibility of Scelso executing a sworn statement (prepared by Jeremy based on his interview with Scelso). Do you think that this would be a satisfactory (although not perfect) alternative to a costly deposition? To: David Marwell/ARRBcc: Jeremy Gunn/ARRB From: Tom Samoluk/ARRB Date: 08/22/96 10:54:05 AM Subject: Mr. Scelso  
 Jeremy and I talked about how to, as best we can, address the growing interest in Scelso among the research community. As you saw below, this researcher suggested a creative way for researchers to address Scelso with their questions. For a variety of reasons, we could not do anything like the researcher suggests. However, I think that because of the growing interest in Scelso (interest that is probably way out of sync with his actual role in the assassination story), he should be deposed. Perhaps we could solicit questions for the deposition from the research community. I think this would go a long way towards satisfying the research community (although not all of them) and demonstrate our openness to ideas. To: David Marwell/ARRB, Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc: From: Tom Samoluk/ARRB Date: 08/19/96 11:40:15 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: Wexler666 @ 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.  
**Body:**  
**recstat:** Record  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**