

NR_key_name: 7CF78E6710C2FAD985256450004582A2
SendTo: paulhoch @ uclink4.berkeley.edu (Paul L. Hoch) @ INTERNET @ WORLDCOM
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 03/04/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 8:44:56 AM
ComposedDate: 03/04/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 7:39:14 AM
Subject: Re: Clarification
Paul--THANKS for your message. I don't intend to be difficult, but I am concerned about the possible undesired consequences of people knowing that we have sent draft research memos to you. On the one hand, we would like to get input from knowledgeable people such as yourself. On the other hand, it is my experience that some people in the research community are irrationally suspicious. For example, I had hoped to attend the meeting in San Francisco last year, but had to cancel because of time constraints. After you had held the meeting, some people in the research community that had reasonably, but mistakenly believed that I had attended. I received copies of e-mail messages from them that accused me of attending a secret meeting with privileged researchers. Separately, I received copies of messages from people who heard that I had not attended that accused me of not wanting to get input and shunning certain researchers. So what's a fellow to do?We are subject to FOIA. Although all of our non-classified records ultimately will be released, we have received some FOIA requests. The FOIA requests that we have received are very time consuming. Rather than having our staff review new records, FOIA requests bog us down. If researchers would just wait until we are out of business, they will get everything anyway (including my e-mails to you and your e-mails to me--they are all being permanently preserved.) As you know, there are virtually no secrets in the research community. If anyone knows that we are sending you draft copies, we will immediately get requests for the same material. Rather than spending our time advancing the ball, we will spend time reviewing what we have just done.I have taken a very strict policy in not telling people what the results of our inquiries have been. Even though I have not told people, I receive comments that say "you are telling so-and-so such-and-such." It is always easier for me to say "I have not said anything about this to anyone." I wish that I could talk to many people and get reasonable feedback. My experience suggests that in the JFK community, this is not possible. We have made an exception for you because of the high value we place on your probity, reasonableness, and knowledge. Unfortunately, I believe that the less said the better off we will all be.On another matter--. Many of the things you have sent us are very interesting, but don't easily lend themselves to work that we can do that is within our mandate. The issues that are difficult for us are those where important witnesses have told interesting stories -- but have recounted them either with significant variations or describe events that are unprovable except by eyewitnesses. The Silvia Odio stories are an example.* The story surrounding her is intriguing, for many reasons. She did, of course, tell different versions of her story. Many people who knew her believed she was credible. One can also probe her motives. Would she have had any reason to lie about persons connected with JURE? Wouldn't she have been loyal to her father? Etc. etc. etc. If we were in 1963 or 1964, Record
Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: