

NR_key_name: 754B11D7BDEAA5778525652B004A3EE9
SendTo: ANELSON @ american.edu @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R econd/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 10/09/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 9:40:04 AM
ComposedDate: 10/09/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 9:30:58 AM
Subject:

Anna:1. I think you are correct that someone referred to my October 1 e-mail to the Board as a "chronology" in talking to Grove. You are also correct that the story is about Hersh, but since the records, in the end, do not have to do with us, I'd just assume that we were not part of the story.2. I will share your concerns about records review with Jeremy.3. I will also raise with other staff members the matter of documents that are representative of the ARRB's work. A couple of preliminary thoughts: 1. The five Swiss/FBI documents give a good visual representation of what the Board has done through the "before" and "after" versions; 2. A selection of the recently released NSA documents give a new window into how governments responded after the assassination, what the US government knew and when. Perhaps we can talk about it on Tuesday.
 To: Tom_Samoluk @ JFK-ARRB.GOVcc: [REDACTED]bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB)From: ANELSON @ american.edu @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT Date: 10/09/97 08:54:09 AM ASTSubject: Tom, My guess is that Grove was referring to your memo to us on the course of events. Fortunately I was out of the country from Sept.27-Oct.6 so didn't have to worry about any calls. It appears that we are part of his story only because we can offer him information on Hersh. Hersh is his subject! I'm not sure just how you and Jeremy have divided the work but, as usual, I have some concerns, two in particular. First, I think we should finish some of the projects that have been around for so long. Let's bring to "closure" the LBJ library for example, including some decisions on tapes, etc. which were played for us three years ago and have yet to be opened. Second, I'm concerned about the fact that our new (and eager) people have been trained to do these sequestered collections. Other records are out there to be reviewed like the original batch. I think the Board should continue to have a hand in the review process. After all, that is our purpose. I think a bit of fatigue has set in and the Board is ready to wind down. I share that feeling, but I also think that since we are faced with another year we should continue our oversight. New subject: I was asked by the editor of the OAH Newsletter (site of Kermit's long piece) if there were some representative documents they could print to illustrate the work of the ARRB. This would provide us with a good way to show historians that we have created a terrific research collection for them. But I am not sure how this can be done. That is, we need half dozen records that can be tied by a brief narrative so that they can make sense. Have any ideas? See you Tuesday. Anna

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