

NR_key_name: 4F198E183B72ED0785256429004EFF4E

SendTo: Judge_John_Tunheim_at_~8DC-MN-Minneapolis @ smtpgw.ared.uscourts.gov @ INTERNET @ WORLDCOM

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 01/24/1997

DisplayDate_Time: 9:24:02 AM

ComposedDate: 01/24/1997

ComposedDate_Time: 9:22:52 AM

Subject: Specter and Stokes Letter

Jack:I don't know whether you have seen this from Kermit. What do you think.To: david_marwell @ jfk-arrb.gov @ internet, jrtunheim @ aol.com @ internet, wljoyce @ firestone.princeton.edu @ internet, anelson @ american.edu @ internetcc: (bcc: David Marwell/ARRB)From: kermith @ HUMANITIES1.COHUMS.OHIO-STATE.EDU @ INTERNET @ WORLDCOM Date: 01/24/97 08:14:01 AM CSTSubject: Specter and Stokes Letter

Colleagues, I am sorry not to have been able to join you for the discussion yesterday. I gather, however, that we have decided to send a letter to Stokes and Specter about the possibility of an extension, using the 25% carry over with something less than \$2 million needed for another year. My reaction to the letter is mixed. First, it does not deal with a real number, but instead indicates that we will need "considerably less than \$2 million." How much will it cost, do we think? Second, whether an extension will or will not compromise what we have done is a good question, but I doubt it. More importantly, I think we way overstate the case about what we can contribute in any case by suggesting that should an end to our existence at the time prescribed by law would "also postpone a solution to a problem that will continue to vex our nation for years to come." What is the problem? The release of the records? The question of who killed the president? I assume that it means the former. If so, then I think the wording should be clearer. My own sense, by the way, is the nation is not much vexed by this matter, although a few vocal people are. Third, other than rhetorically, this letter does not seem to make much of a direct argument about what key areas of records would be opened as a result of our continuation. I appreciate the last paragraph, which indicates our willingness to visit about specific actions, but I don't find that satisfying. We need, I believe, to have something in the letter than speaks to specific bodies of materials that, should be exist another year, will become an important part of the public record. In order to keep the letter to a meaningful length, I would suggest eliminating some of the flag waving in it. Finally, the letter suggests, to me, that we are promising to deliver more than I think we can, at least based on our previous record. The letter carries with it a sense of finality in one year, when it should, I think, stress the contingent nature of our efforts, even if the CIA, FBI, and others cooperated fully and wanted us continued indefinitely. Finally, David, I'd appreciate an update on the discussion yesterday and some sense of where we are with these issues. Best, Kermit

Body:

recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: