

**NR\_key\_name:** 976FEFD2F085D486852564290081CE58

**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:** 6:38:17 PM

**ComposedDate:** 01/24/1997

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 6:37:50 PM

**Subject:** Re: Your e-mail  
 Jack, this just in ...David O. David\_Marwell @ jfk-arb.gov (David Marwell) @ internetcc. (bcc: David Marwell/ARRB)From: kermith @ HUMANITIES1.COHUMS.OHIO-STATE.EDU @ INTERNET @ WORLDCOM Date: 01/24/97 06:15:14 PM CSTSubject: Re: Your e-mail David, thanks. If my colleagues feel good about the letter, then I am happy to join with them. I raised the concerns I did and urge you to note and take account of them as appropriate. As always, however, I am giving my sense of things, not telling you what to do. I am glad to have the other information and will look forward to the meeting. Have a good weekend and I'll see you next week. Best, Kermit \_\_\_\_\_ Reply Separator  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Subject: Your e-mailAuthor: David Marwell <David\_Marwell@jfk-arb.gov> at SMTPLINK-HumanitiesDate: 1/24/97 4:54 PMKermit: I took as my charge from the last meeting to take appropriate steps to "test the water" on the Hill. As I reported to the Board during the conference call last week, I had been in contact with Senator Specter's staff, and they requested a letter that would introduce the issue of an extension. The draft that I circulated was intended to do just that. It was not intended as a comprehensive issue paper. My reading of the Board at the last meeting was that although we might present the issue more tentatively in our annual report and in our public comments, we could not hope to win a sponsor without being clear, and indeed passionate about what we thought was necessary. Hence the tone of the letter. I had hoped to get the letter to Specter's staff today but have now put that off until early next week. I have comments back from the rest of the Board -- mostly stylistic. Your comments go much deeper and reflect what I take to be an uncertainty about whether such an approach is what we should be undertaking. Am I right? I am now uncertain about what I should be doing. Other issues discussed during the conference call: 1. I met with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to discuss our approach to the Cubans for records. After warning us that everything that has to do with Cuba is complicated and unpredictable, he pledged to support the Board's efforts in whatever approach we believe to be appropriate. I'll brief you further when we meet. 2. The Zapruder appraisal is rumored to have been completed. We have not yet seen it but hope to have a copy by the time the Board meets. 3. Seymour Hersh has agreed to visit with the Board and we will try to arrange it for next week. 4. I will do my best to get you a draft of the annual report (minus the section on recommended legislative action) by Tuesday morning. I have just returned from a meeting with a member of Congressman Stokes' staff. She is certain that he would be willing to sponsor and push for legislation to extend. He will not be available to meet with the Board next week, but there is a good chance that he would be in town and have time during our February meeting.

**Body:**

**recstat:** Record

**DeliveryPriority:** N

**DeliveryReport:** B

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**