

**NR\_key\_name:** 2C323A829029C0938525644B004E0990  
**SendTo:** CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB  
**CopyTo:**  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB  
**From:** CN=Joseph Freeman/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 02/27/1997  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 9:36:44 AM  
**ComposedDate:** 02/27/1997  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 9:12:23 AM  
**Subject:** Draft Report

As I mentioned, Cathy gave me a hardcopy of a Draft dated 2/18. I thought it was very good, especially in making the case for an extension. If the draft I read last night is the latest (if it isn't, I'm sure what follows has already been caught), there are two typos that need corrected: 1) p. 18, INS section, the last line in the section references the IRS, rather than the INS, as was surely intended; 2) p. 29, paragraph 2, we need a preposition ("by" or "in", for example) after the word "demonstrated" in the sentence that begins: "The CIA efforts..." The only (genuinely minor) substantive concern I would have is that on page 3, recounting the history of legislative investigations into the assassination, we repeatedly refer to "Congress" having set up various committees/investigations. "Congress", as a term, refers jointly to the House and Senate. Technically, these various investigations were not set up by "Congress", but were instead instituted separately by the respective chambers of Congress. (Unlike legislation which becomes an actual statute by being passed by both chambers.) That is, the House of Representatives voted to set up the HSCA (the Senate was not involved); conversely, the Senate voted to set up the Church Committee (the House was not involved). Thus, if only in a technical sense, it is incorrect to say "Congress" set up the HSCA, or the Church Committee, etc. As a matter of literary practicality, it is probably not an important point -- and I'm no doubt being mildly paranoid -- but we wouldn't want people on the Hill who read the report to think that we didn't understand how these Committees were formed, and by who. Lastly, also on page 3, we refer to "four other Federal investigatory bodies who have dealt with the assassination to some degree..." We then go on to list only three. Moreover, by mentioning a specific number at all (whether 3 or 4), we could leave the impression that that's all there were (or that that's all we think there were), when in fact, ARRB/NARA have already established that there were more than this (however minor), and that entities like HUAC and Sen. Eastland's Senate Internal Security Subcommittee actually conducted post-assassination investigations of a sort (however tiny). Since we don't mention these smaller "investigations" elsewhere in the report (and I'm not suggesting that they warrant mention), it might be better to simply indicate that there have been "other" or "additional" investigations or investigatory bodies, without mentioning a specific number. These are nitpicks, I know, and they probably come too late in the process, anyway, but since you were kind enough to solicit my input, I thought I'd pass them on.

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