NR_key_name:	F74E112B371F1C26852562DD004693A6
SendTo:	CN=Mary McAuliffe/O=ARRB @ ARRB
СоруТо:	CN=Dennis Quinn/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:	
BlindCopyTo:	CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From:	CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:	
DisplayDate:	02/27/1996
DisplayDate_Time:	7:54:34 AM
ComposedDate:	02/27/1996
ComposedDate_Time:	7:50:53 AM
Subject:	Re: File originals
	You are right that we do not want sanitize

You are right that we do not want sanitized "originals" to be destroyed. We should develop language to attach to the final determination forms for all such documents explaining the redactions. Let me know as soon as one actually comes up in the review process and I will draft some language.To:Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc:Dennis Quinn/ARRB From:Mary McAuliffe/ARRB Date:02/26/96 09:04:22 AMSubject:File originalsHow do you want us to handle "original" documents that themselves are sanitized copies? We're beginning to run into this sort of thing, and Barry assures me that much more is to come. HRG refers to these as "file originals" and treats them as open-in-full where no further information is redacted. HRG has been doing this since 1993 and sees no good alternative, short of destroying the documents (which Barry says has been suggested more than once). I emphasized that under no circumstances should these be destroyed, and that we'd like to see original copies wherever possible. He agreed to search for one example I gave him, but says that so many more are coming that this procedure may prove unworkable. What to do? My only suggestion is to accompany each such document on the review sheet and final determination form with a standard notation explaining the problem. Why were these documents redacted in the first place, at such an early date (spring 1964)? My guess is that they were sanitized before being sent to the Warren Commission. Record

Body: recstat: DeliveryPriority: DeliveryReport: ReturnReceipt: Categories:

N B