

Quotes for Chapter 3/7

**"In this era of cynicism about government, your mission is of critical importance."
Lindy Boggs, Review Board hearing in New Orleans, June 28, 1995**

"I know that you are trying to redress the harm and the wound that was done to the American spirit in 1963 and the confusions that have arisen since so that we may -- the American people may be free to move on to the current history, which clamors for its attention."

Priscilla Johnson McMillan, Review Board hearing in Boston, March 24, 1995

"The only option for rightfully restoring and renewing the public trust in its government is by countermanding a history of political constraints and past prejudices in assassination inquiries through an active and massive declassification of all records relating directly and indirectly to the President's assassination, and the time and opportunity is obviously now."

Richard Trask, Review Board hearing in Boston, March 24, 1995

"Though possibly beyond the original scope of your board, the active solicitation of these known and unknown visual prime resources to history are so important to collect and preserve, being among the most important and useful documents of what really occurred on November 22, 1963."

Richard Trask, Review Board hearing in Boston, March 24, 1995

"My family and I would like to contribute all of my father's papers that relate to the Warren Commission service to the American people to be included in the National Archives."
James Rankin, Son of J. Lee Rankin, former General Counsel to the Warren Commission,
Review Board hearing in Los Angeles, September 17, 1996

"This is the week to do it, Mr. Zapruder. Inscribe yourself in the book of life forever. Donate your father's film to the National Archives. Remove all copyright constraints, it is the right thing to do."

David Lifton, Review Board hearing in Los Angeles, September 17, 1996

“...the enduring controversy of who Oswald really was, what he was, is an inherent part of the historical truth of this case...Oswald, as you know, is the most complex alleged or real political assassin in American history...the idea that, for the first time, citizens will be the judge of the balance between government secrecy and what we know, rather than the agencies themselves or the courts, I think is extraordinary...”

Philip Melanson, Review Board hearing in Boston, March 24, 1995.

“...some records that I tried but failed to find when I was writing *Marina and Lee* [included]...Oswald’s Marine Corps Record.”
Priscilla Johnson McMillan, Review Board hearing, March 24, 1995

“The last matter I wanted to bring up--in my own papers...I have 13 or 14 file boxes...they would include between 700 and 800 pages of interviews that I conducted with Marina Oswald in 1964 and '65...then there is my own earlier manuscripts, drafts, which were cut for length...should this board want those records...I will give them to whomever.”

Priscilla Johnson McMillan, Review Board hearing, March 24, 1995

“...Richard Case Nagell [is] a former military intelligence officer and CIA contract agent who was involved with Oswald when both were stationed in Japan in 1957 and ‘58, and later during the 1962 and ‘63 period in Dallas, New Orleans, [and] Mexico City...in brief, Mr. Nagell maintains that he sought to warn both the FBI...and the CIA...of an assassination plot involving Oswald and two Cuban exile associates...the intent of the conspirators, according to Mr. Nagell, was to pin the blame on Castro’s Cuba and spark an invasion of the island...he has indicated to me in the past that, if he was ever subpoenaed by a government agency, he would be willing to testify.”

Dick Russell, Review Board hearing in Boston, March 24, 1995

“In this era of cynicism about government, your mission is of critical importance...my feeling has always been that if new evidence was discovered and new hearings conducted as a result, that Hale would applaud those efforts...and I wish you well in your continued search for truth and justice.”

Lindy Boggs, Review Board hearing in New Orleans, June 28, 1995

“...the [Jim Garrison Clay Shaw prosecution] materials that I have in my office and have had for twenty one and one-half years have been I think under fairly close control...a lot of it, though, is missing and was taken before we took office...I think those files were rifled and I think they took from those files things that would be of great interest to the American public...our criminal code calls that theft...if a public servant removes documents, as they obviously did in Mr. Garrison’s office, that would constitute a violation of our law on theft.”

District Attorney Harry F. Connick, Sr., Review Board hearing in New Orleans, June 28, 1995

“...the historical profession seeks the broadest definition possible in determining what is an assassination record. We hope that the Board will actively pursue records even though agencies may not have labeled those records as assassination-related records...”

Page Putnam Miller, Review Board hearing in Washington, D.C., October 11, 1995

“...how the term ‘Kennedy Assassination Records’ should be defined...is a very significant question because it goes to the heart of this Board’s capacity to restore the confidence of the American people that they have a right to know their own history...”

James Lesar, Review Board hearing in Washington, D.C., October 11, 1995

“...the term or definition of the term ‘assassination records’ is likely to be the most important administrative decision the Board will make.”

Mark Zaid and Charles Sanders, Review Board hearing in Washington, D.C., October 11, 1995

“...no one is going to get everything they want out of this Board or out of this government, but I think it is terribly important to start the right way, as you are, by plugging into the research, being open, being inclusive; that is a very good sign.”

John Newman, Review Board hearing in Washington, D.C., October 11, 1995

“...with respect to any assassination record, deception, alteration, or concealment implies that a truth is being concealed, and the records of the concealed truth, whatever the content of that truth, should be deemed to constitute an assassination record.”

Peter Dale Scott, Review Board hearing in Washington, D.C., October 11, 1995

“Why is this [Zapruder] film important? It is enormously important, if you want to know what happened in Dealey Plaza, this film shows you, as much as any film can. All queries and challenges to...[its]...authenticity, if this film is in government hands, can be satisfactorily overcome. When that is done, this film then becomes a baseline for all additional studies for what happened in Dealey Plaza...there should be a protocol established as for how a digitized copy is made with the state of the art equipment...that digitized copy, which is then fully authenticated, should then be the basis of all research in the future.”

Josiah Thompson, Zapruder film hearing in Washington, D.C., April 2, 1997

“Certainly a copy [of the Zapruder film] should be undertaken now with today’s technology. It is better than what I had 30 years ago [when I optically enlarged the film from 8 mm format directly to 35 mm format]...someone should invest [the] 10 or 15 or \$ 20,000 that is necessary for the hardware to duplicate regular 8 mm [film] with full immersion gate...if it were being scanned rather than being put onto film...scanned digitally, than that image could be enhanced and repaired, so to speak, as many modern motion pictures are...it can be brought to near pristine condition.”

Moses Weitzman, Zapruder film hearing in Washington, D.C., April 2, 1997

“To call Zapruder’s film remarkable is an exaggerated understatement. It is, due to the subject matter and the clear angle of view undoubtedly one of the most important if not the most historically important movie film ever made.”

Richard Trask, Zapruder film hearing in Washington, D.C., April 2, 1997

“If all that mattered [re: the Zapruder film taking issue] was the imagery, then a copy would probably be good enough. But no--a copy is *not* good enough, not if the issue is authenticity...for I believe that the key issue *is* in fact authenticity, as I mentioned [at your hearing] in Los Angeles, and that a major mistake would be made here if the ARRB does not base its decision [on whether or not to take the LMH Co. film] in full recognition of this fact...there is only one way to resolve the authenticity issue, and that is to convene a panel of experts, and conduct certain tests on the original.”

Letter from David Lifton, submitted for the record, Zapruder film hearing, Washington, D.C., April 2, 1997