

NR_key_name: 6C6004B4FF8CB25C8525638E0051597C
SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB
CopyTo: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/22/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 10:54:05 AM
ComposedDate: 08/22/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 10:48:33 AM
Subject: Mr. Scelso

JEREMY AND I TALKED ABOUT HOW TO, AS BEST WE CAN, ADDRESS THE GROWING INTEREST IN SCELSO AMONG THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY. AS YOU SAW BELOW, THIS RESEARCHER SUGGESTED A CREATIVE WAY FOR RESEARCHERS TO ADDRESS SCELSO WITH THEIR QUESTIONS. FOR A VARIETY OF REASONS, WE COULD NOT DO ANYTHING LIKE THE RESEARCHER SUGGESTS. HOWEVER, I THINK THAT BECAUSE OF THE GROWING INTEREST IN SCELSO (INTEREST THAT IS PROBABLY WAY OUT OF SYNC WITH HIS ACTUAL ROLE IN THE ASSASSINATION STORY), HE SHOULD BE DEPOSED. PERHAPS WE COULD SOLICIT QUESTIONS FOR THE DEPOSITION FROM THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY. I THINK THIS WOULD GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS SATISFYING THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY (ALTHOUGH NOT ALL OF THEM) AND DEMONSTRATE OUR OPENNESS TO IDEAS. TO: David Marwell/ARRB, Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc: From: Tom Samoluk/ARRB Date: 08/19/96 11:40:15 AMSubject: Mr. ScelsoI wanted to share this e-mail from a creative researcher. Please advise me of your thoughts and, more importantly, any way to articulate why we are not in a position to do what he suggests.Thanks.To: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrb.gov @ Internetcc: (bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB)From: SWexler666 @ aol.com @ Internet @ WORLDCOM Date: 08/18/96 04:29:44 PM CDTSUBJECT: Mr. ScelsoDear Mr. Samoluk: I first want to commend the board on what has been a very good jobthus far. I receive your newsletter and have recently attended your meetingon the segregated HSCA collection, and am thoroughly impressed. My concern is with the decision not to release the real name of Mr.Scelso, but while I'm interested in the reasoning behind the decision, I'mmore interested in making a suggestion. To be brief the only good Scelso isone who could be questioned live. His testimony before the HSCA, whileinformative, will not answer the big question(s), the one that the HSCA couldnot ask him because they didn't have the necessary documents on which to basethe question(s). As you know from John Newman's book, Mr. Scelso was one ofseveral (and the highest ranking) CIA officials to sign of on a cable whichthey knew to be false, and it was to their own people!. When the only knownsignee (Jane Roman) read those documents 30 years after the fact her comments(to the Washington Post) were astounding-- she said she was knowinglysigning off on something she knew to be false and offered as an explanationthat Lee Harvey Oswald was part of a high-level, need-to-know operation. Newman could reveal what the HSCA couldn't because the HSCA did not haveaccess to certain signing sheets. These sheets showed that Mr. Scelso andco. were reading numerous documents with very valuable (to the Mexico CityStation) information that they later denied having. The questions remain:was there an opeation? If so, what kind? How did this operation affectScelso's investigation of the crime after the assassination? There are manymore. BUT INSTEAD OF JUST LETTNG THE MATTER REST TO PROTECT SCELSO'SIDENTITY, WHY NOT HAVE HIM ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM A SELECT GROUP OFRESEARCHERS (NEWMAN,PAUL HOCH, PETER DALE SCOTT) BY WAY OF ON-LINE

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