

NR_key_name: 4DA49188BD7F364A862565DC0020A786
SendTo: mshack @ concentric.net

debra @ jfklancer.com;MSwift1002 @ aol.com;twinpa @ wf.net;Barb_J @ lx.netcom.com;74041.1372 @ compuserve.com;badams @ redacted.com;bd63 @ ne.mediaone.net;cdrago @ rilin.state.ri.us;SHARRECH @ LANMAIL.SHU.EDU;canyon @ pe.net;CKritzberg @ compuserve.com;JVTG95A @ prodigy.com;dperry2 @ flash.net;dlifton @ compuserve.com;deanie @ freenet.akron.oh.us;DWMANTIK @ aol.com;Eileen_Sullivan @ jfk-arb.gov;72040.2426 @ compuserve.com;71510.235 @ compuserve.com;garyag @ lx.netcom.com;gmack @ jfk.org;gtcressy @ pacifier.com;72724.564 @ compuserve.com;jaynes @ flash.net;igriggs @ hotmail.com;jwjfk @ flash.net;JALentz @ aol.com;JSAWA @ aol.com;rose @ fredonia.edu;jfetzer @ d.umn.edu;jmnewman @ erols.com;joebackes @ aol.com;jnriley @ sprintmail.com;jkelin @ rainbow.rmii.com;jmcadams @ primenet.com;kathy @ ns1.praxis.net;74774.1276 @ compuserve.com;Lenny_M @ earthlink.net;Homeoffice @ Infogenic.co.uk;mam @ comteck.com;mtgriffith @ aol.com;MillicentCranor @ compuserve.com;pamelam @ primenet.com;paulhoch @ uclink4.berkeley.edu;pdscott @ socrates.berkeley.edu;rlinton @ idirect.com;rbfeinman @ junos.com;petereson @ garlic.com;rredmon @ switzerland.k12.in.us;rjmc1 @ dhc.net;russ63 @ lx.netcom.com;r_kent @ hotmail.com;sgalanor @ aol.com;gerlach @ crafti.com.au;sbochan @ erols.com;SGJONES @ PTD.net;74063.3405 @ compuserve.com;ushann @ po-box.mcgill.ca;jrsjfk @ idt.net;KIASJFK @ aol.com;KFITZ @ prodigy.net;robertg1 @ airmail.net

CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB
From: palamara@telerama.com
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 04/04/1998
DisplayDate_Time: 12:54:04 AM
ComposedDate:
ComposedDate_Time:
Subject:

Re: IT IS TIME TO RECONCILE OUR INTERNECINE DIFFERENCES-Part 2
Martin Shackelford wrote: Vince, if you're issuing a call for reconciliation, why leave Kathleen Fitzgerald off the mailing list? Seems like the quality of your work> would greatly improve if you could mend that particular fence. HERE ARE A FEW COMPLIMENTS RE: KATHLEE THAT I POSTED A FEW WEEKS AGO: I just wanted to pass on a note of appreciation in regard to the studies made by fellow Pittsburgher Kathlee Fitzgerald in regard to the Secret Service. Although my particular focus in regard to the Secret Service has always been pretty much related just to the events of 1/22/63, Kathlee has undertaken an impressive look at the agency from its inception up to and including the present. While it almost goes without saying how important it is to document all the actions and testimony of the Secret Service in regard to the terrible events in Dallas, Kathlee has demonstrated that it often is helpful to look at the big picture. Vince Palamara Vince Palamara, author of "THE THIRD ALTERNATIVE- SURVIVOR'S GUILT: THE SECRET SERVICE AND THE JFK MURDER" (1997/1998, LANCER) Also: Be on the lookout for Kathlee Fitzgerald's new book entitled "WHO'S WHO IN THE SECRET SERVICE". We may have had our disagreements in the past, but that's the past: Kathlee has done important work in tackling the whole Secret Service from inception to the present time. I know that this book will be an important addition to everyone's collection, if the preliminary work I have seen is any indication. > I've always had mixed feelings myself about the conferences, > but they do bring people together, they offer opportunities to present > new information, as well as opportunities for some healthy give and take > discussions. I have heard every conference bad-mouthed to some degree, > and it seems kind of pointless. I offer my sincere thanks to everyone > who has made the effort to organize conferences. We owe them a major > debt of gratitude. > I also agree that in-fighting can be destructive, and flaming > cheapens the debate. At the same time, a vigorous debate helps us winnow > out the misinformation, and get closer to the truth of this case. > Maybe some people are thinking of the research community as > similar to the anti-war movement: if we could only reconcile our > differences and pull our full strength together, we could end this war. > I remember all that very clearly. But our unity is around a negative: > the Warren Report got it wrong. When it comes to what we are for, we are > divided into many smaller groups. We were able to unify to some degree > to push for the HSCA investigation, and even better for the JFK Records > Act. Those are the kinds of things we can all agree on and have a strong > chance of accomplishing. WELL PUT! :-)> Instead of general calls for unity, maybe we should ponder > which issues we can fruitfully work together on, accepting that there > will continue to be theoretical differences galore. Back in the Sixties, > the anti-war movement was incredibly diverse; as Abbie Hoffman said > about his co-defendants in the Chicago 8 trial, "We couldn't agree on > lunch," but they were

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