November xx, 1995

Mr. John Pereira, Director Historical Review Group Center for the Study of Intelligence Central Intelligence Agency Washington, D.C., 20505

Re: ARRB requests for evidence

Dear John:

I thought that it might be helpful to you if I were to provide you with our understanding As preparation continues for the November 13 Review Board meeting, we would like to acknowledge the efforts made by the Historical Review Groupto provide ARRB staff with supporting evidence for information contained in the documents being reviewed at that time. While we appreciate the cooperation of HRGand acknowledge the scope of their task, we are compelled to reiterate the type of supporting evidence we need.

Where issues exist that the Board has not yet addressed, and where CIA would like to see postponements upheld, *specific* information must be provided to support a postponement. General statements, while useful in identifying the underlying issues involved, do not provide the Board with the complete knowledge and understanding of the issue that is necessary to make an informed judgment regarding release of the information. For example, in the case of an operational crypt, the nature and specific purpose of the operation must be disclosed in order for the Board to adequately consider CIA's point of view. A general statement that the issue involved is a "sensitive crypt" is insufficient for this purpose.

Since the JFK Act presupposes disclosure of records unless **clear and convincing** evidence exists to warrant postponement, the Board must, according to its statute, release in full the records contained in the JFK collection in the absence of such clear evidence. We would like to emphasize this point, not to confront, but rather to offer HRG every opportunity to provide its evidence.

Additionally, you will find enclosed with this letter the next in our series of information requests, covering boxes 4-9 of the Oswald collection. We appreciate that the HRG is still occupied with preparing for the November Board meeting; we are submitting these requests now in an attempt to give HRG as much advance notice as possible of which records we will be reviewing in the January 4 and January 31 meetings. Evidence for records to be reviewed January 4 should be provided no later

than December 20, 1995; for records to be reviewed at the January 31 meeting, no later than January 16, 1996.

We hope that during HRG's review of the January documents, the standards outlined in this letter will be kept in mind. If at any point an issue is deemed so sensitive that a briefing is required, ARRB staff will meet with you at your convenience.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

David G. Marwell Executive Director

File 4.20.3