

7-21-04

Commission Meeting

Senate - Love-In
Gorelick - Lots of people at the Post

Discussion on referral - to IGs

Discussion of access to records

Hermultra - as open as possible

Richard B-V - should be open soon, as we are advocating declassification

GC - We originally advocated 5 years.

Understanding it is untenable.

PZ - My concern: these will be distorted
Some MFRs available, some not.

PZ - Anything faster than 5 years - you are still part of the news cycle.

Tom Keen - 5 years may be too long.
At least a year or two.

Some e-mails written in haste.

Gorelick - If I had appreciated that e-mails were part of the records.

Lehman - 2 years far too short

5 is too short. More like 10 years.

Reimer - I don't want to have to say that I am opposing.

Contra.

January 2, 2009

Get past two full Congressional cycles

- GC - Recommends interval deliberative process held for 5 years
- GC - "We are told we can put whatever conditions we want on the records"
- PZ - Opposes dubbing out material.
- Who wants the documents out?
- > Press
 - > Families
 - > Lawyers

Our material in Archives not subject to FOIA.

Jamie - I would split in two.
We were very frank w/ each other.
We will be cajoled around the axel.

* Deliberative material 1/2/09 (inc. minutes)
Via Chair dissent

BV - Is the theory here the great cover-up of partisan differences?

Roemer, B-V, Hamilton opposed
but 6 in favor (Kenny absent)

Fielding - asked PZ's view

PZ - In the context of historians, 5 years isn't very long.

- Thompson - recommended 5 years across the board (Jan. 2, 2005)

Motom - 6 in favor, 3 opposed.

John Lehman // suggested