

NR_key_name: 6280BA6BF3AD949885256524004433BE
SendTo: Judge_John_Tunheim @ dcn.uscourts.gov @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 10/02/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 8:28:03 AM
ComposedDate: 10/02/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 8:24:57 AM
Subject: Re: Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post
 JACK.I have to talk to GROVE again this morning. HE did not mention that he had called you. My fear is that if you talk to him it will elevate the story to a level that does not benefit us. If I think that based on what he says to me that having you talk to him will help, I will call you and advise you of that.TomTo:Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrb.govcc:1bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB)From:Judge_John_Tunheim @ dcn.uscourts.gov @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT Date:10/01/97 06:38:31 PM ASTSubject:Re: Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post Thanks, Tom. This little exchange is quite interesting and does explain some of Hersch's behavior with us. Do I need to call Grove back, is he expecting me to call? JRT
 Reply Separator Subject: Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington PostAuthor: "Tom Samoluk"<Tom_Samoluk@jfk-arrb.gov> at ~InternetDate: 10/1/97 6:41 PMAs you are aware, Lloyd Grove of the Washington Post, has called againabout Hersh and the Cusack papers. In response to his latest round ofquestions that have to do with the chronology of events, this evening, I told Grove the following:1. By the end of 1996/early 1997 it was well known that documents werebeing used by Hersh in connection with his Kennedy book.2. We were aware of the records through several sources with whom we hadcontact, as well as media reports.3. In early January 1997, David received a call from Hersh after he hadapparently learned of our interest in the documents, as they may or may notrelate to the assassination and our mandate.4. That conversation began the dialogue with Hersh.5. We asked Hersh to come in and meet with the Board and that occurred onFebruary 13.6. Subsequent to the February 13 meeting, the Board decided that it wantedto see the documents.7. Obenhouse had some contact with Cusack regarding our interest.8. We then dealt directly with Cusack to schedule a preliminary review ofdocuments.9. The preliminary review of document copies occurred on June 9.10. As you are aware, at nearly the same time as the preliminary review,the Board received information casting doubt on the authenticity of therecords.11. No determination had been made by the Board relative to the documents.12. At this time, no additional steps are planned by the Board relative tothese records. In response to a follow-up question about whether the Board felt like wewere getting cooperation, I said yes, and if we had not received thecooperation we needed, the Board was prepared to subpoena the documentsfrom Cusack.At the end of our conversation this evening, the one question that Grovehad left for me, and I have to consult with David on it, is if Hershcontacted David on Friday, June 6, before the document review on Tuesday,June 9, to tell us that it looked like the documents were bogus. After Italk to David, I will get back to Grove.The background to this latest round of calls by Grove is that he hasletters from Hersh to Cusak, written between December 1994-June 1995, whichGrove says have Record
Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: