

NR_key_name: 05244D874464BA9F8525652400556711
SendTo: wljoyce @ yuma.Princeton.EDU @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT
 JRTunheim @ MND.USCOURTS.GOV @ Internet @ Interliant;hall.409 @ osu.edu @ INTERNET @
CopyTo: INTERLIANT;INTERNET-BOARD;CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 10/02/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 11:43:45 AM
ComposedDate: 10/02/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 11:32:49 AM
Subject: Re: Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post
 Bill, thank you for your message. In my conversations with Grove, I have emphasized the preliminary nature of our involvement in this matter, the fact that we never saw the originals and never made any determinations. David and I did have a conversation this morning about that Hersh call on the Friday before we went to Stamford. It was followed by a conference call between David, Obenhouse and Hersh on Saturday. On Hersh's "use" of the Board, I have tried to emphasize that we got what we wanted before the whole situation was overtaken by other events, (the revelations about authenticity), but that we would have used our subpoena authority if it had been required. Thanks for your thoughts. I left a message for Grove this morning, but have not spoken with him. I do not know if he is in the office today. I'll let you know about any additional developments. At this point, if he writes anything it will be for next week.
 TomTo: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-
 arrb.govcc: bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB)From: Wljoyce @ yuma.Princeton.EDU @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT
 Date: 10/02/97 09:51:17 AM ASTSubject: Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post
 Tom: I'm sorry that I was unable to respond to your message sooner, but I can add some points here. First, the Board cannot make any determination of records without seeing the originals, and we never saw them. Second, our "preliminary review" of the record copies, as you accurately describe it, was only an occasion for us to familiarize ourselves with the range and scope of the records and the issues they presented. Third, as you likely already know from David, Hersh did contact David on either the Friday or Saturday before we went to Stamford, urging us not to view these fakes. I know that because David called me at home on that Saturday, and we discussed what to do. Fourth, I never heard that Hersh "used" the Board in the way that Grove has described to you, but there was speculation among us that Hersh and Obenhouse might have "used" us to try to be sure to get full cooperation out of Cusack. Fifth, my own view is, as I told Grove, that once the records were deemed suspicious they became correspondingly less consequential to us, and we've moved on to other matters. I hope this helps.
 Bill At 06:41 PM 10/1/97 -0400, you wrote: >>As you are aware, Lloyd Grove of the Washington Post, has called again about Hersh and the Cusack papers. In response to his latest round of questions 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 were being used by Hersh in connection with his Kennedy book. >>2. We were aware of the records through several sources with whom we had contact, as well as media reports. >>3. In early January 1997, David received a call from Hersh after he had apparently learned of our interest in the documents, as they may or may not relate to the assassination and our mandate. >>4. That conversation began the dialogue with Hersh. >>5. We asked Hersh to come in and meet
Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: