

**NR\_key\_name:** 226EBE7E66A15A468525651B00568F26  
**SendTo:** CN=Janice Spells/O=ARRB @ ARRB  
**CopyTo:**  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB  
**From:** CN=Tracy Shycoff/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 09/23/1997  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 11:45:57 AM  
**ComposedDate:** 09/23/1997  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 11:45:27 AM  
**Subject:** Talking Points For Questions on Hersh and Allegedly Bogus Documents

please see the last part of this note as it relates to you. thanks.To: David Marwell/ARRB, Jeremy Gunn/ARRB, Eileen Sullivan/ARRBcc: Tracy Shycoff/ARRB From: Tom Samoluk/ARRBDate: 09/23/97 10:51:39 AMSubject: Talking Points For Questions on Hersh and Allegedly Bogus DocumentsFollowing our conversation yesterday, with the news that ABC News is going with a story tomorrow night, and with a couple of media calls apparently related to the Hersh situation, I thought it would be helpful for all of us to get some talking points down on paper that we had discussed on the phone. The following is an attempt to memorialize the proposed talking points:1. After receiving some credible information, the Board made a preliminary review of records that had been brought to our attention as potentially relevant to our work.2. This review is consistent with the Board's mandate from the Congress to pursue records in private hands that may enrich the historical record surrounding the assassination and consistent with previous efforts we had made in the pursuit of private records. Examples of some of these efforts relate to the Garrison records, Clay Shaw's personal papers, and J. Lee Rankin's files. 3. No determination had been made by the Board relative to the documents.4. Subsequent to the preliminary review, the Board received information casting doubt on the authenticity of the records. 5. At this time, no additional steps are planned by the Board relative to these records.I would like to make two additional points.First, if we get media calls, Eileen and I should be used as buffers. I do not think David, Jeremy, Jack, or any Board members, should talk to a reporter before screening the call through Eileen or me. We want to buy some time by getting as much information as we can and then huddling to discuss our response. If a media call comes in that looks like it is on the topic, Eileen and I should have Janice dump the call into voice mail or if necessary talk to the person to get as much information as possible and say we will get back to the person. Janice should be reminded that when she asks a person where they are from and they say the name of a media outlet, the call should go to Eileen, regardless if they have asked for David or someone other than Eileen. This, as you know, is a standard practice in government agencies. Then, Eileen and I will discuss the call with David and Jeremy and decide who should call the reporter back with our response.Second, although it is better if the same person speaks to the media on this issue, preferably a "spokesperson" (to keep from elevating the matter), the Board members may get calls directly made to them. Consistent with our policy, the callers should be sent to Eileen, but I think the Board members should be aware of what we will be saying to the media. Please advise me on your views. Thanks.

**Body:**  
**recstat:** Record  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**