

**NR\_key\_name:** B3C92CF5DC6C18718525651B0073D888  
**SendTo:** CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB  
**CopyTo:**  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:**  
**From:** CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 09/23/1997  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 5:05:25 PM  
**ComposedDate:** 09/23/1997  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 5:05:21 PM  
**Subject:** Suggested Talking Points Regarding Hersh and Allegations Regarding Documents  
TO: David\_Marwell @ JFK-ARRB.GOVCC. (UCC: David\_Marwell/ARRB)FROM: WJOYCE @ PHOENIX.PRINCETON.EDU @  
INTERNET @ INTERLIANT Date: 09/23/97 04:44:14 PM ASTSubject: Suggested Talking Points Regarding Hersh  
and Allegations Regarding DocumentsDavid: I did speak with Grove this morning (off the record), and I  
don'tthink that I went beyond your talking points. Indeed, I said that we sawonly copies of records, that we  
could not make determinations on thatbasis, and that, to the extent they are not authentic (and records  
cannotbe authenticated by viewing copies), the interests of the Board endedthere. It was an uncomfortable  
exchange for me, and I hope that Imaintained the interests of the Board and didn't create problems. Ugh! --  
Bill>X-Lotus-FromDomain: ARRB @ INTERLIANT @ OUTBOUND>From: "David Marwell"<David\_Marwell@jfk-  
arrb.gov>>To:"internet-board"<notes.interliant.com.@phoenix.Princeton.EDU>@waltz.worldcom.com>Date:  
Tue, 23 Sep 1997 15:07:38 -0400>Subject: Suggested Talking Points Regarding Hersh and Allegations>  
Regarding Documents>To: David Marwell/ARRB>cc:>From: Tom Samoluk/ARRB>Date: 09/23/97 02:04:25  
PM>Subject: Suggested Talking Points Regarding Hersh and Allegations> Regarding Documents>>I am  
forwarding this message from Tom. As I suggested might happen,several members of the Board have been  
contacted by Lloyd Grove of theWashington Post concerning the Cusack story. As you know, I declined tohelp  
Grove. Apparently he was more successful in getting information frommembers of the Board. It is my strong  
recommendation that any futurecalls from Grove, or any other member of the press, be forwarded to Tom  
orEileen.>>David:>>Per our conversation and your edits to the first draft of the talking>points, the following  
are the suggested talking points if we get more>specific inquiries regarding the documents:>>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. At nearly the same time as the preliminary review,  
the Board receivedinformation casting doubt on the authenticity of the records.>>3. No determination had  
been made by the Board relative to the documents.>>4. At this time, no additional steps are planned by the  
Board relative tothese records.>>Should the caller question what the Board was doing reviewing  
these>records, the following statement with some background can be used:>>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 hadmade in the pursuit of  
private records. Examples of some of these effortsrelate to the Garrison records, Clay Shaw's personal papers,  
and J. LeeRankin's files.>>As I mentioned, I believe that the Board should speak with one voice on>this matter.  
**Body:** There will probably be more calls. The calls should be>directed to me, or Eileen, at the Board, for a discussion  
**recstat:** Record  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**