

**NR\_key\_name:** 53FC04B7D21269DD8525652300773A31  
JRTunheim @ MND.USCOURTS.GOV @ Internet @ Interliant;hall.409 @ osu.edu @ INTERNET @  
INTERLIANT;wljoyce @ phoenix.Princeton.EDU @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT;INTERNET-BOARD;CN=Eileen  
Sullivan/O=ARRB

**SendTo:**

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

**From:** CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 10/01/1997

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 6:41:34 PM

**ComposedDate:** 10/01/1997

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 5:42:17 PM

**Subject:** Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post  
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 with the Board and that occurred on February 13.6. Subsequent to the February 13 meeting, the Board decided that it wanted to 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 of documents.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 the records.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 to these records. In response to a follow-up question about whether the Board felt like we were getting cooperation, I said yes, and if we had not received the cooperation we needed, the Board was prepared to subpoena the documents from Cusack. At the end of our conversation this evening, the one question that Grove had left for me, and I have to consult with David on it, is if Hersh contacted 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 I talk to David, I will get back to Grove. The background to this latest round of calls by Grove is that he has letters from Hersh to Cusack, written between December 1994-June 1995, which Grove says have Hersh using the Board as the reason why Cusack should cooperate with him. Hersh allegedly told Cusack that the Board would subpoena the records and take them away from Cusack. In addition, Hersh is quoted as saying that he planned on "stonewalling" the Board. Lastly, Grove says that what "sealed the deal" between Cusack and Hersh was that Hersh threatened to reveal to the Board the existence of the records which Cusack possessed. It was at that point (July 1995), according to Grove, that Cusack shared some of the documents with Hersh. Hersh later allegedly wrote to Cusack that the Board was going to move deliberately and that he did not think that the Board would be a problem. Grove is very intrigued by all of this because it involves Hersh and the approach Hersh used (including his "use" of the Board with Cusack) to get the documents from Cusack. As I noted above, I will probably talk to Grove on Thursday on the last question he posed to me. He is

**Body:**

**recstat:** Record

**DeliveryPriority:** N

**DeliveryReport:** B

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**