

**NR\_key\_name:** 2A10A1261A53431E86256524004F647E

**SendTo:** Tom\_Samoluk @ jfk-arrr.gov

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

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

**From:** wljoyce@yuma.Princeton.EDU

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 10/02/1997

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 9:51:17 AM

**ComposedDate:**

**ComposedDate\_Time:**

**Subject:** 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 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

**Body:**

**recstat:**

**DeliveryPriority:**

**DeliveryReport:**

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**