

NR_key_name: 87E3F71B2B3881EC862565290058A2FC
SendTo: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrr.gov
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
From: Judge_John_Tunheim@dcn.uscourts.gov
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 10/07/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 10:39:11 AM
ComposedDate:
ComposedDate_Time:
Subject: Re[2]: Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post

TOM. Anything further ON GROVE. Has he written about Hersh yet? Please advise.

Jack _____ Reply Separator _____ Subject: Re:
 Update on Call From Lloyd Grove, Washington Post
 Author: "Tom Samoluk"<Tom_Samoluk@jfk-arrr.gov> at
 ~InternetDate: 10/2/97 11:43 AM
 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.
 Tom To: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrr.gov
 cc: (bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB) From: wljoyce @ yuma.Princeton.EDU
 @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANT
 Date: 10/02/97 09:51:17 AM AST
 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

Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority:
DeliveryReport:
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: