

NR_key_name: E42CE8E51A3625F48525651B0073DE02
SendTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo:
From: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/23/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 5:05:40 PM
ComposedDate: 09/23/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 5:05:35 PM
Subject: Suggested Talking Points Regarding Hersh and Allegations Regarding Documents
TO: David_Marwell @ JFK-ARRB.GOVCC. (UCC: David_Marwell/ARRB)FROM: wjjoyce @ 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: