

NR_key_name: F01453047F7D39E38625638100706DA8

SendTo: Tom_Samoluk @ jfk-arrrb.gov @ internet

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB

From: mtgriff @ ironrod.win-uk.net ("Michael T. Griffith")

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 08/09/1996

DisplayDate_Time: 9:13:21 PM

ComposedDate:

ComposedDate_Time:

Subject: Re: Interview with Autopsy Pathologists

Mr. Samoluk, in the near future Chairman Tammert will receive a letter from a gentleman named Michael Nurko. Essentially, the letter sharply questions the Board's handling of the interview with the autopsy doctors and the Board's handling of the medical evidence as a whole. I was asked to have my name included as a co-signer of the letter, but declined because I felt the letter was somewhat combative and perhaps a little too heatedly worded. However, I do share some of the concerns expressed in the letter--not all, but some. The letter has been widely circulated among the research community, and leading researchers have been asked to add their names to it. The letter will be mailed in hard copy via the postal system within the next week or two. I emphasize that I do not agree with all the sentiments expressed in the letter, nor do I approve of its rather strident, combative tone. Some of the complaints voiced in the letter include the fact that no ARRB member was present at the interview with the autopsy pathologists and that the Board allegedly failed to consult with concerned researchers prior to the interview. The letter also expresses doubt that the pathologists were asked or adequately questioned about certain key issues and conflicts in the evidence. I would be interested to know if the autopsy pathologists were asked about the following:

- * The suspicious 6.5 mm fragment that now appears in the autopsy radiographs. -- This fragment was almost certainly not present on the x-rays that were taken during the autopsy. Every single pre-1967 medical report that discussed fragments found during the post-mortem stated that only two sizable fragments were seen and recovered from the skull by the pathologists. The chief pathologist, Dr. Humes, specifically said in his Warren Commission (WC) testimony that during the autopsy they recovered all of the sizable fragments that they saw. It seems impossible that the radiologist, Dr. Ebersole, along with the three pathologists, could have missed the large 6.5mm fragment in the x-rays. --
- Additionally, Dr. Humes said nothing about any such fragment in his WC testimony. Nor did he mention it in the autopsy report or in the supplemental autopsy report. -- Furthermore, the fragment, according to the Clark Panel and the HSCA's medical panel, is located on the outer table of the skull and slightly *below* the defect identified as an entrance wound in the back of the skull, but forensic expert after expert has stated that it is extremely unlikely that a bullet striking the skull at a downward angle would have deposited a fragment below the entrance wound (if anything, say the experts, the fragment should have been deposited above the wound). --
- Moreover, the type of ammunition that was allegedly used, fully metal-jacketed (FMJ) Carcano missiles, is known for not having fragments shear off from it upon impact with bone. Indeed, several forensic experts have stated they've never heard of an FMJ missile behaving in this manner.
- * The apparent moving of the back wound from the third thoracic vertebrae to "the base of the neck." -- There is considerable evidence that this

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: