

NR_key_name: 1F33C5194AFFC26A85256382000022C7
SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB;CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/09/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 8:03:52 PM
ComposedDate: 08/09/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 8:01:29 PM
Subject: Re: Interview with Autopsy Pathologists

PLEASE SEE MY EMAIL RESPONSE TO THE WRITER. THIS MESSAGE FOLLOWS MY RESPONSE. IT REALLY BOUNDED ME AND I almost sent my message right away, but thought I should show it to you to ensure that there wasn't anything that we didn't want to say at this point in time. Please advise. I would like to send it soon.To: mtgriff @ ironrod.win-uk.net ("Michael T. Griffith") @ Internet @ WORLDCOMcc: From: Tom Samoluk/ARRBDate: 08/09/96 07:14:32 PMSubject: Re: Interview with Autopsy PathologistsI will try to address the points that you have made, in the order that you made them.First, I have no idea who Michael Nurko is, have never heard his name, and the Review Board has not, to my knowledge, ever received any input from him on any issue, while thousands of others have written, called and faxed information to assist the Board.Second, I am astounded that anyone could "sharply question the Board's handling of the interview with the autopsy doctors and the Board's handling of the medical evidence as a whole." The Board should be congratulated for "pushing the envelope" on its authority and having the courage to delve head first into this difficult area. Furthermore, any criticism is completely unfounded at this point, since the Board has not released the depositions or other information relative to the medical evidence while our pursuit of the medical evidence is ongoing. Thus, no one outside of the Board and staff knows what was asked and what was not asked of the autopsy doctors. We have stated that the autopsy depositions will be released at the conclusion of our pursuit of the medical evidence, likely to be by the end of the year.Third, criticism of the fact that no Board members were present for the depositions is unfounded. The staff members who conducted and were present for these depositions were extraordinarily prepared. I know. I saw the amount of preparation that went into the depositions.Fourth, in fact, the Board did consult with researchers and outside medical professionals to assist in preparation for the depositions and the exploration of the medical evidence.Fifth, how can anyone reasonably "express doubt that the pathologists were asked or adequately questioned about certain key issues and conflicts in the evidence" at this point in time? What is it based on? People will have the opportunity to make that judgment when the depositions are released. I reiterate at this point: researchers were consulted, and many began sending information, suggestions, and leads relative to the medical evidence from the very beginning of the Board's existence. In addition, other outside consultation was undertaken. Furthermore, the preparation for the depositions also involved a detailed study of the medical record compiled by all previous government agencies, as well as a careful study of the published literature on the subject.Sixth, the specific areas on which the autopsy doctors were questioned will be known when the depositions are released. Thus, I cannot respond to the specific areas that you raised.Seventh, I assure you, and reiterate, that the pursuit of the Record

Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: