

NR_key_name: 28C81BC206A53E288525628200772CFC

SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 11/28/1995

DisplayDate_Time: 4:42:01 PM

ComposedDate: 11/28/1995

ComposedDate_Time: 4:41:43 PM

Subject: Re: Dr. McClelland

FROM: JEREMY GUNN/ARRBcc: DENNIS QUINN/ARRB FROM: DOUGLAS HORNE/ARRB Date: 11/28/95 04:39:33
PMSubject: Re: Dr. McClellandI essentially agree with everything Dennis has said, but add one caveat: if we find that a certain number of people are prepared to say under oath that some of the photos and X-Rays are inconsistent with, or do not represent, what they saw on November 22, 1963, and we decide we want one additional witness to this effect to add weight to the statements of the others, then we may choose to pursue Dr. McClelland's testimony anyway. I have added direct, verbatim quotations of many of his statements to our witness file from two recent published works (both circa 1989) which not only reinforce his sworn 1964 testimony that there was an avulsive occipital-parietal wound, but ALSO provide his opinions about the autopsy X-Rays and photographs...in short, he says that the X-Rays of the skull are inconsistent with what he observed on November 22, 1963, and he also says that there are some photos in the collection which show the large deficit in the back of the head with the scalp NOT covering it up (I assume by this that he may be referring to photo 17). If we decide that we must have his testimony to add to that of others, then I am assuming that, although probably reluctant, he will still tell us his very consistent story about the large posterior cranial defect, UNDER OATH, that he has consistently told over the years. The key question we will have to ask ourselves, perhaps after we talk to other Parkland witnesses, is "how much additional corroboration to the Parkland observations do we need, or desire?" After participating in the NOVA broadcast, the KRON-TV interviews, The Men Who Killed Kennedy, and a JAMA interview, he may simply be weary and a bit gunshy, but I am assuming that he has been telling the truth as he saw it, and that his story would not change under oath.To: Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc: Douglas Horne/ARRB, David Marwell/ARRBFrom: Dennis Quinn/ARRBDate: 11/28/95 03:30:26 PMSubject: Re: Dr. McClellandI do not believe there is anything to be gained from compelling Dr. McClelland to speak with us. He has given several interviews over the years and has been fairly consistent in his opinion that Kennedy was shot from the Knoll. I am not aware of any previous statements from Dr. McClelland that need clarification, except perhaps for his original opinion that the President was shot in the left temple, but I believe he has retracted that statement. Serving him with a subpoena and forcing him to give the same information he has given over the years would be, in my opinion, a waste of time.Furthermore, there is no evidence that I have seen that indicates Dr. McClelland (or any other Parkland doctor) has any medical records not already in the JFK Collection. To: Dennis Quinn/ARRB, Douglas Horne/ARRBcc: David Marwell/ARRB From: Jeremy Gunn/ARRB Date: 11/28/95 01:50:51 PMSubject: Dr. McClellandDr. McClelland does not want to talk to us. He said that he has said everything he has to say on the Record

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: