

NR_key_name: 292B766B4A296062852565FA0075B11B

SendTo: CN=Peter Voth/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 05/04/1998

DisplayDate_Time: 5:25:51 PM

ComposedDate: 05/04/1998

ComposedDate_Time: 5:25:31 PM

Subject: Re: Draft 5 of Medical Evidence
 FROM: JEREMY GUNN/ARRBCC. FROM: DOUGLAS HORNE/ARRBDate: 05/04/98 05:25:07 PMSUBJECT: RE: DRAFT 5 OF
 Medical EvidenceThe electronic file is hereby forwarded to you, per your request.Frankly, I am mystified by
 your response, when in my opinion I have incorporated, very faithfully, in both tone and content, the items
 you wanted included in this memo for the public. You spoke to me on the concept of this joint Horne/Gunn
 memo on about three occasions, and you made the following points quite clearly:(1) You said I was to take the
 approach of a critic of the Warren Commission and HSCA's failings--i.e., wear one of the critic's hats, so to
 speak, when writing the draft memo; and that you would wear the hat of a Warren Commission loyalist when
 reviewing my draft, since you said you did not think me fully capable of assuming that role--and that in the
 process, we would eventually (hopefully) produce a balanced product. I agreed to proceed as you had
 directed.(2) You also told me to specifically mention the following shortcomings of the work of the Warren
 Commission and HSCA: failure of the Warren Commission to authenticate photographs and x-rays from the
 autopsy, and to resolve chain-of-custody questions; the completely inaccurate statement in HSCA volume 7
 (section 4) about all of the HSCA's interviewees agreeing with the wounds in the autopsy photographs (which
 we now know, since 1993, is not the case); you told me to discuss evidence for missing autopsy photographs;
 and you told me that we would highlight, in our memo, the problems with the brain photographs. All of these
 things I have done---and by citing evidence from the Warren Commission and HSCA reports...after all, we
 should not criticize the work of two official investigations without citing evidence...so this I have done. I
 incorporated all of these directions of yours into the beginning of the memo, since they are the clear rationale
 for pursuing the course we did--of attempting to clarify the record.(3) You also told me that we would explain
 to the reader that this evidentiary adventure upon which we embarked is a cautionary tale, because of the
 relative unreliability of eyewitness testimony, particularly after many years have passed. I wrote an eloquent
 paragraph saying just this, which I thought added appropriate balance to the beginning of the memo. I
 specifically cautioned against selective citations of witness statements by researchers, saying that to do so
 without taking into account all of our witnesses' testimony, previous testimony by the same people, and the
 findings of the two official investigations, would present a distorted view of the evidence, and of our
 efforts.(4) In short, the first 9 pages of this 11 page memo are the full introductory text explaining why we did
 what we did...that is the obvious way to start such a memo, in my view, and in doing so, the content I inserted,
 in my view, was in strict accordance with your instructions. The last two pages are the outline you requested
 this morning of the remainder of the memo. Three sections of it are clearly labeled:-ARRB Witnesses Whose
 Record

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: