

Reasons Not to Depose Dallas Doctors

- Interviews of the Parkland doctors would be investigative interviews, and not record-based interviews. We would essentially be asking the Dallas doctors to tell us their recollections of what they witnessed in Dallas on November 22, 1963.
- If we interview some, but not all, of the Parkland doctors, we subject the Review Board to the same criticisms that we are currently facing, specifically (1) that we have started but not completed a particular project, and (2) that we chose to interview certain doctors and not others because we believed that their testimony would support whatever position we believed to be the most credible or valuable.
- On the same note, if we interview some, but not all, of the individuals who witnessed the President's wounds in Dallas on November 22, 1963, we subject the Review Board to the criticism that we believed that certain eyewitnesses were more credible or valuable than others. For example, many of the individuals who were in Dealey Plaza could provide eyewitness testimony describing the shots and the President's wounds. In practical terms, it would be difficult to distinguish between the Review Board's choice to interview the doctors, but not the eyewitnesses.
- Interviews will not solve any problems.
- Staff resources are very limited. With nine weeks left to complete our work, Ron's time is leveraged with compliance-related matters and with all of the additional General Counsel work that he has taken on in the last two weeks.