

TIME RECONSTRUCTION AT THE BOOK DEPOSITORY - SOURCE OF SHOTS

Statements of Witnesses - Marrion L. BAKER, March 25, 1964, 3 H 241-70

Although it was far from the Commission's intentions, motorcycle patrolman Baker proved that Oswald could not have been the assassin, cast further doubt upon the integrity of the Commission's staff (of its competence I have no doubt), gave unsolicited information that could have a considerable bearing upon the source of some of the shots, and gave leads that were not followed.

Baker is the officer who dashed into the building, by his own testimony and that of Roy Truly, pushing people out of the way in his charge, rushed to the second floor where he found Oswald in the lunch room. The Commission called him to elicit this testimony and because it had used him in a reconstruction of what he did and how long it took.

It didn't take long enough. According to the reconstruction by Baker and the staff, Baker would have gotten to the lunchroom before Oswald. The Commission makes efforts to camouflage this - in fact, lies about it - in the Report. But the facts as presented by Baker are uncontroverted.

On the question of the integrity of the staff, the reconstruction of Baker's movements and the calculation of his time knowingly and deliberately were commenced with the first shot. The reconstruction could not possibly begin until sometime after the final shot. The Commission's own minimum time lapse between the first and the third shots was about 5 seconds. By the reconstruction, therefore, Baker got there a minimum of 4 seconds before Oswald.

Also bearing on the integrity of the Commission's staff is the testimony of Baker about the information given him by a companion officer in the motorcade, Chaney. This will be summarized briefly below. The Commission did not call Chaney as a witness. There is only one possible reasonable explanation for this failure: The Commission was

2 - Baker

unwilling to accept testimony that Gov. Connally was hit by a separate shot and there was a witness to it. It was unwilling to allow Gov. Connally's substantial testimony, the most believable I have read, to be substantiated in any way. In the light of the analysis I have already made of the autopsy report, the suppression of the photographs of the President taken at Bethesda Hospital, and the participation of the staff in the deceit involving the false "artistic" representation of the President's wounds, makes its failure to call Officer Chaney even more suspicious, and allows Baker's hearsay testimony to stand uncontroverted and we are entitled to accept it as unquestioned.

Baker is a veteran Dallas policeman with 7 or 8 years of experience as a motorcycle policeman, prior to which he was a patrolman and for almost 2 years was in the radio division. (p.243) Baker was not one of the flankers of the Presidential car, but was several cars toward the rear in the motorcade. He testified to having just turned the corner from Main into Houston when he was struck by a strong wind from the north that almost unseated him. He also testified that at the time he turned the corner the Presidential car was just beginning to turn from Houston into Elm. (Note that the Commission ignores this and other testimony about a strong north wind in its May reconstruction where it assumed the trees, and especially the tree directly outside the Book Depository, were not moving in the breeze at all.)

Inadvertently, perhaps, Dulles revealed Commission knowledge at variance to the position it has taken about an important factor involving distance. The Commission and the Secret Service have referred to a gap of 20 to 25 feet between the Presidential and the followup cars at the time it turned the corner. This is not supported by the Altgens photograph, which, despite the fact that it was taken by a telephoto

3 - Baker

lens, shows a relatively short space between these 2 vehicles, and this is important in a number of respects, especially because eyewitnesses have placed the timing of the shot with respect to where they saw the followup car.

Dulles places this distance at 6 to 7 feet. This is supported by the Altgens photograph and it is supported by the testimony of the motorcycle policemen in the motorcade. (p.245)

In the reconstruction, Baker stopped his motorcycle at the point along Houston St. he recalled being at the time he heard the first shot. It was measured at "60 to 80 feet" from the corner, or approximately 35 to 40 percent of the distance from Houston to Elm St. There was no doubt in Baker's mind that the first shot was a rifleshot. He is a hunter and had just returned from hunting (and the other traffic policemen say the same thing), and his testimony is explicit and unchallenged. I make this point because the Secret Service people fairly uniformly describe the sound as that of a backfire. This might be acceptable coming from ordinary civilians, but it is not acceptable coming from men supposed trained in and experienced with firearms. Almost without exception, the police and the sheriffs immediately recognized the first and succeeding shots as rifleshots. The traffic policemen in the motorcade are expressly explicit, and one of them points out the clear difference between the "pop" of a backfire and the sound of a rifle. (p.246)

Baker's description of what he did after the shots was that he "immediately revved that motorcycle up," parked at the corner of Elm and Houston, the distance having been paced the Friday previous to his testimony at from 180 to 200 feet, and rushed to the Book Depository Building. (p.247)

Baker comments on something that looks like it should be a good

4 - Baker

lead, but at the moment I don't know what to do with it. His testimony is paralleled by that of other policemen in the motorcade. He said, "...I noticed one, I didn't know who he was, but there was a man ran out into the crowd and back." Belin asked merely, "Did you notice anything else?" and the incident is at that point dropped completely. (p.248)

Baker then describes going into the building with Truly, saying "...we kind of all ran, not real fast but, you know, a godd trot, #.." (p.249) Truly rushed ahead of him up the stairs, and Baker said that as he came to the second floor, "... I caught a glimpse of this man walking away from this - I happened to see him through this window in this door. I don't know how come I saw him, but I had a glimpse of him coming down there." Note the use of the word "walk" to describe the man's pace. Later, Baker changes this to "run".

Now this door closes by an automatic closing mechanism. Truly was ahead of Baker and saw nothing unusual, either about a man or the door. At the time Baker reached this door, the outer door of the lunchroom, which is, as previously pointed out, at an angle, "... I could see him, he was walking awsy from me about 20 feet away from me in the lunchroom."

I am by no means suggesting that Baker didn't see either part of a man or something else that he might not have explicitly recalled that attracted his attention. But I am suggesting his recollection is not accurate. Baker describes a man as walking into a blank wall. This is something that completely defies explanation. If the man was 20 feet away by the time Baker ran 15 feet, the small size of the window in the outer door (Baker gress it at 2 x 2) and the angles involved in seeing simulataneously through both doors, even without regard to the

5 - Baker

increased difficulty of accomplishing this if the outer door had been open, had placed the man in close proximity to the south wall of the lunch room for which there could be no possible reason and which is not suggested in anybody's testimony.

Again Baker describes the man as "walking". (p.250)

Baker is shown Exhibit 497 (17 H 212) and here and in succeeding testimony he identifies certain marks already on the exhibit as the place where he was, as the place where he was face to face with the man who returned upon Baker's call, and he shows his path from the steps to the doorway, showing that he had not made any kind of a wide circle in the course of coming up the steps.

But on p.252, following a suggestion in the form of a question by Dulles that the man was hurrying, Baker says, "Evidently he was hurrying" and makes the point I made previously, that at the time Baker got to the door the man was "some 20 feet away from me."

But when questioned by Rep. Boggs, Baker said the man did not appear to be out of breath, "He appeared normal you know." Boggs then wants to know, "Was he calm and collected?" and Baker describes the man in the following fashion, "Yes, sir. He never did say a word or nothing. In fact, he didn't change his expression one bit." This also meant not flinching when Baker, in Balin's words, "put the gun up in his face". When Dulles corrects Balin on the position of the gun, Baker said, "I had my gun talking to him like this." There is nothing in the transcript to indicate what "like this" is, but Truly described it as pointed at Oswald's midsection and approximately touching it. Baker says it was about 3 feet away.

What kind of an assassin do we have who shows no emotion at all upon what seems like apprehension? He shows neither anger nor fear,

6 - Baker

neither anxiety nor hate, he has nothing to say, he makes no effort to do anything, and he shows no apprehension of any kind whatsoever? This is an assassin? Even the kind the Commission describes? As one who wants to get caught?

They then get into the time reconstruction which Baker says was done with a stopwatch from the time of the first shot. Actually, Baker either erred or recognized the flaw in the Commission's reconstruction and wanted to help because this is what actually happened:

"Mr. Dulles. Will you say from what time to what time, from the last shot?

Mr. Baker. From the last shot.

Mr. Belin. The first shot.

Mr. Dulles. The first shot?

Mr. Baker. The first shot." (p.252)

Saying he wanted to get it clear in his own mind, Dulles asks if this was in fact the first shot and if the timing terminated at the reconstructed time he saw Oswald. Baker affirms it. There were two such timings. The first was 1 minute 30 seconds, the second 1 minute 15 seconds. Belin asked:

"Mr. Belin. Were we walking or running when we did this?

Mr. Baker. The first time we did it a little bit slower, and the second time we hurried it up a little bit. (p.252)

Mr. Belin. Were we running or walking, when we moved, did we run or walk?

Mr. Baker. From the time I got off the motorcycle we walked the first time and then we kind of run the second time from the motorcycle on into the building.

Mr. Belin. All right. When we got inside the building did we

7 - Baker

run or trot or walk?

Mr. Baker. Well, we did it at kind of a trot, I would say, it wasn't a real fast run, an open run. It was more of a trot, kind of."
(p.253)

This is nothing but fraud. There was no possible justification for any kind of a walking reenactment. All the testimony, including that of Baker himself, is that he ran. Truly gives a description of Baker tearing madly through the people, scattering them in all directions as he ran up the steps of the Depository. They were moving so fast inside the Depository that Baker bumped into Truly before Truly opened a swinging door.

So in addition to starting at a distance considerably ^{farther} ~~farther~~ from the building than Baker was at the time of the last shot - and the assassin could not have discarded the rifle until after the last shot - the Commission here postulates a known impossibility and a known falsity. A walking reenactment has no relevance and is a deception. It is, however, used in the Commission's report.

Even the description of the pace inside the building as a trot is undoubtedly a considerable underestimation. Baker was in a real hurry. All of his testimony indicates that he was wasting not a fraction of a second. He had a specific thing in mind ^{and} ~~that~~ he was pursuing it rapidly. As it turns out from the reconstruction, this is not too important, but it nonetheless is undoubtedly a slower pace than that at which they were traveling.

Notice also that with respect to the shorter time, the 1 minute 15 second interval, even then there is no indication that Baker was running as, by his own testimony and that of Truly, he was. He said merely that instead of walking "we hurried up a little bit." This again

8 - Baker

resulted in a longer time lapse than could be justified, knowing what happened and what was seen and what was done on the 22nd of November.

Then they get into the reconstruction of Oswald's projected time from the window to the second floor:

"Mr. Belin. ~~Did~~ Did we make any or do any stopwatch tests about any route from the southeast corner of the sixth floor down to the lunch-room?

Mr. Baker. Yes, sir; we made two test runs

Mr. Belin. All right. Do you remember what the route was?

Mr. Baker. Yes, sir; we started on the sixth floor on the east side of the building.

Mr. Belin. All right.

Mr. Baker. We walked down the east wall.

Mr. Belin. We started at that particular corner?

Mr. Baker. Yes, sir; we started in the southeast corner.

Mr. Belin. All right. We walked down the east wall, you say?

Mr. Baker. That is right.

Mr. Belin. All right, then where did we go?

Mr. Baker. To the north wall and then we walked down the north wall to the west side of where the stairs was.

Mr. Belin. All right, we ~~walked~~ ^{walked} from the southeast corner to the northeast corner?

Mr. Baker. That is right.

Mr. Belin. ~~Alright~~ Then along the northeast corner, around the elevators, do you remember who was with us when we did this?

Mr. Baker. Yes, sir. There was, it seems to me like his name was John - snyway, he was a Secret Service man.

Mr. Belin. JohnHowlett.

9 - Baker

Mr. Mr. Baker. John Howlett. That is right, sir.

Mr. Belin. Did Mr. Howlett simulate anyone putting a gun in any particular place?

Mr. Baker. Yes, sir; he did.

Mr. Belin. And then what did we do when we got to the - where did he do that, do you remember?

Mr. Baker. That would be as we approached the stairway, there were some cases of books on the left-hand side there.

Mr. Belin. All right. And Secret Service Agent Howlett went over to these books and leaned over as if he were putting a rifle there?

Mr. Baker. That is right, sir.

Mr. Belin. When what did he do?

Mr. Baker. Then we continued on down the stairs. (p.253)

Mr. Belin. To the lun_chroom?

Mr. Baker. That is right, sir.

Mr. Belin. Do you remember how long that took?

Mr. Baker. The first run with normal walking took us a minute and 18 seconds.

Mr. Belin. What about the second time?

Mr. Baker. And the second time we did it at a fast walk which took us a minute and 14⁴ seconds." (p.253)

Ignoring the variables permitted by Howlett's part in this reconstruction, described as "putting" a gun in a place, and as "leaned over as if he were putting a rifle there", this took a minute and 18 seconds at a normal walking pace and only 4 seconds less with a fast walk, which seems like an optimism again worked out on behalf of the Commission's thesis.

But even accepting the figure of a minute and 18 seconds and allow-

10 - Baker

ing only 5 seconds for the interval between the shots, Baker still got to the lunchroom before Oswald. If we accept the more realistic figure, which is probably closer to the time Oswald would have taken had he, in fact, made this trip, we have then a difference of a minimum of 6^f seconds by which Baker would have preceded Oswald to the lunchroom, and even this doesn't allow for the time it would have taken Oswald to walk past Roy Truly without being seen, cross about 20 feet of open hallway, again without being seen or heard, open the door to the lunchroom and have it at least, by Baker's testimony, almost entirely closed by an automatic closing device, the time cycle of which the Commission does not at any point investigate.

So accepting the Commission's figures, and accepting their thesis, Oswald could not possibly have preceded Baker to the lunchroom.

There are other major flaws in this reconstruction. Despite the implications of the Commission to the contrary, if that rifle was on that occasion used, whoever used it stopped long enough to wipe it clear of fingerprints. This, obviously, took time. The Commission in its report does not say the rifle did not and could not ^{take and} hold fingerprints. It merely implies this. But the Report and the other testimony bearing on this indicate that, without question, the rifle could take, did take, and did hold an identifiable palmprint which was found on the only part of the rifle not accessible to wiping, lower part of the barrel between the barrel and the wooden stock, a print that could have been placed upon there only prior to the reassembly of the rifle.

Then again we have the reconstruction of Howlett "putting" a gun away and just leaning over the boxes to do it. This is in no sense a parallel of the actual testimony having to do with the location ^{and} of the discovery of this rifle. Searchers went by it 9 or 10 times without

11 - Baker

seeing it, it was so well hidden. It was described by various police witnesses as even partly hidden when they found it surrounded by walls of boxes. So even if we assume that the alleged assassin was totally unconcerned about leaving fingerprints on the boxes (and nobody would be so unconcerned, especially after he had wiped the fingerprints off the rifle), he still had to get over and through the wall of boxes, and he put the rifle down neatly and carefully on its bottom edge, propped against a wall of boxes and partly obscured. This was no simple leaning operation. It was not just a simple question of putting. This and the wiping off of the fingerprints I believe did take an appreciable amount of time not allowed for by the Commission.

Had the Commission allowed for it, this also would have completely eliminated Oswald as the assassin because he would have of necessity have been higher in the building than the second floor at the time he was encountered by Baker.

So all of this phony reconstruction, all of this invalid duplication, serves only ~~one~~ one purpose: To pin it all on Oswald, and in defiance of all the information the Commission had.

We have not only what I have cited above about the wiping off of the fingerprints and the time consumed in hiding the weapon inside a barricade of boxes. We have also the uncontested testimony of the 3 Negro employees on the fifth floor that they never heard anybody walking or running or moving in any way on the sixth floor above them, even though they thought the shots came from there. These Negroes stayed on the fifth floor for some time and described even how they went to the west window to look out it. They testified the elevators were not in motion. And the witness, Jack Dougherty, who was on the fifth floor near the elevators, saw nobody and heard nobody.

12 - Baker

This reconstruction and the Commission's entire position, in unadorned language, is nothing but a frameup.

The testimony of Baker at this point and that earlier of Truly proves clearly that anyone coming from the sixth floor to the second floor had two elevators available to him on the fifth floor and did not, in fact, use either one. Baker testified that he did not hear any elevator moving. He also testified he never saw any of the cables moving. (p.254)

And note that Baker does not say that Oswald had come down and gone through this door. By Baker's testimony, Oswald could have been in the lunchroom all of the time. He is specifically asked about this by Dulles and replied, "I can't say whether he had gone on through that door or not. All I did was catch a glance at him."

In the light of the above analysis of the Commission's "reconstruction", especially since Roy Truly saw no one entering this door and did not see the door itself in motion, the probability is that Oswald was in that lunchroom and had not come down from the floor above. Note the Commission avoids the fact that Truly could have heard and/or seen anyone coming down the stairs. This is completely consistent with what the police say Oswald told them, that he had gone up from the first floor to get a beverage. (p.255)

Dulles continues his interest in this matter after Belin gets Baker to mark Baker's path from the stairway to the doorway on Exhibit 497. Baker has reiterated "I was just stepping out onto the second floor when I caught this glimpse of this man through this doorway."

Now, leading into the vestibule are two other areas, the one in the center of the building marked "Office space," and ^athe hallway leading to the south and then turning to the east and ending in a flight

13 - Baker

of stairs leading to the first floor. According to Exhibit 497, these stairs lead to the front main entrance of the Book Depository Building. So, if Oswald had not already been in the lunchroom, and nobody saw him entering it, he could have entered the vestibule from 2 points other than the hallway leading to the stairs upward.

Dulles got to this point and asked what he himself described as a leading question: "Could I ask one question before you ask this question, and this is a bit of a leading question, and think carefully. If Oswald had been coming down the stairs and going into the lunchroom would he have been following the course insofar as you saw a course, that - that you saw him follow?" Baker's response of "Yes, sir" is completely false. He has already testified on more than one occasion that the man he saw was inside the lunchroom and he saw him through the outer door. Baker tries to explain this in terms of a hallway to the right, but is interrupted by Belin before he finishes it, and Baker then interrupts Belin to say, "This is a hallway right here." Belin says, "It is a hallway that has the number 27 on it?" to which Baker agrees. Now, actually, the hallway does not have the number 27 on it. There is approximately 90 feet of hallway illustrated on Exhibit 497. The point at which the Commission decided to mark a number on this exhibit representing the hallway just by pure coincidence happened to be exactly the point at which the doorway was. So, unless ~~you~~ ^{you} examine Exhibit 497 with extreme care, you will find this doorway almost entirely obliterated by arrow symbol employed by the Commission with a circle in which the number 27 is enclosed. Doesn't it seem odd that with all those feet of hallway in which to put a symbol, the Commission elected to use only that spot which could result in a deception?

Baker then says that he understood there are offices along the

14 - Baker

hallway and Dulles agreed. Baker then switches roles from witness to analyst and moralist: "And he had no business in there and the lunch-room would be the only place that he would be going, and there is a door out here that you can get out and to the other part of the building."

Now this was none of Baker's business as a witness. Entirely aside from whether or not it was his business, he was completely wrong. If in no other respect, it is one of the means of getting to a lunch-room from the first floor, and this is precisely what Oswald, according to the police, had told the police he had done. In any event, Baker's comment does not constitute testimony; it should not have been permitted by the Commission. Once it was out, it should not have been permitted to stay uncontested in the record or in the record in any fashion. It is thoroughly and completely incompetent.

However, it suited the purposes of the staff of the Commission for it to remain, and it does remain. There is no comment, criticism or question of Baker about it. (p.256)

Baker is asked to describe Oswald as he was dressed and while admitting he was uncertain he said, "he had a light brown jacket on and maybe some kind of white-looking shirt." (p.257)

The next several pages are occupied in rehashing and retracing Baker's movements and observations after he left the lunchroom. He and Truly took the elevator to the sixth floor and walked up to the seventh floor. In the course of this, Baker points out that in his opinion the shots could have come from either the Depository Building or the one across the street. This is a very likely possibility that the Commission has entirely ignored. It also has ignored the revelation in the police radio log that a suspect who had no business in the second building was, in fact, apprehended there. I have as yet seen nothing

15 - Baker

indicating what happened to this man after he was picked up by the police. (p.259)

Baker made a rapid inspection of the 7th floor and the roof, because he had been certain the top of the building was one of the points from which the shots could have come.

Even when he walked from the 7th floor to the 6th floor after this inspection, it never seems to have occurred to him to have inspected the 6th floor, which was not only at the top of the building, but also because there was an open window there and he himself elsewhere testifies to having made a rapid examination of this side of the building and noticed people in the windows and windows open. But instead of his looking on the 6th floor, he went down in the elevator (p.260) and on either the 3rd or the 4th floor saw Inspector Sawyer, believes he reported what he had done to Insp. Sawyer, and refers to no instructions of any kind that he got. As a completely free agent, he left the inspector (p.261) (and as he subsequently testified decided to go first to the Trade Mart and then to Parkland Hospital - p.265).

Here we have a picture of an organized, responsible, disciplined trained police force. And Baker didn't waste any time getting out of the building. His words were, that, when he got off the elevator, he left Mr. Truly there and "I immediately went on out." (p.262)

Dulles asks Texas Attorney General Carr if he has any questions to ask, and Carr does:

"Mr. Carr. Yes, sir; at the time he has been testifying about. Did you have occasion during the rest of the day either in passing visits or idle conversation or anything of that type with any of the people that were there at the time who might have seen something or told you some theory they had about what might have happened?

Mr. Baker. Not until last Friday morning. Chief Lunday, which

16 - Baker

is my chief in traffic, called me and asked me to go down to this Texas Depository Building, and I had - I have worked traffic outside several times but I never did go inside or talk to any of the employees.

Mr. Carr. I am referring to the people who were out there at the time of the shooting...." (p.264)

Perhaps Carr had no interest in what Baker learned the previous Friday morning, but there can be no question, the Commission should have had an interest. It didn't. So whatever Baker may have learned at the Book Depository the ^{Friday} previous to his testimony, is totally unrecorded.

Then Baker said the only people he talked to at the time of the assassination were his companion motorcycle policemen (p.264) They were talking about where each of the flankers was with relationship to the car in which the President was riding, and all agreed that at the time of the first shot they didn't know whence it came. Then: "The second shot they still didn't know, and then the third shot some of them over to the left-hand side, the blood and everything hit their helmets and their windshields and they they knew it had to come from behind." Baker quotes Officer B. J. Martin, who he describes as having been on "the left front" of the President's car. This is inaccurate. There was no motorcycle in front of or abreast of the President's car by apparently the President's own instruction, judging from the testimony of the other motorcycle policemen. Hence, there is significance having to do with the source of the shot coming from the parts of the policemen splattered with blood and other human materials, and if their being splattered while in front of the President proved that the bullet had come from behind, is not the converse true; since they were behind the president, does it not mean that the bullet came from the front? (See depositions of Martin and Hartgis.)

Baker continues with his second description of the splattering of

17 - Baker

the policemen and their motorcycles and again, when asked by Dulles, is entirely uncorrected by the staff, who obviously knew better, when he said of these policemen, "They were immediately in front of the car."

The silence of the staff, especially with the member of the Commission involved, cannot be regarded as a simple oversight. (p.265)

Baker then runs two important observations together. The first is the hearsay he got from Officer Jim Chaney who, as I pointed out above, was never called by the Commission. Note that Chaney said each of the 3 shots hit separately and that one hit the Governor and did not hit the President. The only question asked by Belin establishes the fact that Chaney was at least as good a witness as could be expected because he was, other than the occupants of the car, closest to it and presumably looking at its occupants.

The other point, that the car almost came to a stop, is frequently referred to by a number of witnesses and always avoided by the Commission. Baker's reference to Truly is precise and accurate and in my analysis of Truly's testimony I pointed out how, among other things, this maneuver by the Presidential car so close to the curb opposite the door to the Depository itself, invalidated all of the alleged reconstruction coming from the window because the Presidential car was not where the Commission presumed it was in its reconstruction.

Baker also quotes Chaney as having said of the shot merely that it came from behind and as specifically not knowing where behind. He also quotes Chaney again as seeing the shots strike home. (p.266)

Returning again to how Baker entered the building, he said, "As I ran in I was pushing them aside and running through them ..." This addresses itself to my analysis in which I pointed out that Truly had described Baker as dashing madly through the crowd, scattering people as he went. This is anything but a walk, anything but a trot. He de-

18 - Baker

scribes himself as making the best time he could. Also in this sequence of testimony, he reveals that he had seen the front of the building, and when asked by Sen. Cooper, "did you notice whether anyone was looking out of the windows ...?" he replied affirmatively, saying a number were open and " ... to the best of my recollection, I scanned those windows, but I can't recall anybody looking out of them, you know."

It can be understood that after, as he testified, looking at buildings throughout the entire motorcade, Baker might have no independent recollection of 3 people looking out of the windows of the Book Depository Building. But it is asking too much to expect, that, after having heard a shot, having identified it as a shot, if he had seen a barrel protruding from a building when he was looking at the building, he would not have noticed it or not have remembered it. This addresses itself to the testimony of Brennan who may, in fact, have seen a weapon in the building, but who, as I indicated in the analysis of his testimony, could not very well have seen as much of the weapon as he said he did. Brennan was closer to the building and he was farther to the west. But by Brennan's description, Baker could not have avoided seeing a major part of the rifle. Needless to say, this is of no interest to the Commission. (p.267)

Again one of those cases where Baker wanted to say something and didn't get a chance. He is asked by Sen. Cooper if he could "see the railroad yards", to which he replied affirmatively and was then asked, "did you see anything there which attracted your attention other than - " and Baker interrupted to say, "Nothing except - " and was at this point interrupted by Sen. Cooper who addressed Baker's attention to the crowd. If Baker had anything in mind that attracted his attention other than the crowd, we probably will never know it.

19 - Baker

He again describes the mysterious man "... I saw this man run out into this crowd and back. I don't know who he was but I ~~just~~ saw that ...". This happened, he said, as he parked his motorcycle and saw the Presidential car "had swerved to the left." Baker thought this man came from one of the cars "right there by the President's car. He was, he came from the motorcade, inside the motorcade out to the sidewalk and then back." (p.268)

Questioned about his immediate recognition of the first as a rifle shot, (because Belin knew that all of the Secret Service people who should have recognized it said they didn't) Baker replied, "To me it was immediately a rifle shot...." He said that a lot of the solo officers thought it was a backfire, "But that instant it just, I don't know, it just hit me as a rifle shot."

He gives an interesting picture of his mates in the police department saying that, while he himself is unfamiliar with foreign guns, "most of the boys down there at the police department have had dealings with foreign type guns, rifles, you know of this kind, and a lot of them sell them, and a lot of them rework them, you know, make them into deer rifles."

Nobody on the Commission and none of its staff is interested in this/~~commentary~~ on the Dallas police.

Then Baker, describing the backfire from a motorcycle as a "pop", says there is a difference between that sound and the sound of a rifle. (p. ~~268~~ 269)