

AS:mLn

INV 5

MEMORANDUM

Int

March 11, 1964

TO: Mr. J. Lee Rankin

FROM: Arlen Specter

SUBJECT: Witnesses Who Testified Before the Commission on March 9 and 10, 1964

On March 9, 1964, Roy H. Kallerman, William R. Green, Clinton J. Hill, and Rufus W. Frankford testified before the Commission. As you know, I interviewed these witnesses on March 3rd and 4th at which times they told me of the assassination events just as they were set forth in their statements previously provided to us by the Secret Service.

The testimony of the four Secret Service agents was very similar to the information provided in their prior interviews. Kallerman added a significant element when he testified before the Commission that he believed there must have been more than three shots. I then developed fully all of the factors which led to this conclusion. Mr. Green told me on March 3rd that he recalled three shots, but testified that he heard three shots. All four witnesses expressed me as being credible. Mr. Kallerman tended to elaborate on the events with explanations of the various occurrences. Mr. Green testified in an abbreviated fashion sticking close to what he knew for sure. Mr. Hill was an extremely articulate witness and had a thorough grasp of all the factors about which he testified. Mr. Frankford also was quite articulate and poised in his testimony.

In my opinion all these witnesses did their very best to recount the situation as they recalled it. Notwithstanding that, it is my conclusion that they do not accurately recall many of the details on the precise time or sequence of shots or their exact movements and reactions during the crucial 5 or 6 seconds.

Since the question had not been resolved as to the policy on interviewing witnesses with or without a verbatim transcript advance of their testimony, I did not interview Robert M. Jackson, Arnold Louis Rowland, James Robert Marshall or Anon Lee Haine in advance of their being called to testify before the Commission. In my

view their testimony would have been somewhat better organized and more coherent with a pre-testimony interview, but all factors considered, their testimony was reasonably well.

Mr. Jackson was the oldest and most mature of this group and was a very credible witness. Trained as a photographer, it is my conclusion that substantial reliance can be placed upon his observations, especially in view of his spontaneous declaration at that time, corroborated by the other witnesses in the automobile with him. Mr. Jackson gave the impression of being confident of the factors he recalled and was, in general, an impressive witness.

Arnold Louis Rowland presented the picture of being a good-looking, bright, well-dressed young man. While he has the face of an 18-year old, he has the carriage and demeanor of an individual somewhat older. He gave the impression of being alert and intelligent, and he testified that he had straight A's during most of his high school career and had an I-Q. of 147. At the conclusion of his testimony he broke down when Senator Cooper asked a well-intended question as to whether it occurred to Mr. Rowland to call to the attention of a nearby policeman the presence in the window of the man with the gun. Rowland assumed that that was a recurring dream which he had which indicated his deep emotional involvement in the event.

There are many details of Rowland's testimony which cast significant doubt as to whether he could have observed and remembered so much. He testified that he had told the FBI on two occasions about the negro gentlemen in the alleged assassination window which, of course, must be checked out. My impression was that the witness was telling the truth as he remembered it, but he had obviously thought about the subject on a great many occasions and had passed the assassination scene frequently which may provide the basis for his recollections of the event.

Congressman Ford did not notice that Rowland was starting to become upset and began to ask a line of questions which the Chief Justice interrupted. Congressman Ford asked me to ask the questions in behalf of Rowland which I did in the intervening weeks, but they were not put on the record because Rowland did not return to the afternoon session. The Chief Justice very graciously sent Rowland on a tour of Washington with his chauffeur. Rowland told me that he passed by the assassination scene every day because it was on his way to work, but he had never gone back to the scene and stood there to try to recreate what he saw. I have drafted a brief memorandum to Congressman Ford on this subject which I am attaching to this memorandum. The transmission to him is your approval.

James Richard Worell was a very dull and inarticulate witness. He impressed me as being honest and straight forward, but not very alert. I do not place a great deal of reliance on his testimony and the position

which he described he was in, when he looked up and saw the rifle, was a
downward position. Horrell testified that he put his head straight
back and looked up so that his eyes would have been looking straight
ahead in a line of extension of 100 degrees from his body. It is very
possible that he did see the rifle but it is most likely that he turned
his head in a different position if, in fact, he did see the rifle.

Amos Lee Ekins was an inarticulate young negro boy (age 16) who,
nevertheless, did a reasonably good job in relating what he saw. He
was noted as being credible and I evaluate his testimony as being
believable. I concluded that it was not worthwhile to resolve the number
of minor inconsistencies among his various statements and testimony.