

**NR\_key\_name:** ED7B21FE5576FF6C8625651B00073AB3

**SendTo:** Eileen\_Sullivan @ jfk-arrrb.gov

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

**From:** MGriffith\_2@compuserve.com

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 09/22/1997

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 9:16:32 PM

**ComposedDate:**

**ComposedDate\_Time:**

**Subject:** Re: Question  
Mrs. Sullivan, you wrote, "I know you are aware that the Board made the decision to pursue the area of the medical evidence because so much of the controversy in the assassination emanates from this area and there was a desire to attempt to clarify the existing record and determine if there were other records not in the JFK Collection. However, the Board has had to be very careful in allocating resources for this type of project that "pushes the envelope" on our authority under the JFK Act. I did make a specific inquiry about your suggestion regarding Officer Baker. Your suggestion remains on an informal list with many similar suggestions, all presented to the Board as being important and worthy of our attention. This informal list is always being reviewed and reevaluated, but the focus during our last year will be on the completion of the review of existing records. Should the Board staff desire additional information regarding your suggestion on Officer Baker, you would be contacted on this matter. <<<I have recommended reinterviewing Officer Baker precisely because his extant testimony is so incomplete and in need of crucial clarification. The issue of Baker's encounter with Oswald is hugely critical because it goes to the very heart of the matter of placing Oswald on the sixth floor during the shooting. Respected assassination researchers like Harold Weisberg and Anthony Summers have written about the severe problems with Baker's testimony as it relates to his encounter with Oswald. As Weisberg has pointed out, (1) the Warren Commission seemed to carefully avoid the thorny problems raised by what Baker did say, and (2) the Commission failed to ask Baker a number of questions that were both obvious and crucial. Even on the basis of just what Baker did say, one can make a credible case that Baker's testimony indicates Oswald was not, and could not have been, on the sixth floor during the shooting. If Baker were properly questioned, significant, historic progress could be made in this area. I discussed these issues in my initial message on Baker's testimony, but allow me to briefly review some of them: \* Baker apparently initially said Oswald was drinking a Coke when Baker spotted Oswald in the lunchroom on the second floor. Then, in his final sworn statement, Baker dictated to the interviewing FBI agent that Oswald did in fact have a Coke in his hand when Baker first spotted him in the lunchroom. Yet, at the end of the interview, Baker lined through his statement about the Coke, without explanation. This is a crucial issue because one cannot imagine how Oswald could have had the time to beat Baker to the lunchroom to such a degree that he had time to buy a Coke and have it in his hand by the time Baker first saw him. Commission staffers and their defenders recognized the importance of this issue early on. \* Baker was not specific when he discussed the status of the foyer door when he reached the second-floor landing, and the Commission, incredibly, did not pin him down on this monumentally important issue. That door had an automatic closer, but to this day we don't

**Body:**

**recstat:**

**DeliveryPriority:**

**DeliveryReport:**

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**