Albredge steet

JEK assaudination records appeals Harold Weisberg 11/26/79

— Scientific testing - other shooting; Dallas records

In a prior appeal I provided details of belated taking of a maple and the making of scientific tests of a reported impact of a bullet not otherwise accounted for he the official explanation of the assassination of Freedent Kennedy. a Not Recorded sorial of 10/28 66, Dallas to Director, attention Lab, forwards "material from midemalk," identified as Item Q618. I believe that this relates to what was reported by an man named Aldredge, a matter I brought to light in my second book. The Dallas records I have read disclose that although Dallas told HQ not to return the specimen BQ did divest itself of it twice. I have not found the results of the testing, spectrographic analysis, in any records provided. The results of this testing are clearly within my request in C.A. 75-226, presently before the appeals court. The FRI made no reference to this at all at any point in this long litigation. You will recall, baving your own means of recalling, that this matter was first litigated in 1970 and want to the Supreme Court. The apetrographic plate or plates were not shows to me at a pre-trial conference with the FML. None of the spectrographic plates have been provided in response to by request for them. This one was not referred to by the PM at the pre-trial conference. Of course if the testing disclosed that there use the impact of a bullet, particularly if that could not be related to the so-called Oswald rifle, the official solution to the crime would be in serious distress. And as the disclosed records leave without doubt, the Founding Director ordedned this solution as soon as he beard of the orice, virtually.

For your information Aldredge was more of the reported impact of this bullet, on the mideralk near the building from which all the shots were fired in the efficial accounting of them, because it was on TV at the time of the crime. So when the Warren peport made no reference to this shot he asked the PEI have come. The PEI's response was to ask him to explain his believed reporting of it. His rejoinder is that he had assumed that the PEI had investigated the crime and was some of what was public.

I cannot explain the delay of two more years in obtaining the sample and anking the tests, except to correlate it with public attention to my and other criticisms.