

12 April 71

Dear Sylvia:

I am sorry that you are having trouble publishing your excellent article on Givens, for that matter badly needs to be exposed. I wish that I could offer suggestions as to what else you might do, but I am sure that you would know more about such things than I.

The news that you have not published the article leaves me with a small problem-- if it is that. Believing that the piece had already been published, or would soon be published, I sent a copy to Howard Roffman, for ~~that~~ the matter bears very directly on things that he treats in his book. I sincerely hope that you do not mind my sending it to him. If you do, please excuse me, and have my assurance that Howard would not in any way refer to that material without first receiving your explicit permission.

Also, in a recent letter I briefly outlined your conclusions to Harold, but I did not send him a copy.

Roffman was thrilled by the article, as I learned from this morning's mail. He asked for a bibliographical reference to it, so that he could refer to it in a footnote, but since the article has not been published and there seems no immediate prospect of publication, I do not know what to tell him. The publication of his book would be relatively far in the future, since he has not yet sent it to a publisher, and still anticipates some re-writing, so that probably your article on Givens will have been published before then.

I'll advise Roffman to do the following: Write the footnote, and refer to the article as an unpublished monograph. If the article is published before the book, then he can revise so as to refer to the periodical in ~~xxx~~ which it appears. If not, then he can write to you requesting permission to refer to the article. If you say that it is all right, he can use the footnote as written; if not, then he can simply delete the footnote. Roffman would well understand if you declined to let him refer to the article, for he has a good sense of who controls literary material, and a fine respect for other people's wishes in this regard. Unless I hear otherwise from you, I'll assume that this proposal is acceptable.

The news that you gave about the Walker bullet seems important indeed. Without more information than you provide (I have not yet reviewed the record of the bullet), I cannot say anything definite. If the person who turned up the recent data about the bullet does not plan to pursue the matter, please tell me, for I think other things should be done-- things that might settle important questions, two questions basically: is the bullet recovered from Walker's house the same as came into evidence as CE573? and is the bullet that Frazier et al. examined the same as the one presently in the Archives?

You recall, of course, that just after the Walker incident the bullet was identified as 30/06 (this is a spurious designation, since 30/06 refers to the cartridge, which cannot not be known from a bullet alone. What was meant--probably-- was .30 caliber, which is a proper designation for a bullet). Steel jackets are not uncommon in the once-standard and readily available ~~30/06 military grade~~ bullets used in the military versions of the 30/06 cartridge use by U.S. ~~and~~ forces. Even today they use steel jacketed bullets in some of the now-standard 7.62 NATO cartridge. So, if the true Walker bullet

were .30 caliber, it would not be surprizing if it were steel jacketed.

I am fairly certain that no 6.5 M-C bullets were made with steel jackets, although some were made with a jacketing material that might be mistaken for steel. This is a jacket composed of copper and nickel that has the silvery appearance of steel.

I do not think that a .30 cal. bullet would be confused with a 6.5 M-C, regardless of color. For one thing, the 6.5 is long and thin-- it's shape is very distinctive, unlike any fully jacketed .30 cal. bullet that I know of. The most commonly used fully jacketed .30 cal bullets weigh about 150 grains; they are discernibly thicker and shorter than a 6.5. Moreover, the fully jacketed .30 cal rounds are constructed with sharply pointed noses, not rounded like those of 6.5's.

The information that the bullet now in the Archives shows no identification marks needs to be pursued farther-- it may be the most important off all. A lot can, and should, be done. For example, check the record so as to be absolutely sure that the bullet ~~x~~ itself was marked for identifiaction, for sometimes examiners mark the container of the bullet (although it is normal practice to mark the evidence itself). If the record does not give definite information, I might even try writing to the Dallas Police, FBI, Nicol, et al. to learn whether they would provide definite information about how the bullet was identified. Supposing that there was written evidence of the bullet itself being marked, I would have archives first send all the pictures of CE 573 currently in their possession, and any than can get from the FBI (i.e., picture that the FBI took but did not turn over to the Commission) and/or the Dallas Police. Once these are in my possession, I would have Archives make several pictures of the bullet now in their possession, from different angles. Then compare the two sets of pictures to see whether they show the same bullet. There is more to be done, too, but that would make a good start.

Let me know if your friend plans to do anything. I don't think that the matter should be allowed to rest. The information now in hand is not sufficient to warrant anything but very cautious comment.

In glancing over the record, I found a remark by Eisenberg that you will find interesting. At 3H39 Frazier says that the bullet has his marking on it (I assume he meant the bullet, and not the container). Eisenberg then asks: "Can you think of any reason why someone might have called this a steel-jacketed bullet?" It's clear that Eisenberg knew the report designating the Walker bullet as steel jacketed.

I probably won't do much serious research on the Walker bullet unless you tell me that your informant plans to let the matter be. Otherwise, I shall bother about it. There is need to be cautious, for Frazier and other made some errors which ~~xxxx~~ I have found difficult to explain either in terms off innocent error or of deliberate intent. These things definitely are errors, but they are nonsensical errors-- at least I can't explain them. It's largely because I can't explain the "why" of these errors that I havn't done memo's on them. It's really very strange.

If the need arises to discredit Frazier in court, these things will be useful, for they give a very damaging view of his competence, but presently they don't seem to lead anywhere. Later, when I have time, I'll send you an example or two, so that you will know what I mean. It would take some preliminary explanation, and presently I don't have the time.

If your article ~~gax~~ on Givens gets published, please tell me, so that I can pass the word to Roffman.

Still,

*Dirk*