

Paul and Dick,

10/10/70

In the few moments before the expected arrival of "in" I was to work on my suits with me - and want better context for noting the currency of that for the suppressed spectrographic analyses/2 a few comments on Dicks 10/11/70.

First of all the most emphatic possible concurrence with the responsibility charged at the end, were I not now very late ago, at the outset of Paul's disclosure to me of this project, I urged him to check the ballistics with Dick, which magnifies the responsibilities consequent to this failure.

These comments are from memory and may be imprecise.

Page 2-Kellerman actually testified that most of the X-rays were of the lead, but my recollection is that despite this, the panel's relevant reading is of but a single one. To know also that X-rays are and have been missing - that at the outset they were not all given to Kellerman. With the reading apparently being of a single X-ray, that is, of a single projection, I suggest there is an indeterminate number of other dustlike fragments hidden by the fluorescence of that perceived from that single projection. If I think this unessential to Dick's reasoning, I think it also fortifies it and diminishes the expectable amount of fragments to be accounted for otherwise. Here I skip to the long paragraph on 7 to add that the car was washed at the hospital. I suspected this to begin with, as my 2/65 writing shows, got confirmation from Tom Wicker not long thereafter, that summer-as saw the bucket of bloody water - and since then as various official and incontrovertible confirmation, not from the Archives and given to me in person.

Penultimate paragraph: is is precisely this that led me to the attempt to trace the alleged ammo purchases that you may recall from "W" and one of the reasons for my very early interests in and efforts to get the spectro, my first letter to Justice being dated 6/23. It had to be obvious if one with so little knowledge of ballistics could detect it.

3- Dick did mention this to me, long ago, but again, it had to be obvious, if one understands the purposes of the Geneva convention, which dominates the characteristics of military ammo, even its design - not to fragment.

Para 2 and 3, if Dick can cite a standard source for me for future use I'd appreciate it. Anything NRA on it?

4- to add to what you say on varieties, I used .30-06 without identifying it or was and now reloaded. Remington-Peters alone lists 9 different such standard bullets. Then there is the Nosler, etc.

5 Also for my own, future use, I'd appreciate a clear copy of the illustration, esp. if there is also one showing dispersion pattern after hitting something hard, like Masonite, too. Could fit into "M III" perfectly.

Bottom - if only one type of ammo was used, is it not appropriate to ask why there is no similar, dustlike pattern in the x-ray area in panel report - or how such a project could, honorably, even be conceived with these vital discrepancies between the autopsy and the panel report on it?

While I would presume it would be too much of a burden for you to distribute all the comments and criticisms he got, I'd like to know if there is any major disagreement with what I sent and if there is any major agreement with what I wrote, if there is any critic or scientific approval of the design of the "test" or the interpretation of the "results".

Sincerely, m