

Dear Jim and Mark,

7/28/89

Thanks for the Misbet 7/6/89 and attachments. I've read them and if we have further correspondence about them I've filed all but the single document relating to the FBI's interview with Rolando Otero, I'm filing them under the HSCA and Otero under his name. I have no clear recollection of Otero or those bombings, which I do recall, however.

Sprague was engagingⁱⁿ the kind of pointless arrogance I'd warned him against and there really was no useful purpose to be served by his needlessly antagonizing the FBI.

It happens I do not recall any Dallas citizen turning in a fragment of a bullet. I do recall a number of spent bullets but can't identify this particular incident because the FBI omits the name and date.

My recollection is that the FBI returned all the submitted specimens to the Dallas office from the Lab with the comment each was worthless because it would not have fit in Oswald's rifle. If this is of interest to anyone I do have separate files on each such incident I saw in the files and I did look at every Dallas page.

Perhaps there was a purpose in the FBI's risen back because it could have determined the caliber without examination of the test bullets and if not the Oswald caliber it could have said so and gone no farther. I think it probably is not unlikely that the FBI could have compared the specimen with its Lab's pictures of the test bullets and eliminated them on that basis alone.

So the only apparent reason for the nature of the FBI's response was to have a legit complaint against HSCA, which I think it did, and to set the stage for what it could anticipate would follow.

If you or Mark know anything about this particular specimen I'd appreciate copies for filing and perhaps for content.

I think also that the FBI went out of its way to underinform the AG about the specimen and its history. When it underinforms or avoids specifics it usually has some purpose in mind, as it does when it overwhelms with details.

In thinking about this it became apparent that the only use to which the test bullets could be used was comparison with this submitted specimen. That meant that except for being handled by fingers and perhaps put under a misc microscope the test bullets would not have been touched in any way. Certainly they would not have been damaged and no samples would have been removed for such things as spectro and NAA.

So what could Sprague have been up to except picking a stupid thing with which to establish his turf. Particularly when the FBI agreed to an Archives presence. That is exactly what ~~the FBI~~ HSCA did when it had Gidm make NAAs. And that was not with test bullets but with alleged assassination evidence.

I'm disappointed not to have heard from you or Dan about what appears to be an in-progress FBI smear of me that I think is valuable to you in Mark's case after they argued as they did based on the Reporters decision. And a means of at least judicial expose of the FBI and its FOI/PA practises and claims.

best,

