

(Based on a fairly quick check of my on-hand list)

PLH X 3/9/75

1 ✓	Jan 10	JEH to JLR	Will Get		Arrangements with AEC for NAA
2 ✓	Feb 4	R/CNS JEH	H.47	3 pp.	Basis for ballistics identification in CD 5
3 ✓	Feb 7	JEH to JLR	D.6	2 pp.	Basis for firearms ident. [Reply to 2/4 ltr]
4 ✓	Feb 12	R/HPW JEH	DLA.20	2	Wants more detail, firearms ident. [Ref. to 2/7]
5 ✓	Feb 18	JEH to JLR	Will get		More details on firearms ident. [Ref is in 2/24]
6 ✓	Feb 24	R/HPW JEH	DLA.21	1	[This is CD 383, 1&3&5 pp; have on APK film]
7 ✓	Mar 4	MAE JLR	Will get	4	Thanks for 2/18 ltr, firearms ident.
8 ✓	Mar 10	JEH JLR	CE 2455	2	Ballistics identification [25H604] NAA on paraffin casts
9 ✓	Mar 11	JEH JLR	Will get	1	[This refers to the Jan 10 letter]
10 ✓	Mar 13	JEH JLR	423.3	1	JFK ballistics [cartridge clip 42]
11 ✓	Mar 18	JEH JLR	20H1-2	2	Independent examination of firearms
X12 X	Mar 24	JEH JLR	#13X.9	1	[Refers to a 3/12 discussion with MAE]
C13 -	Mar 18	JEH JLR	Will get	1	Misc. MAE questions from 3/16 discussion
14 ✓	Apr 2	JEH JLR	CE 2561	1	[Gallagher Ex. 1] [Possibility of NAA on coat hole discussed]
15 ✓	Jul 2	NR AWD	Will get	1	Lead in car-spectro [Reply to 3/18 ltr]
16 X	Jul 8	JEH JLR	#13X.21	1	Wants info re exam of car, description of scene
					Paraffin tests, rifle (unreliable) [Ref: 3/30 discussion with MAE]
					NAA; Dulles' proposed Readers Digest article
					Spectro; minor differences found
					[This is the letter Wecht quotes in full]

Dear Jim, Archives response on 226-75 request

6/8/75

I put the papers you sent in chronological order and compared them with the list from Paul Hoch, eliminating from his list what his brief descriptions identify as ballistics, or eliminating all he does not explicitly say are relevant.

I thought you had not sent me all you got. However, I think now that it is more likely I remembered others from having them.

They sent us Hoover's 3/18/64 letter to Rankin dealing with a discussion of two days earlier (I had this). They did not send Hoover's reply of 3/24/64.

They did not send the 7/8/64 Hoover to Rankin on minor differences shown by NAA. I believe I have this and used it five years ago in PH.

(Before we really got into 2301-70 I started a file for use if needed and for the NAA I expected to go for after that suit. I had it in the special file I set up for this spectro litigation. That folder is gone. It is possible that in shifting files when I got new cabinets I mislaid it but I do not see how this would have happened because I have gone through the entire part of the drawer.)

My original is gone. I have a copy of it I made. This is probably the thing about which Guril has been proclaiming loudly that he ended suppression.

I'm sure there is more.

Johnson has not honored my request to know which papers the FBI discussed with him so we can know which embody conclusions and he has not answered my letter.

Looking at the 11/23/63 lab report to Gurry again reminds me that I forgot, in telling you that Kelley's 4/10/75 letter cites reference to the clothing, to tell you of the extra need to give an NAA to Q2 and Q3. Both had copper. But spectrographic was inconclusive, it says. Could not determine if same.

CD5:163-5 is a duplication of the above as DL 89-43, all inside " marks. In the margin attributing "similarity" to the lead of Qs 4,5,9,14 and 15 to that of Q2 is a check mark.

AEC 12/11/63 to Herbert Miller. AEC experienced in criminalistics, vo, unteered to FBI "within 24 hours."

Top page two says possible to determine identification unfired, fatal bullets (sic) by "trace-element measurements."

Vincent Quinn was in charge of this work at General Atomic, the AEC contractor. He is the guy Nichols used, to go over results only.

6/2/64 is no more than a Warren form letter to all agencies.

1/7/64 is Seaborg's reply saying work is already underway with FBI at Oak Ridge.

1/7/64 Rankin to Hoover on taking AEC 12/11/63 up.

1/10/64 Hoover's reply noting work in progress as per Seaborg's 1/7/

3/10/64 Hoover tells Rankin NAA on paraffin casts "could not be specifically associated with the rifle cartridges."

3/18/64 JEH letter, Gallagher Ex 1, is CR 525. I had it, too.

7/2/64 Redlich to Dulles: NAA "at best the [NA] analysis shows that Oswald may have fired a pistol, although this is by no means certain." And "There is no basis for also concluding that he also fired a rifle..."

9/5/64 Eisenberg NAA "questions should be asked the FBI," and not a bit too soon with the presses rolling 19 days later. If they were asked, we were not given a copy of the reply. We could use 1, a description of the NAA test. Restricted to paraffin tests.

9/8/64 JEH to MLR. Oddly conveys a second copy of the 3/18/64 letter.

None of these contain either meaningful "results" or details of what I asked for.

Even the JEH masked letter we got from DJ is missing. So is a page and a half lab paper we got and I had and I think was published, identical with the beginning

of the first item, the 11/23/63 to Curry.

They did not give us CD205:15344 12/5/63 ~~xxxx~~ lab report to Rowley reported in it (undated). Says back shirt spectro contains copper. Not alloy, only copper. Front: "No bullet metal was found..." Does not say re tie.

We were not given Rowley's 11/23/63 to which this refers, repeating the response.

Please remember for the judge that we are not permitted to ramble through the Archives's files, the FBI would not tell us which documents they mean and would not give us copies, we did ask the Archives, and we are at their mercy. The one thing we can say with certainty is that they did not give us all they have and have to know they have.

Remember also that a DJ employee at the Commission, Howard Wullens, ended the making of an index as an economy measure.

Perhaps without telling him what we have you ~~ought~~ ought to ask the FBI's honcho again, telling him the ^{answer} ~~status~~ of the Archives was delayed, incompletely an answer at best, and leaves us without certainty as to what they are referring to. If necessary tell him you'll file a other FOI suit if he does not stop playing games with us. We are entitled to this wherever we make the request, and they, not we, are required to refer. We want 100% and no more nonsense, etc. remind him that Kilty swore we had been given all whereas they had not given these reports in whatever form they exist.

If nothing may help along this line with Pratt, it will be a good appeal record and will make clear that the simplest part of the request is unmet after swearing it had been met completely and so many months after the initial request.

This kind of chickenshit ought influence all but the hardheads.

est,