

4/27/69

Dear Dick,

I have not sent the letter to Playboy because I am certain the timing, formulation and approach are wrong for them. If you feel otherwise, send it attention Mr. Goode and use my name.

They agonized over coming to see me for months, then didn't. They sweated over some of my unpublished stuff and then didn't go for it. Their explanation is that they would publish nothing again on the subject unless they could solve the crime. You know what the Burkley signature on what I have it and the authorization are sensational, scandalous things. They saw these and many others in February 1968. Now we also know they have not ended treatment of the subject, for they are publishing-commissioned-Kirkwood. So, it boils down to a fear to handle except in special formats, like interviews.

It is better to approach them with the completed article, for they do not know you. Failing in that, then a simple letter would be much more effective and have none of the (for them) liabilities of your approach. One is stipulating appearance with Kirkwood. They will find it an unacceptable stipulation and would reject on this basis alone. It may also be a mechanical impossibility. If you want me to elaborate, I will.

Hasty comment on the addition to the sections on dents:

Page 1- par. 2 do you not want to note that the case also gets marked? "all traces" or "all visible traces"?; par 5 "allegedly" before ordered; par. 6, can we postulate that no bullet was fired from the cases?; six, "Oswald" rifle, quote to ~~marks~~ indicate lack of positive proof it was his or that he even ordered it.

Page 2-lines 203, why not indicate no fingerprints on shells, unusual for actual use and significant if planted; par 3, is it only the firing-pin marking the fremer knew was needed, or did you restrict it to this for a purpose?

Page 3- par 3, "directed" or "ordered" rather than "caused", and I think that here you should lean on the Commission, really its lawyers, with reference to the character and limitations of the questioning, for, technically, a witness is restricted to responding to questions. Frazier did not design this. Had he been told to find out what had happened, this is what he would have done. He was given a job to do. He did that job, nothing else. Relevant here is what you discovered with the trajectory, etc. If you were in a position where you could ask him and get an answer, he would say I did what I was asked to do, nothing else.

I have lost the range-master's phone but will get in touch soon.

No word from Lincoln.

Nothing else new, save that Dawney is going out of business. I have a young helper in London now.

Hurriedly,

What do we know now? What can we say with absolute certainty?

There are but two ways of removing a bullet from a loaded cartridge: either you shoot it out, or you pull it out. If you shoot it out, the cartridge case takes essentially the shape of the chamber in which it was fired, and if there is a dent on the case when a bullet is fired from it, all traces of the dent are removed. If you pull the bullet out, the cartridge case retains its original shape and all of its original defects, even when its primer is subsequently fired.

CEs 544 and 545 (dented case shoulder) held bullets when they were dented, but bullets cannot have been fired from them; the firing of bullets would have obliterated the dents. The bullets that were seated in CEs 544 and 545 were pulled and discarded.

Of CE 543 (dented case mouth) what has been said does not yet conclusively establish that it never fired a bullet, for it is possible to suppose that a bullet was fired from it and that subsequently the empty case was dented in the course of a faulted attempt to chamber it. In anticipation of evidence that will be presented in another part of this article, I ask the reader at this point merely to accept the assertion that CE 543 never fired a bullet. Even now, however, it is possible to know that CE 543 did not fire a bullet at the President; the case mouth would have retained its uninterrupted circular shape if a bullet had been fired from it during the assassination.

The primers of the three cartridge cases bear microscopic marks which were made by the firing pin and bolt face of no other weapon than the one that Oswald ordered. That Mannlicher-Carcano rifle was used to blast those primers.

An obscure but fundamental difficulty causes me to resist elaborating the description of what happened to the cartridge cases. There is a temptation to place the rifle and cartridges in the hands of the accomplice, to watch him pull the bullets and drain the powder from the cases, to see him charge the clip with an empty case and try to chamber it, to hear him curse when he fails, to watch him search for another way and hear "ah" when he succeeds, to see him blink as the primers pop. But that is more than the evidence allows. Although we know the sequence of events which affected the cartridge cases, we cannot know the lapse of time between each event.

Nevertheless, knowledge of the sequence alone leads without encouragement, without effort, to the unshakable conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was framed.

Firing the primers of the three cartridge cases in rifle that Oswald ordered surely was part of the deliberate preparation of inculpatory objects. (We cannot call



them evidence, except with reference to the cartridge cases as evidence of a frame-up). Dropping the cases near the Depository window likewise was a deliberate part of a frame-up. The dents on the cartridge cases, however, probably were administered without deliberation, unconsciously. They may not even have been noticed.

Something can be said about the person (or persons) who prepared this phase of the Oswald frame, for he is an exemplary instance of the biblical dictum, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

He knew enough about the procedures of firearms identification to understand that the primers had to be marked by the firing pin of the rifle that Oswald ordered, for otherwise there could be no positive connection between the cartridge cases and the rifle, no faultless link between the crime and Oswald.

His knowledge was imperfect, however, for he failed to perceive that the firing of unbulleted cartridge cases alters only the primers. When a fully loaded cartridge is fired in a rifle chamber, a thousand changes take place all over the cartridge case. Several of the changes are conspicuous even to inexperienced eyes; all the changes are evident under the tedious scrutiny of a microscope where seemingly smooth surfaces appear as mountain ranges.

Why he did not bother to prepare the inculpatory objects by firing fully loaded cartridges is a question that only he can answer. The press of time, or the unavailability of a suitable location, or both, or another reason may have hindered him. It is likely that he failed even to consider firing bullets from the cases, for the physical evidence of his activity clearly indicates that he did not regard it important.

The cost of his blunder is coming due. Seeking to implicate a vulnerable young man who would inherently be a subject of suspicion, the genuine accomplice in the assassination blasted the primers of three empty cartridge cases. The outcome was a muffled "pop", "pop", "pop", and an indictment of official government complicity in the frame-up of Lee Harvey Oswald, an indictment that is offensive to the ears (more offensive than primer-pops), offensive to the mind (more offensive than assassination itself), and offensive to the conscience of the nation, but true, true, true.

When the three cartridge cases were left near the Depository window, "the buck" was passed to Robert A. Frazier, firearms identification expert of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Frazier did not pass the buck back; he cherished it, and he shared it with others.

"The buck" has four corners: Frazier holds one (very tightly); FBI firearms identification expert Cortland Cunningham holds another (gently, with the tips of two fingers); Joseph D. Nicol, firearms identification expert for the State of Illinois, holds the third (he may not even know it).

The fourth corner does not hang loose. It is held by whatever person (or persons) caused Frazier to examine the cartridge cases and to report his findings, but not all of his findings.

The official investigators of the assassination can have found comfort for their consternation only because the accomplice knew enough at least to blast the primers with the same rifle that was left in the Depository building; otherwise, the burden of obfuscation would have increased a thousandfold.

Even so, Frazier deemed it necessary twice to perform a criminal act with the foul intent of perpetuating the work of assassins, of perpetuating the frame-up of Lee Harvey Oswald, of corroborating the frame-up, of endowing it with official government sanction, of stamping it "BORN IN DALLAS, BRED IN WASHINGTON".

What follows is a discussion of the things that Frazier found and reported, and of the things that Frazier found and failed to report-- and of the things that Frazier did to comfort and aid assassins.

Lest the onus of guilt fall on Frazier merely because his work is the focus of discussion, the reader should understand now and always that Frazier did not act in his own interest, that Frazier was not his own agent.

*end of relation on details*