November 15, 1972

Dr. Vincent P. Guinn Professor of Chemistry University of California Irvine Campus Irvine, California 92664

Dear Dr. Guinn:

Enclosed herewith please find your Declaration which has been re-typed according to the corrections made by you.

Please sign the enclosed before a Notary Public and return same to this office at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

Tamsin Lee Secretary

/tl encl.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DECLARATION OF DR. VINCENT P. GUINN

I

My name is DR. VINCENT P. GUINN, and I am a Professor of Chemistry at the University of California, Irvine, California.

II

I hold the degrees A.B. and M.S. in Chemistry from the University of Southern California, and the Ph.D. in Chemistry from Harvard University.

III

I have had many years of professional experience in chemistry, research, and teaching, and I have published numerous scientific papers, as can be ascertained by perusal of my attached resume.

TV

One of my fields of research specialty is a scientific.

technique known as Neutron Activation Analysis; I have particularly undertaken application of this technique over an eight-year period from 1962 to 1970, when I was on the research staff of the Gulf General Atomic Corporation, in San Diego, and since 1970, at the University. In this field, I have authored and co-authored reports and scientific papers. One of my main areas of application of this technique has been in the area of Scientific Crime Investigation.

My forensic activation analysis studies at Gulf General Atomic were conducted with the financial support of the United States

%6

Atomic Energy Commission (Contract AT (04-3, GGA Project 295), and of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice.

v

Following the June 5, 1968 assassination of Senator
Robert F. Kennedy, (on June 7, 1968), I was contacted by the Office
of the Los Angeles County Coroner, Dr. Thomas Noguchi, M.D. Dr.
Noguchi was interested in the possibility of my applying the technique of Neutron Activation Analysis to the bullets involved in the
Robert F. Kennedy assassination. Essentially, this would have
involved my comparing the chemical-element constituency of the
bullets removed from the spectators at the scene of the Kennedy
homicide with the bullets removed from the body of Senator Robert
F. Kennedy. the importance of this test is the following:

Assuming that the eight copper bullet casings removed from the gun of Sirhan B: Sirhan on June 5, 1968, were all of one manufacturer (indeed, I understand, all eight have been reported to have been made by Cascade Cartridge Company, all bearing the letter "C" at the firing pin end of the copper jacket), the scientific presumption and scientific likelihood is that all eight bullets placed in the gun by Sirhan were selected from the same box of 50-shot capacity 0.22 caliber ammunition. Also, the scientific likelihood is that all 50 cartridges in any given box of ammunition were produced in the same "batch" of ammunition, (in this instance, by the Cascade Cartridge Company). When ammunition is made, literally thousands of 0.22 caliber cartridges are made from one "batch" of bullet lead. This "batch" would then have the same chemical characteristics throughout the batch - that is, the

same percentages of lead and antimony, and the same levels of various other trace elements.

Under the assumption that bullets made by two different manufacturers at two different geographical locations and two different chronological times would potentially have different chemical makeups, (and this assumption is supported by a considerable amount of experimental data), and assuming that the bullets removed from Senator Kennedy's body were manufactured by a different firearms producer than those removed from the spectators at the scene of the crime, there is an excellent probability that this technique would reveal appreciable differences in their respective elemental compositions, if, indeed, these bullets had different origins. It was in this vein that the original contact was made to me by the Office of the Los Angeles County Coroner on June 7, 1968.

Following this initial contact and two subsequent ones on September 23 and 24, 1968, I received no further contact from that office, nor any request to proceed with such analysis.

It is my opinion that the potentially highly significant findings that could have resulted from the application of this powerful analytical tool were removed from the case of People v.Sirhan by the failure to have such an analysis undertaken, either by the prosecution or the defense.

VI

The technique of Neutron Activation Analysis is still quite applicable to the analysis of bullet-lead specimens even after a long passage of time. This means that today the tests may still be made on all of the slugs involved in this case, and that the results will be exactly as meaningful today as they were on

7.4

.17

8 VII'

I have been contacted by Roger S. Hanson, Attorney at Law, of Beverly Hills, California, pursuant to the possibility of my undertaking these analyses at my laboratory, and I related to Mr. Hanson that I could undertake these measurements. To do so, it is only necessary that I be allowed to remove a minute portion of each bullet. The tiny portion analyzed is also not destroyed in the analytical procedure, and such tiny portions can be removed from the bullets such as to not interfere in any way with any further ballistics analysis that might be undertaken.

VIII

I can analyze these bullet specimens and prepare a report covering the analyses and findings, within a period of four weeks after my receipt of the specimens.

XIV

It is my professional opinion that the foregoing analyse should have been undertaken in June, 1968, and still should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.

	I	declare	the	foregoing	to	be	true	under	the	penalty	of
perjury	this	day	of		, 1972.						

VINCENT P. GUINN, Ph.D.

Professor of Chemistry University of California Irvine Campus Irvine, California