82 Squankum Road
Howell, New Jersey 07731
January 23, 1976

By Certified Mail 303058

Dr. Vincent P. Guinn, Ph.D.
Professor of Chemistry
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Irvine, California 92664

Dear Dr. Guinn:

The passage of time has made it rather clear that you had no intention of responding to my peevious letters of August 12, 1975 and August 25, 1975. I therefore took the liberty of writting to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and requesting a copy of the spectrographic report, which you stated that you also had a copy of. By letter dated January 5, 1976, Director Kelley advised me that at no time, has the FBI ever furnished you with any such materials.

Since this turn of events would seem to present a question of honesty, I am now hoping that you will choose to reply and clear up the matter. Should you choose not to do so, I must assume that the statement setforth in Director Kelleys letter, represents the true facts in the case.

Sincerely,

Emory L Brown, Jr.

Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

IRVINE, CALIFORNIA ~~92664~~ 92717

January 27, 1976

Mr. Emory L. Brown, Jr.
82 Squankum Road
Howell, New Jersey 07731

Dear Mr. Brown:

Your letter of January 23 arrived today. As you may recall, I sent you considerable information concerning the FBI emission spectrographic results on bullet-lead specimens involved in the 1963 Dallas assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Due to a very heavy work load here at the University last Fall, I did not have the time to reply to your subsequent letters.

For your information, my copies of the FBI material were sent to me by Dr. John Nichols, of the University of Kansas, with whom I have been collaborating on various aspects of the President Kennedy assassination. He obtained them directly from the FBI, under the Freedom of Information Act.

Due to your jumping to erroneous conclusions, you have sent me an insulting letter. If you expect any further information or cooperation from me on this subject, a profound apology from you is a prerequisite.

Very truly yours,

Vincent P. Guinn

Vincent P. Guinn
Professor of Chemistry
Telephone: 714/833-6091

VPG/pk

82 Scrankum Road
Howell, New Jersey 07731
February 24, 1976

Dr. Vincent P. Guinn, Ph.D.
Professor of Chemistry
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Irvine, California 92717

Dear Dr. Guinn:

If by jumping to an erroneous conclusion I have offended you with out just cause, as you stated in your most recent letter, then I do want to take this opportunity to offer an appology. However, I must tell you in all honesty that it is not exactly a profound one. I do not attempt to extricate myself from any blame, when I say that you may quite possibley share some of the responsibility for the confusion. If you will, I would ask you to view this miss-understanding from my position.

When I last heard from you (your only letter which was dated June 4, 1975), you stated only that you had a copy of the F.B.I. ES results and made no mention of Dr. Nichols or anyone else. Though wrong, I do not feel my assumption that you obtainéd them from the F.B.I. was unreasonable. When at length I had received no word from you, I wrote to the F.B.I. and ask for a copy of the documents which you had refered to, to which they replied, that they had never furnished any such documents to you.

The question of honesty did not single out either party in particular, allthough you may be surprised to know that because of past dealings with the F.B.I., I suspected that they might have been up to something. It was obvious however, that based upon the only information which I was able to come by, something was not right.

I realize that in your position of employment, you are probably quite busy but then so are many of us who put in a full days work and then some. Surely I thought, I would have received atleast a postal card as I would certainly have done that much for you had our positions been reversed. Considering the fact that you do have some interest in the case, I could only assume that you looked upon my inquirèss as some sort of nuisance and had therefore chosen not to answer any futher letters. Had I only known that the delay was due to your schedule, I could have avoided hurting your feelings and the misunderstanding as well.

As to the considerable amount of information you say that you sent me regarding the JFK bullet fragments and test results, I have yet to receive it in my mail. All that I have

from you is the eight page reprint on NAA which makes no reference whatsoever to the JFK bullet fragments or test results and your letter of June 4, 1975, inwhich your second paragraph makes mention only, of certain elements not detected by the NAA examination. No other correspondence or materials have as yet reached me. If you would still care to send them, I would very much appreciate receiving same.

I have offered my defense as it were and it was not intended to be offensive or insulting. It is simply an expression of one of two individuals who holds a different view of a situation, than the other and whether or not you will chose to write again, I do want you to know that I have made no judgement concerning you. I admitt my error and leave the forgiveness of it, in your hands.

Sincerely,

Emory L Brown, Jr.