

JUNE  
1983WHERE HAVE ALL THE BULLETS GONE?

Edgar F. Tatro

Appendix XII of the Warren Report dealt with speculations and rumors. After each allegation was presented, a commission finding followed. The impression given to the public was that for every accusation there was a simple and innocent explanation.

One of the more persistent speculations revolved around the reliability of the ammunition allegedly used to kill President Kennedy. Mark Lane was the predominant exponent of the speculation that "Ammunition for the rifle found on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository had not been manufactured since the end of World War II. The ammunition used by Oswald must, therefore, have been at least 20 years old, making it extremely unreliable."<sup>1</sup>

The commission finding concluded that "The ammunition used in the rifle was American ammunition recently made by the Western Cartridge Co., which manufactures such ammunition currently. In tests with the same kind of ammunition, experts fired Oswald's Mannlicher-Carcano rifle more than 100 times without any misfires."<sup>2</sup>

The commission provided no documentation to support their contention, but Mark Lane and Sylvia Meagher in their respective books proved that the finding was inaccurate.

Lane published a letter, dated July 14, 1965, in Rush To Judgment from the assistant sales service manager for the Winchester Western division of Olin Mathieson which stated that "Concerning your inquiry on the 6.5 millimeter Mannlicher-Carcano cartridge, this is not being produced commercially by our company at this time. Any previous production on this cartridge was made against Government contracts which were completed back in 1944."<sup>3</sup>

Sylvia Meagher in Accessories After The Fact published a paragraph from C E 2694 in which Mr. R. W. Botts, a district manager for Olin stated that his company "manufactured a quantity of 6.5 mm Mannlicher-Carcano ammunition for the Italian Government during World War II."<sup>4</sup> Meagher also stated that she received two letters in April, 1965 from an Olin company official that "the ammunition had once been produced under a government contract but was no longer available." and in which "the manufacturer states frankly that the reliability of the ammunition still in circulation today is questionable."<sup>5</sup> Her attempts to bring this obvious contradiction to the attention of the commission's legal staff were ignored.

The status of this issue remained dormant for over a decade. In 1977 the F.B.I. released 80,000 pages of previously classified

*Continued*

assassination related documents. One of those pages was an F.B.I. memo, dated December 2, 1963, to Mr. Conrad from R.H. Jevons who had been instructed that "every effort be made to trace the ammunition on the possibility that some of it may be traced into Oswald's hands."<sup>6</sup>

Jevons stated that the company "manufactured four million rounds of this ammunition for the United States Marine Corps during 1954."<sup>7</sup> Jevons attached "a two-page copy of the records of Western relating to the complete manufacture of this order of ammunition which was authorized under Government contract DA-23-196-ORD-27."<sup>8</sup>

Jevons then dropped a two sentence bombshell. He wrote, "The interesting thing about this order is that it is for ammunition which does not fit and cannot be fired in any of the U.S.M.C. weapons. This gives rise to the obvious speculation that it is a contract for ammunition placed by C.I.A. with Western under a U.S.M.C. cover for concealment purposes."<sup>9</sup>

Some newspapers briefly wrote about this issue, but the articles were one day wonders and nothing more was published about the matter.

I obtained a copy of the original Jevons document through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). I decided to pursue two issues at hand, the actual date of ammunition manufacture and the true purchaser of the ammunition.

A.S. Hill, a technical consultant for Olin, wrote, "Ammunition of this caliber was manufactured by Olin Industries Inc., only as a military cartridge. It was manufactured on a one time basis at the East Alton, Illinois plant of that company under contract with U.S. Ordnance Department and shipped to Raritan Arsenal, Nixon, New Jersey between April 1, 1954 and May 28, 1954. The letter from H.J. Gebelein, Assistant Sales Service Manager, dated July 14, 1965 is incorrect as to the date of manufacture, probably due to a typing error. It should have read 1954 instead of 1944."<sup>10</sup>

Thus Olin claims that the Army purchased the bullets in 1954, not 1944, and a typographical error was the culprit.

Like a pebble dropped in a pond, each simple answer produces more ripples. If 1954 was the accurate date, how can the testimony of Mr. R. W. Botts and other Olin spokesmen regarding World War II references be reconciled?

I brought this information to the attention of my friend, Emory Brown, a meticulous assassination researcher, who wrote, "On Olin, Winchester-Western, you have another unusual situation. If the 1954 date is the correct date that production began, it would seem rather a waste of time and money. By that date, the Italian Army was armed with the U.S. M-I Garrand .30 caliber and certainly the 6.5 mm rounds could not have been used in such a weapon. On

*Continued*

the other hand, we were still fighting in Italy in 1944 and the Italian troops which fought for the Allies, used their own weapons which, of course, means the 6.5 and 7.35 mm Carcanos. It is curious, however, that Western would make the same typo so many times to different people and also include in their letters that the ammo was manufactured during World War II."<sup>11</sup>

One point is definitively settled. Whether 1944 or 1954, the Warren Commission was emphatically wrong about the ammunition being "recently" and "currently" manufactured.

At this time I had more questions than answers and I had hoped that the House Select Committee on Assassinations had pursued these mysteries, so I let the issue drop til I could read all the HSCA volumes. After doing so and realizing that the HSCA whitewash was complete, I decided to investigate the ammo question again.

I wrote again to Olin to ask if anyone had investigated the ammunition question and whether any Olin records show any C.I.A. or U.S.M.C. involvement in the purchase.

Olin's A.S. Hill responded, "We have no present knowledge as to whether the Warren Commission, F.B.I., C.I.A. or House Select Committee questioned anyone in our organization regarding the purchase of this ammunition. All persons who might have been questioned are deceased. Our records do not show any involvement of C.I.A. or U.S.M.C. in the purchase."<sup>12</sup>

F.B.I. agent, R. H. Jevons had Olin's two shipment pages in his hands which stated that the U.S.M.C. had ordered the bullets. Olin records claimed that the buyer was the U.S. Army.

I wrote to Raritan Arsenal in Nixon, New Jersey and after a thorough explanation, I asked a barrage of questions.

"1) Who actually purchased this ammunition from Winchester-Western in 1954? U.S.M.C.? C.I.A.? other?

"2) Why was this ammunition sent to Raritan Arsenal, Nixon New Jersey?

"3) What was the purpose for this ammunition?

"4) If, according to your records, the U.S.M.C. was not involved with the purchase, can you tell me why the documents in the hands of the F.B.I. say that they did? What could cause a discrepancy between the Winchester-Western records and the F.B.I.'s copies of these records?

"5) Did the F.B.I., C.I.A., Warren Commission, House Select Committee on Assassinations, your own arsenal personnel or any other organization or individual ever investigate these matters I have presented here?

"6) If so, who did and what was determined?

*Continued*

4

'7) Do you have any existing records of this shipment? If so, could I obtain copies? I would be glad to pay all costs involved.

"8) Is there any other information pertaining to this matter which you can add which I have not asked about?

"9) Do you have any suggestions as to whom else I could contact to obtain information about this matter?

"10) What is your overall opinion about the material enclosed?"<sup>13</sup>

My letter came back to me, "Return to sender for insufficient address." How many Raritan Arsenals could there be in Nixon, New Jersey?

I turned my energies toward the F.B.I.. Through an FOIA suit I requested a two-page copy of the records of Olin's Winchester-Western as cited by R.H. Jevons in his memo. I also sent my list of questions which were ignored, but in May of 1980 I received the shipment pages and they must be seen to be believed, not for what they detail, but for what they do not tell.

There are no indications of who sent what to whom except a "6.5 mm Mannlicher" notation and the contract number at the top. There are some started and completed dates, some lot numbers and amounts in millions specified, but there are no headings on the pages, no letterheads, no logos, no shipping invoices. There is no specification of what is actually being sent, to whom it is being sent or from whom it is being sent.

It is impossible to believe that Jevons handled these two pages when he wrote his memo. What happened to the originals in Jevons' possession? Why did they disappear? Did the Army or the Marines purchase the bullets or was the C.I.A. somehow involved?

Since I did not obtain what Jevons originally observed, I proceeded to appeal my FOIA suit to the Associate Attorney General's Office, but my appeal was rejected because as the Appeals Director wrote, "The Bureau released to you in their entirety the two pages of records which you requested and informed you that a search of its General Index failed to locate any additional documents within the scope of your request. Since you have now received all the records you requested, I am closing your administrative file in this office."<sup>14</sup>

Of course the response reassures nothing. We are forced to trust that the F.B.I. has given me all that they possess simply because they said so.

What are the alternatives? First, Jevons saw the originals and made a two-page listing of the statistics, then failed to send to Headquarters any substantiation of the U.S.M.C., (allegedly

*Continued*

5

C.I.A.), purchase of the ammunition which is what he found most "interesting" about the order so stated in his memo.

Why would Jevons omit such evidence? Did he think his memo was sufficient? If he did just send unofficial statistics and omit the U.S.M.C. originals, would Hoover's F.B.I. Headquarters just let it ride, especially with the intensity of the F.B.I.-C.I.A. rivalry as it was in Washington?

Would Jevons fabricate the story? I have been informed by a reliable researcher that the aforementioned F.B.I.-C.I.A. rivalry was so heated then, that F.B.I. agents in several instances issued information about the C.I.A. to make them look bad. Perhaps the Jevons memo was an example of such dirty tactics, but these allegations were incredibly "heavy" and easily disproved by copies of the original contract.

It is also possible that the F.B.I. is withholding the originals or they could have destroyed them to prevent the exposure of unrelated clandestine activities of the Government or to prevent suspicious assassination-linked data to reach the public. Speculation is endless, but the choices in general lead to incompetence, libel or whitewash.

I wanted to compare the Jevons shipment pages with Olin's records, but A.S. Hill informed me that, "The original invoice copies ... were scrapped long ago, as our policy dictates getting rid of routine invoice files after a suitable period of time."15

Then I wrote to Hill again and I sent copies of the shipment pages. Hill confirmed the obvious - "The two pages of copy reported to be 'records of Winchester Western' attached to the F.B.I. letter are not the original invoices.... This probably was a summary which was prepared by someone in our organization at the request of the F.B.I. and may have been all that was requested of us and all that was furnished to them in this respect."16

Hill continued, "I am sure that this is not original invoice material since each lot would have had a separate invoice which would have been typed copy on our invoice letterhead and would have included information such as gross weight, destination, pricing, etc."17

Jevons sent to Mr. Conrad two pages. Hill wrote that each invoice was a separate page which would suggest five pages. This discrepancy supports Hill's theory that just a summary was sent. Perhaps Jevons just wasn't thorough, but can we assume that the Army purchased the ammunition, not the U.S.M.C. and Jevons was a liar also?

Dead ends for me had become commonplace, but Quinlan J. Shea of the Associate Attorney General's Office had suggested that I contact the F.B.I.'s Springfield, Illinois office for possible additional Olin documents and the U.S. Army Reserve Component in St. Louis, Missouri for Raritan Arsenal documents. (I will

*Continued*

deal with military aspects later).

I wrote to the Springfield F.B.I. office and requested through an FOIA suit any and all documents pertaining to the Olin ammunition.

Instead of sending me what I requested, Springfield's Special Agent in Charge, Robert Davenport, sent me a letter of invitation to review their files and specified that, "If the material desired is of a small amount, you will be able to buy and receive documents while in the Reading Room with little delay."<sup>18</sup>

The reader must appreciate the fact that at least a month passes prior to hearing from almost all of these agencies. Such a sweet letter like this ignored my FOIA suit and killed time. Stonewalling is an art in the hands of the F.B.I.

Upon receiving this letter, I promptly demanded through the FOIA route every single document pertaining to the assassination in the possession of the Springfield F.B.I. office. Touche!

Davenport's next response informed me that of the 108 JFK serials, only four pertained to Winchester-Western ammunition and copies of those four documents would be sent to me after being processed by F.B.I. Headquarters in Washington D.C. first.<sup>19</sup>

Three points came immediately to mind. First, why didn't Davenport just send the four documents after my initial request? Secondly, his first letter stated that if I visited in person and only wanted a small number of documents, I could receive them while in the Reading Room with little delay. Why was it necessary to send four documents first to Washington D.C. Headquarters for processing? Perhaps that's an F.B.I. postal regulation. Then again, three documents might be a small amount and four documents must be considered substantial. Right? Finally, did they think by ignoring my FOIA suit for all their JFK documents, that I was only kidding? (I subsequently obtained 189 pages from the Springfield F.B.I.).

At last the four documents arrived and one of them hit the bullseye. A document from Special Agent Charles M. Ungermann detailed a telephone conversation with Special Agent Robert Haines whose assignment was to obtain samples of the assassination ammunition to be transported to Washington D.C. Ungermann continued that Haines "also stated enclosed with the ammunition would be a copy of five orders of such ammunition manufactured by the Western Arms Division of Owens Mattheson Chemical Corporation, (sic.), which reflects that five orders were placed for this ammunition in 1954 by the U.S. Marine Corps."<sup>20</sup>

The date of this memorandum is November 23, 1963 which precedes the Jevons document of December 2, 1963. Therefore the Haines memo is the primary source. Jevons, no doubt, obtained his data through channels originating from Haines and had never actually seen or possessed the original data or copies of the original data.

*Continued*

The least suspicious of the preliminary theories for the absence of copies of the actual invoices was that Jevons was not thorough and only wrote down a summary of the statistics. Also there existed the possibility that Jevons was performing a hatchet job on the C.I.A. which may still be true, but the Haines information altered the picture considerably.

Neither Haines nor Ungermann made any C.I.A. speculations. The accusation of libel and dirty tricks does not apply to them. Haines does not refer to "two pages" either, which dismisses Hill's innocent explanation. Haines specifies "a copy of five orders" and that these orders "were placed for this ammunition in 1954 by the U.S. Marine Corps."

What happened to Haines' "five orders"? I have no idea if determining the purchaser of the original ammunition shipment would have any significance to the assassination of President Kennedy, but I do know that I began to suspect the possibility that someone had done something very ugly at some time with four million bullets and somehow a few of them had reached Dallas.

I knew it was time to try to contact the agents, Jevons and especially Haines myself, but the F.B.I. understandably wasn't about to give me their addresses.<sup>21</sup> However they did tell me that they would forward my mail to the agents, but they added, "Please be advised, however, that we can only forward your letters to the agents' last known address. It will be left to each individual's discretion as to whether he wishes to respond to your letters."<sup>22</sup> I smelled an unavoidable, stonewalling rat again.

Also I requested a copy of the "five orders" cited by Haines in the Ungermann memo in the hopes that I would receive the original invoices, but I was informed that I had received these documents on May 16, 1980.<sup>23</sup> This simply meant that the two pages purported to be Olin's records by the F.B.I. via R.H. Jevons were the same as Haines' "five orders."

If they're going to tell lies, then they might as well tell whoppers. F.B.I. agent Robert Haines specified that he enclosed the "five orders" which cited the U.S.M.C. as the ammunition purchaser and the F.B.I. lamely tried to pawn off those same two vague pages of statistics as official verities. It was pretty difficult to accept an innocent explanation anymore.

Next I mailed to the appropriate F.B.I. forwarding office my letters to Jevons and Haines. I explained the situation to both agents and I asked each man basically five questions -

- "1) Can you reconcile these contradictions for me?
- "2) Are Jevons' two pages the same as Haines' "five orders".
- "3) Where did you obtain the information that the U.S.M.C. purchased the ammunition?

*Continued*

"4) If these two pages are legitimate, why didn't the F.B.I. obtain actual copies of Winchester-Western records instead of a summary of unofficial statistics?

"5) Do you have any suggestions as to whom else I could contact to pursue this matter?<sup>24</sup>

On January 15, 1981 the F.B.I. informed me that the letter to R.H. Jevons had been forwarded as requested, but that several people were employed under the name Robert Haines and that my Haines Packet was being returned. I would need further identifying information.<sup>25</sup>

Shortly thereafter the Jevons packet was returned to me. R. H. Jevons had moved and left with no forwarding address. Another stonewalling action had succeeded. I find it impossible to accept that the F.B.I. could not obtain a present address of a former agent.

My next Pyrrhic victory came when I discovered more information about Robert C. Haines, who, at one time, was a member of the Alton, Illinois Resident Agency. Ironically I discovered this data in the 189 pages of my Springfield FOIA suit.

I immediately sent the information and my Haines packet, sealed, return addressed, and appropriately stamped, back to the F.B.I. forwarding office in care of Security Officer, Lloyd E. Dean, who had been the agent who had last contacted me about this procedure. I only requested that my packet be forwarded to Mr. Haines. My cover letter instructions were explicitly clear and concise.

On February 19, 1981 I received a curious letter from Mr. Dean, who wrote, "Mr. Haines retired from the F.B.I. effective December 30, 1977. I am unable to furnish you his address as to do so would be an invasion of his personal privacy. However I have forwarded a copy of your letter to him for appropriate action."<sup>26</sup>

First, Dean's response implied that I had requested Haines' address which was not true. Secondly, I wasn't thrilled when I read that a "copy" of my letter had been forwarded to Haines for "appropriate action," which sounded ominous also. Did the F.B.I. open my mail prior to sending it? In fact, did the F.B.I. send it?

On March 24, 1981 my suspicions were confirmed. My Haines packet returned to me with the same explanation as the Jevons packet, but with one stupendous exception. The Haines data returned to me inside a sealed F.B.I. envelope!

I waited awhile to cool down and on May 23, 1981 I wrote my letter, the third page of which tells the story - "It is perfectly clear that some F.B.I. personnel opened my mail, (the Haines packet), without permission. The letter of February 19,

*Continued*



1981 from Dean implied it and the letter of March 24, 1981 confirmed it. Otherwise, the Haines packet would have returned to me 'the sender,' not the F.B.I., (just as the Jevons packet had returned to sender - me).

1) I am not a lawyer, but opening mail is against the law - true?

2) Why was my Haines packet opened? Who opened it? Surely Dean knows.

3) Neither you nor I, under the circumstances, can prove that my Haines packet was ever sent to Haines' address. I am expected to assume that it was sent.

4) I intend to contact the postal department, my senators, and my congressman about this issue.

I'd like some explanations."<sup>27</sup>

The June 8, 1981 response from Chief of the F.B.I.'s FOIA section, James K. Hall, was a masterpiece intended to make me feel guilty for the F.B.I.'s inefficiency and/or suspicious actions. The reader will need a bulldozer rather than a shovel to wade through the verbal manure in Hall's letter. My mail had been "apparently inadvertently opened", Mr. Dean simply assumed that I would want Haines' address, and the term, 'copy,' was an error as it was my original correspondence that was forwarded.<sup>28</sup> If Mr. Hall's explanations and excuses are valid, then heaven help us that the nation's key law enforcement agency is so incompetent and if the F.B.I. just couldn't trust Haines to correspond with me because he might tell the truth so they pretended to send him my mail, what else is new. Nineteen years after the murder of the President, the political farce rampages onward.

Meanwhile I decided to ask the C.I.A. to check their files to see if they had, in fact, purchased the ammunition. On April 29, 1980 the C.I.A. responded with a lecture of what they will and won't do along with a list of records service fees which are considerably steep and inflationary.<sup>29</sup> The obvious purpose is to discourage researchers, maximize C.I.A. privacy and minimize their workload.

On September 27, 1980 I sent a check for \$65.00 for a computer search and one and one quarter hour's worth of professional personnel search time for any documents pertaining to the purchase of this ammunition. My request was not complex.

Over two months elapsed without a response so I wrote an update letter on December 8, 1980. Finally on January 19, 1981 the C.I.A. answered with a "final response" to my letter of April 12, 1981 with another dissertation of what they do and don't do, the return of my check and an assurance that "this agency has already

*Continued*

10

reviewed for release all of its documents known to be related to the investigation of John F. Kennedy's assassination. As far as we are aware, none of this material concerned the question of the ammunition used by Oswald."<sup>30</sup>

I wonder what happened to my second and third letters. Aside from their introductory letter of instructions, their "final response" was their first response. At the very least, the C.I.A. has no manners. I wonder what might exist in the documents which have not been reviewed for release. I wonder why they advised me that they don't comment on speculation when I never asked them for any comments, especially since they had already instructed me in their initial letter about their tight-lip policy.... and isn't it comforting to know that the C.I.A. is convinced that whoever purchased the ammunition originally, it was Oswald who used it in the end. You see, when it comes to stonewalling, the F.B.I. has not even reached the puberty stage as compared to the C.I.A.

I was determined that the C.I.A.'s letter of January 19, 1981, would not be their "final response" to me. After explaining the details in Dick and Jane language, I wrote, "Now that I have updated the situation, let me make myself perfectly clear. I am asking you to search your records for any documents your agency may have pertaining to the purchase of 6.5 mm bullets (most likely 1944 or 1954) from Olin's Winchester-Western firm in East Alton, Illinois. Enclosed is my check for \$65.00 - \$55.00 = computer search, \$10.00 = 1 1/4 hours professional clerk search.

"You will notice that I am only asking for a records service search. I am not asking for comments, nor speculation. Ironically, I am not (necessarily) even asking for documents pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy. Am I allowed to ask for this search through FOIA or not? If I am not allowed to do so, I am sure you will tell me so. I believe my request is specific, clear, and within the scope of the FOIA. I hope to hear from you soon."<sup>31</sup>

A month later, almost a year since my original request, the C.I.A. promised to begin a search of their files. My check of \$65.00 was returned. The C.I.A. coordinator wrote, "once we have completed the processing of your request, we will advise you of the amount of our search and copying fees, if any."<sup>32</sup>

My check must have set a Guinness record for mail returns and the term, "if any," sounded like stonewalling foreshadowing to me.

The "final reply" arrived on May 6, 1981 and the C.I.A. concluded, "after a careful and thorough search of our files, we were unable to find any record of the purchase of bullets from Olin's Winchester-Western firm."<sup>33</sup>

*Continued*

11

The clincher followed, "The cost of this search was \$8.00."<sup>34</sup>

Can there be any doubt in the reader's mind as to the wholesale degree of insincerity and the extent of unmitigated dishonesty to which the C.I.A. will stoop. No computer search, no proof of professional personnel search. If they had charged me \$65.00, I would have never known the difference, but by charging me \$8.00, we all become aware of how insensitive, bold, and stupid they are and how powerless we are to combat them. It was worth the eight bucks to detail this sham.

Let us return now to the letter I sent to the U.S. Army Reserve Component in St. Louis, Missouri for possible Raritan Arsenal documents to obtain an overview of how the military dealt with the mysterious four million bullets. My letter was eventually forwarded to Dale Birdsell, the Chief Historian stationed at the U.S. Army Material Development and Readiness Command in Alexandria, Virginia.

Birdsell detailed some much appreciated information to me. He wrote, "This contract was executed by the Small Arms Ammunition Center (disestablished in July 1954), an element of the U.S. Ordnance Corps (disestablished in August 1962). Raritan Arsenal was also disestablished in June 1966 and its contract related records presumably transferred to the U.S. Army Munitions Command, Dover, N.J., also since disestablished. Contract files are required by Army Regulation 340-18-14 to be destroyed six years after final payment. Conjecturally, the contract would have been destroyed in 1960 at the latest."<sup>35</sup>

Is it a coincidence that almost all army avenues for obtaining information pertaining to the ammunition which allegedly killed the President were disestablished before the murder was perpetrated? The ammunition was shipped to Raritan Arsenal between April 1, 1954 and May 28, 1954 so the Small Arms Ammunition Center which executed the contract was defunct a month later.

Birdsell then referred my subsequent letters and questions to the Marine Corps Historical Center of Washington D.C. and eventually I received a letter from them stipulating the following -- "As the enclosures show, the Marine Corps' ammunition records for the 1954-1964 period have been destroyed, and the disposal authorizations do not contain information relating to the purchase of 6.5 mm ammunition by the Corps."<sup>36</sup>

Another dead end, another assurance, another coincidence. The documents were destroyed in 1964 while the Warren Commission was conducting their investigation. Enclosed with the letter was a re-typed copy of the Jevons allegation so it is clear that the U.S.M.C. did some in-house investigating once they were informed of the memo. Again, there are no means of ascertaining the truth.

With regard to the National Archives, the General Archives Division stated, "We were unable to locate any information relating to your topic among the Records of the Chief of Ordnance, Record

*Continued*

Group 156, or the Records of the U.S. Marine Corps Record Group 127, in the custody of the General Archives Division."<sup>37</sup>

However, I was provided with an interesting F.B.I. document from the Civil Archives Division. An unidentified informant charged that the Winchester Western 6.5 mm ammunition had been "furnished to the Government of Greece under the Greek Aid Program in 1952 or 1953. Further, the informant stated that two lots of this ammunition were exported from Greece to Canada by a Greek national named Fontinellis who was acting as an agent for International Firearms, Montreal, Canada. He advised that Mr. Sucher is the principal stockholder in International Firearms Company. The informant continued that one of the two lots of the subject ammunition was sent from Greece to Canada after February 1, 1962. The informant alleges that this ammunition was imported into the United States in contravention to the section of the law that restricts the return to the United States for resale any ammunition of United States manufacture furnished to foreign governments by the United States under any foreign assistance program."<sup>38</sup>

The document continues, "The informant believes that the ammunition was consigned to Century Arms in St. Albans, Vermont based on his knowledge that Mr. Sucher, the principal stockholder of International Firearms, is a brother-in-law of Mr. Manney Wigginsburg (phonetic), who operated Century Arms. Accordingly, the informant concludes that S. Klein could only have gotten the ammunition from Century Arms, who in turn obtained it from International Firearms."<sup>39</sup>

Mr. John Sipes, Deputy Director of the Office of Munitions Control, concluded that "If the ammunition used in the assassination of President Kennedy was part of any United States aid program shipment to Greece, it could not legally have been brought into the United States for resale except for personal use by a collector or for military use, notwithstanding the United States - Canada agreement."<sup>40</sup>

Were the bullets shipped to Greece and if so, what was the purpose? Who sent them? Did the bullets return via Canada to the United States? If so, what was the purpose and who brought them back? Did the bullets return illegally or for "personal use by a collector" or for "military use"? The questions and their ramifications are mind boggling and the need for historians to research this area is mandatory.

The fact that the informant cites Century Arms in St. Albans Vermont as the culprit opens up a sinister can of worms. George Michael Evica's excellent book, And We Are All Mortal, seriously questions whether the rifle attributed to Oswald actually came from Klein's of Chicago because the Klein rifles were modified by Luciano Riva and the "Oswald" rifle's Italy stamp was different from the Riva rifles' stamp and it also still had its identifying marks still impressed on it whereas Riva had ground all those marks off the Klein rifles.<sup>41</sup>

*Continued*

Evica also proves another 6.5 mm Carcano also bearing serial number 2766, (Oswald's alleged rifle was c2766.), was sent to Alden's of Chicago via Century Arms Inc., St. Albans, Vermont through Arms of Montreal.<sup>42</sup>

We know this identification number was not unique to "Oswald's" alone and maybe two rifles of the same serial number were suspiciously floating about Dallas in November of 1963 suggesting possible evidentiary fabrication to frame Lee Harvey Oswald. The serial numbers of the Mannlichers shipped to Alden's are not available and no reports of the F.B.I.'s investigating the Alden Carcanos are available in Warren Commission records.<sup>43</sup>

Evica's research indicates a possible shady Mannlicher Carcano in Dallas the day of the assassination and now an unidentified informant charges that 6.5 mm bullets illegally re-entered the United States (unless they were employed by a "collector" or for "military use") at the same location as the mysterious second rifle - Century Arms Inc., St. Albans, Vermont.

John Thomas Masen is Evica's primary suspect as the second Oswald and the supplier of 6.5 mm bullets in Dallas,<sup>44</sup> but the amazing link of a twin carcano and the ammunition to one location in Vermont should not have been ignored. The Warren Commission, The F.B.I. and the H.S.C.A. all had this information and apparently did nothing or hid what they found.

Finally, let's review the attitudes of the politicians in this matter. First, I wrote to Representative Henry Gonzales of Texas, a man with whom I had corresponded for several years in an attempt to reinvestigate the assassination and the former executive to the H.S.C.A. prior to his bitter resignation. He did not respond. I then wrote to Representatives Samuel Devine, Christopher Dodd, Richardson Preyer, and Louis Stokes of the H.S.C.A.. Devine and Dodd ignored me. Preyer and Stokes politely said goodbye.<sup>45,46</sup>

I then contacted the National Archives to determine if the H.S.C.A. had investigated any aspects of Winchester Western's ammunition. I was told, "We have checked the John F. Kennedy name and subject indexes to the files of the H.S.C.A., 95th Congress, and have found references to two documents pertaining to the Western Cartridge Company. However, since the files of the Select Committee are not open to the public, except for such documents as have been published, we cannot disclose those two items."<sup>47</sup>

Records of the H.S.C.A. are classified for the next 50 years and the records of Congress are exempt from the Freedom of Information Act. What could these two documents possibly contain to withhold them from the public for half a lifetime?

As a result of my desire to learn the proper means by which to introduce a bill into Congress to declassify within reason as many H.S.C.A. documents as possible and to complain about my forwarded F.B.I. mail having been opened as well as other issues, I wrote to my two U.S. Senators, Paul Tsongas and Edward "Ted" Kennedy and my Congressman, Brian Donnelly. Tsongas, who as a

*Continued*

representative agreed with me about a reinvestigation of the assassination and even co-sponsored the bill, now as a senator, did not respond. Representative Donnelly did not respond.

Senator Kennedy avoided the issues as follows - "I am sure you understand that these questions are difficult and painful ones for my family to consider. If sufficient evidence exists to re-examine the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President Kennedy or Robert Kennedy, we feel that the decision to do so must be made by the appropriate authorities responsible for any further investigation.

"I am confident that these authorities will make an objective determination on the merits of the issue. I do not believe that their decision should be influenced in any way by the feelings of anyone in our family."48

Months later Representative Donnelly mailed out a questionnaire to his constituents. I wrote a lengthy diatribe which included the following - "Last year I wrote to you about three issues pertaining to the J.F.K. assassination and you did not respond. I didn't expect you to help me. The issue is considered too old and politically too risky for most politicians to get involved. However I did expect some kind of response.

"After all, it's not everyday that a citizen sends you photos which show a possible gunman at the time of a presidential murder. It is also not everyday that a citizen writes to complain that the F.B.I., instead of forwarding my mail as promised, opens it instead. Finally I did expect you to inform me how to properly get a bill proposed to get the H.S.C.A.'s classified material declassified. You could have informed me on that without committing yourself."49

Donnelly responded, "I am sorry to hear that you sent mail to my office last year dealing with the Kennedy Assassination, and did not receive a response. My office has searched through our correspondence files, and cannot locate your letter. It may have been misplaced, and in that case, I am very sorry that you did not receive a prompt response.

"Your comments on the questionnaire mention the disclosures of corruption involving public officials. As an elected Representative such instances bother me greatly. Due to my awareness of peoples' opinion of politicians in general, I make every effort to remain accessible and accountable to my constituents. I feel this is the best way to reaffirm peoples' faith in their government, and I am committed to that personal code of conduct.

"Again, Edgar, thank you for your thorough response to my questionnaire. Please let me know if I can be of any further service to you regarding the Kennedy Assassination findings, or any other matter."50

I intend to find out if Mr. Donnelly is a man of his word. Did my packets to a senator and a representative both get

*Continued*

misplaced? Were the issues just too controversial for politicians to address unless I pressed the issue with a second letter? Is something funny happening to my mail again as it did when I corresponded with the Irvin Committee about J.F.K. assassination-Watergate links and with the late Deputy Sheriff Roger Craig who witnessed all sorts of unusual incidents that he wasn't supposed to see or, perish the thought, discuss with anyone? Take your pick. All alternatives reek with the stench of incompetence or cowardice or corruption. Perhaps Representative Donnelly is an exception. We shall see.

I realize that my unfinished research raises more questions than answers. I realize that this article exposes more about how bureaucrats and federal agencies function poorly rather than aid the solution to the murder of the President, but exposure of these political games is important also.

The future demands that someone contact R.H. Jevons and Robert C. Haines to see if they will confirm their original documents. Historical researchers should investigate the alleged U.S. to Greece to Canada to Vermont to Dallas trip of 6.5 mm ammunition as well as why this occurred and who was responsible. There is need to determine if the notorious Dallas bullets and a second "2766" Carcano actually reached Dallas together from Century Arms Inc., St. Albans, Vermont, through Alden's of Chicago and who was responsible. Finally we must all push to declassify the crucial documents buried in Washington by the House Select Committee on Assassinations.

P.S. I would like to thank Emory Brown and Harold Weisberg for their valuable suggestions in researching this project. **END**

# Flood of TV specials to mark JFK shooting

Again, Dallas will be 'the site'

By Ed Bark  
Television Critic of The News

**O**HSO-SLOWLY, the image has been altered.

From Dallas, assassination site, to Dallas, home of the Ewings.

Southfork Ranch has replaced the Texas School Book Depository as the city's prime tourist attraction.

But an anniversary looms. Nov. 22 will be the 20th reminder of the day President John F. Kennedy was murdered in Downtown Dallas. Television will be marking the occasion

with an onslaught of Kennedy specials scheduled for broadcast next November.

Kennedy, NBC's 7-hour miniseries, stars Martin Sheen as JFK and Blair Brown as Jacqueline Kennedy.

ABC News plans a prime-time special that will be "similar in nature" to the network's recent 3-hour Franklin Delano Roosevelt retrospective.

Two major syndicated productions, *Being With John F. Kennedy* and *America Remembers John F. Kennedy*. Please see TV SPECIALS on Page 6C.



Associated Press  
Geraldine Fitzgerald plays Rose Kennedy and E.G. Marshall plays Joseph Kennedy in the movie *Kennedy*, which will air this fall, in the 20th-anniversary year of the assassination.

*Continued*

FOOTNOTES

- 1) Report of The Warren Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), Appendix XII, p. 577
- 2) Ibid, p.577.
- 3) Mark Lane, Rush to Judgment (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966) p.411.
- 4) C E 2694 p.12
- 5) Sylvia Meagher, Accessories After The Fact (New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1967), p 113.
- 6) F.B.I. Memorandum, to Mr. Conrad from R.H. Jevons, #105-8255, December 2, 1963
- 7) Ibid.
- 8) Ibid.
- 9) Ibid.
- 10) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from A.S. Hill, Technical Consultant, Winchester-Western Division Ammunition Operations, Olin Industries, East-Alton, Illinois, August 23, 1978.
- 11) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Emory Brown, September 16, 1978, pp. 2-3
- 12) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from A.S. Hill, Olin, April 15, 1980.
- 13) Letter to Raritan Arsenal, Nixon, New Jersey from Edgar F. Tatro, April 19, 1980, pp. 3-4.
- 14) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Quinlan J. Shea Jr., Director Office of Privacy and Information Appeals, Office of the Associate Attorney General, U.S. Dept of Justice, June 25, 1980.
- 15) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from A.S. Hill, Olin, August 28, 1980.
- 16) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from A.S. Hill, Olin, September 26, 1980 .
- 17) Ibid
- 18) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Robert B. Davenport, Special Agent in Charge, Springfield, Illinois, F.B.I., undated, (July,1980)
- 19) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Robert B. Davenport, F.B.I. September 19, 1980.
- 20) F.B.I. Memorandum, to SAC from SA Charles Charles M. Ungermann, Springfield, Illinois Office, November 23, 1963.
- 21) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Thomas H. Bresson, Chief, Freedom of Information - Privacy Acts Branch, Records Management Division, F.B.I., U.S. Dept of Justice, October 16, 1980.



- 22) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Thomas H. Bresson, F.B.I., January 7, 1981.
- 23) Ibid.
- 24) Letters to R.H. Jevons and Robert Haines, F.B.I. agents from Edgar F. Tatro, January 12, 1981.
- 25) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Lloyd E. Dean, Security Officer, F.B.I., U.S. Dept. of Justice, January 15, 1981.
- 26) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Lloyd E. Dean, F.B.I., February 19, 1981.
- 27) Letter to F.B.I. from Edgar F. Tatro, May 23, 1981.
- 28) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from James K. Hall, Chief, Freedom of Information - Privacy Acts Section, Records Management Division, F.B.I., U.S. Dept of Justice, June 8, 1981, pp. 1-2.
- 29) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Charles E. Savige, Acting Information and Privacy Coordinator, C.I.A., April 29, 1980.
- 30) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Charles E. Savige, C.I.A., January 19, 1981.
- 31) Letter to Charles E. Savige, C.I.A. from Edgar F. Tatro, February 9, 1981.
- 32) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Charles E. Savige, C.I.A., March 9, 1981.
- 33) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from John E. Bacon, Information and Privacy Coordinator, C.I.A., May 6, 1981.
- 34) Ibid.
- 35) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Dale Birdsell, Chief Historian, Headquarters U.S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, Alexandria, Virginia September 3, 1980.
- 36) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from D.J. Crawford, Head, Reference Section, History and Museums Division, Headquarters, U.S.M.C., Dept of Navy, March 16, 1981, pp. 1-3
- 37) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from George C. Chalou, Assistant Chief, Reference Branch, General Archives Division, G.S.A., January 19, 1981.
- 38) National Archives, F.B.I. document #1066, p. 1.
- 39) Ibid., p. 2.

40) Ibid., p. 2.

41) George Michael Evica, And We Are All Mortal (Connecticut: University of Hartford, 1978), p.30.

42) Ibid., pp. 30-36

43) Ibid., p. 35.

44) Ibid., pp. 106-113.

45) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Richardson Preyer, House of Representatives, May 6, 1980.

46) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Louis Stokes, House of Representatives, August 28, 1980.

47) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from George P. Perros, Legislative and Natural Resources Branch, Civil Archives Division, G.S.A., September 29, 1980.

48) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Edward M. Kennedy, United States Senate, August 4, 1981.

49) Letter to Representative Brian Donnelly from Edgar F. Tatro, February 19, 1982.

50) Letter to Edgar F. Tatro from Brian Donnelly, House of Representatives, March 4, 1982.

All letters from the C.I.A., U.S.M.C., F.B.I. and Politicians are from Washington D.C. except where noted.