

Dear Dr. Bahmer,

Previously you have denied me access to the typescripts of testimony before the President's Commission on the ground they are classified and it is beyond your authority to remove the classification.

There are two items I have wanted to examine where I believe the situation surrounding each is now altered and where I believe the information I seek can be provided without violation of any reasonable cause for denial of access.

One of these has to do with interrogation of Mrs. Helen Markham by Wesley J. Liebeler ( 7H499-506). Toward the end of this deposition, the words in brackets "pointing to telegram" appear/in the printed transcript. These cannot have been spoken during the ~~the~~ deposition, but they may have been added before the transcript was originally typed. While I would very much like a Xeroxed copy of this page of the stenographic transcript, I will be satisfied if you can have <sup>typescript</sup> this ~~examined~~ and inform me whether or not there is <sup>to it.</sup> ~~any addition or to the transcript~~.

The second has to do with Mrs. Kennedy's descriptions of her husband's wounds and any pertinent testimony. It is clear from the public press that this is the kind of information that was not denied William Manchester. I am therefore renewing my request for access to this information. While I would much prefer to examine the exact language, subject, as I have earlier offered, to any reservations and restrictions the government may impose, ~~exists~~ there is an alternative that suggests itself. The reason given for this withholding of testimony, which I consider to be suppression, is alleged good taste. Can one of your staff, as an alternative, paraphrase it, without altering its meaning but expunging anything that might affront good taste? Mr. Manchester was granted unusual privileges, such as attendance at the hearings in which the now-suppressed testimony was give. He is also a defender of the conclusions of the government's Report. I believe this and other factors should impel the government to want to at least seem to <sup>provide</sup> ~~grant~~ those who disagree with its Report access to information to which Mr. Manchester had access.

Sincerely yours,

Dear Dr. Bahmer,

Previously, you and ~~the~~ your staff have informed me that I have seen all the photographs of the assassination and ~~its scene~~ <sup>the scene of the assassination</sup> that were then in the ~~archive~~ <sup>of</sup> archive.

I was then informed that there were not in the archive any copies of the Betzner, Moorman, Hughes, Couch or Underwood films.

In one way or another, all of these films were considered by the Commission. In the case of some, like the Moorman and Hughes films, I know of copies having been made by the government ~~to~~ prior to their return. Under the ~~order~~ <sup>order</sup> of the acting attorney general these copies, which I understand also includes cropped copies of ~~the~~ Moorman picture, should now have been placed in the archive. I am writing to learn if this has happened and if I may now examine them and ~~other~~ <sup>any</sup> other pictures, such as from TV tapes, <sup>now</sup> that may have been placed in the archive.

In his testimony (6H165-6) Tom Dillard testified that he took three pictures. He was to have provided the Commission with prints he personally made of each of the three. ~~But~~ <sup>only</sup> two are printed in the exhibits (Volume 19). Can you tell me if he ever supplied the third and if I ~~am~~ may now see it?

Has anything new developed in these files to alter what you have earlier reported to me about any of these pictures?

During the testimony of several of the witnesses who took photographs or were present when photographs were taken, references were made to statements taken by Secret Service Agent Patterson and FBI Agent Keutzer. Statements seem to have been taken of Malcolm Couch, A.J. L'Hoste, his associate, and of Tom Dillard. I would like to obtain Xeroxed copies of these and to be referred to any similar or related ones not immediately identifiable from the ~~bibliography~~ file list.

Sincerely

Julius Frandsen, vp UPI Ne Press Bldg.

While his grudging letter to the Washington Post does acknowledge Merriman Smith's recognition that, although he won the Pulitzer Prize for reporting it, he is the one man in the world who doesn't recall where he was the moment President Kennedy was assassinated, it in no way relieves the damage he and you have done me and about which I have written you, without reply.

Not does he diminish this hurt or reflect the slightest honesty of motive when he continues his campaign with consistent inaccuracy on the electronic media.

Had his letter to the Post been motivated by any honorable motive, Mr. Smith would have acknowledged that he also did not know the weather when he was there that terrible day. Recall this was the <sup>an</sup> other basis for his assault upon me. I quote you from page 42 of the Report: "In Dallas the rain had stopped and by midmorning a gloomy overcast sky had given way to bright sunshine that greeted the Presidential party..."

If Mr. Smith's letter served any purpose, it was to give the Post an excuse for not printing the one I promptly wrote it. If his story and his ~~on~~ continuing campaign serve any purpose, it is not to inform.

His gross inaccuracies, shameful in a cub reporter, continue to cause me damage. I might expect no more from a man so cowardly he refuses to face me on the basis of fact while continuing his slanders. I certainly should be able to expect more from UPI and I again call upon you to do what you can to end the damage your inaccurate story continues to do me and to relieve the damage it has already caused.