

Dear Dr. Bahmer,

Your letter of February 16, 1967, is a partial answer to mine of December 16, ~~and~~ January 2 and 11 and my letters of January 10 and 11 to Mr. Johnson. There are a considerable number of unanswered requests remaining. If you ^{will} desire, I can review this correspondence and prepare a new list.

I would appreciate copies of those reports relating to Father ^{each of} McHenn that you ~~enumerate~~, unless one is Exhibit 2943. I would also like like copies of those additional reports relating to Tom Dillard.

There is what I take to be a typographical error in your reference to page 196 of Vol. 6. This is the testimony of Ronald Fischer, not Dillard. If you check the reference I gave you, you will find that Dillard testified he took a third picture, and it is this picture and anything else relating to it ^{about} of which I inquired. It is not a picture of the Depository Building but was taken toward the Triple Underpass.

May I ask you to clarify your explanation of the insertion in the testimony of Mrs. Helen Markham? Are the words "referring to telegram", whether or not typed, added to the original typescript or do they appear in the line of typing?

Mr. Rankin's letter to Mr. Marshall Kaufman may be a reflection of Mr. Rankin's opinion, but it does not in any way answer my questions ~~about~~ about Mrs. Kennedy's testimony or about the nature of the President's wounds. Mrs. Kennedy was the only close eyewitness of her husband's murder. Anything she had to say about it interests me, whether or not it ~~did~~ did Mr. Rankin. This relates to any ~~and~~ ^{and} all motions, opinions, observations, etc. *and I still want to study it.*

However, the first sentence of Mr. Rankin's letter excites me for in it he refers to Mrs. Kennedy having seen ^{these wounds,} ~~them~~, in the plural, "at the moment of impact". This is contrary to both the Report and the testimony with which I am familiar and is enough in itself to impel me to renew my request as expressed previously.

That Mr. Rankin found "ample evidence" about these wounds elsewhere in no way addresses itself to my desire to ^{analyze} learn what Mrs. Kennedy saw.

Am I correct in understanding your statement that "No original autopsy notes were received by the National Archives with the photographs and x-rays..." to mean that you do not have these notes, in any condition and in any file?

I want to be certain I do not misunderstand your letter and that you have not inadvertently overlooked any part of mine.

Are you saying I can examine Bullet 399 and all the fragments attributed to it and found elsewhere and alleged to have been associated with the assassination?

Do you have the spectrographic analysis?

Do you have the two original copies of the Zapruder film and those frames made by Life and delivered to the government and not printed in Exhibit 885? This is in addition to Frames 208-212.

Do you have the curbstone?

and/or arrest records

Do you have the photographs referred to in Document 1553 and the other photographs referred to in various Documents relating to the persons in the story of the False Oswald?

Do you have any references to a Colonel Caster, Castor or Castorr aside from those in Exhibits 2943 and 3108?

Is there a list of photographs and/or photographers of the assassination and/or the scene of the assassination?

I do not believe my requests of January 11 to Mr. Johnson and January 16 to you have been answered.

Also, I asked verbally for ^{copies of} the first five pages of the FBI Supplementary Report of January 13, 1964 and for the two Sibert-O'Neill autopsy reports. These appear to have been overlooked. If any of these things have been mailed to me, I have not received them.