

The continued suppression of Mrs. E's description of her husband's wounds is made possible by the dead hand on the control, that of the nonexistent commission. What Man, whose incompetence is equalled only by his contempt for fact and reality, could be trusted with, anyone could. His access to it establishes a precedent. It is clear that the real purpose is to deny access to the testimony of the only close eyewitness in the world, whatever the excuse given.

January 2, 1967

Dr. Robert H. Bahmer
Archivist of the United States
Washington, D. C.

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 "pointing to telegram" appear in brackets in the printed transcript. These cannot have been spoken during 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 this typescript examined and inform me whether or not there is any addition to it.

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, 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 secret hearings in which the now-suppressed testimony was given. 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 provide those who disagree with its Report access to information to which Mr. Manchester had access.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg