

(Thomas Stamm)

28 December 1967

Dear Tom,

Thank you for sending me the Garrison WFAA transcript, as well as the copy of your letter to David Lifton, which I greatly enjoyed and admired. I know next to nothing about movie cameras and I have often been bewildered by the whole debate launched by Harold Weisberg about the speed of the Zapruder camera. I certainly agree with your reasoning with respect to Barrett's apparent error and with the importance of the still-unresolved puzzle of the discrepant speed of the FBI reenactment film.

As you may know, I was associated with Tink Thompson's book in that I read the ms. shortly before it went to press. Although I regard the book as a forceful and important contribution to the effort of exposing the Warren Report and establishing the facts about Dallas, I was incredulous and disturbed by Tink's speculation about the stretcher bullet and the "innocent" manner of its deposit on the stretcher on which it was found. I pleaded with Thompson, in writing as well as verbally, to abandon this whole idea—not only for the reasons you suggest in your letter to Lifton, but also because in posing the question of the dented cartridge case found with two other shells on the sixth floor but lacking a marking found on every other Carcano-fired shell, Thompson raises the irresistible implication of a planted item of hard evidence. The planting of the shell, over and above the case made long ago by yourself and Marcus and others for the planting of the stretcher bullet, is a formidable clue to the fabrication of the whole "evidence" in the case. I was very disappointed that Thompson, instead of pressing this, refused to relinquish his theory of souvenir-hunting (resting, as it does, on the very questionable and unsupported assertion that there was an attempt to make a souvenir of JFK's undershirt, which the evidence suggests he was not wearing on that day).

You may wish to consider sending Tink a copy of your letter or of that part of it that deals with his speculation on the stretcher bullet. Perhaps you have already done so.

As for Manchester: I was happy to see that Esquire awarded him the distinction of designating him the mealy-mouth of the year; and Garrison, the loudmouth of the year. But Garrison has been moving rapidly from the merely grandiose and comical to the deliberately evil and consciously unscrupulous, and is creating a spectacle that is terrifying as well as shameful. You have no doubt seen the current Ramparts, with its cover story on "the Garrison Commission." Seldom have I read such an endless string of "it may be's" and "possibly's" and "it is likely's" and variations on these phrases; seldom have I read such a checkerboard of irrelevant and dubious speculations, hawked under the pretence of constituting a "case." Ramparts and Bill Turner, no less than Lifton, would benefit from the astringency of your logic. I hope that you will find time to write a critique of Turner's article; it is high time for him and others like him to sober up from their romantic fling with the New Orleans D.A. and to realize what an unconscionable demagogue and super-Specter they are hero-worshipping.

All good wishes for 1968,

Sincerely,