

February 27, 1974

Dear Mr Weisberg

Again I am glad it is not your intention to give offense. Your frankness is unusual.

I am indebted to you. You have almost convinced me I am an abysmally ignorant, scheming knave, incapable of shame and unworthy of your confidence, who would, if he could, take from you the fruit of your labor which you have harvested at great sacrifice. You will not divulge any part of it. My offer of editorial assistance is no more than a device to gain access to what I have been unable to discover and you have uncovered. I say you have almost convinced me because notwithstanding my moral and ethical presumptuousness and pseudoscholar's approach, you accept my offer as genuine. Unfortunately, however, you think it impracticable and too late.

This is so because your 600-page manuscript is typed and you do not have the means to have it retyped after editing. But suppose means can be found to have the retyping done without cost to you? Would you then consider editorial review of your manuscript with yourself the final judge of whatever revisions, excisions, and additions may follow? And, of course, you would have solemn assurance no misappropriation of your writing would be made prior to, during, or after editorial reworking of it.

That suggestion springs from a feeling that he who has enlisted in the struggle to lay bare the truth about the assassination of president Kennedy, against the stubborn resistance of the establishment, has a moral claim to collaboration and assistance from those who profess the same intent. You were animated by the same feeling when you assisted others to whom you made your files and time available. Inevitably, of course, you suffered disappointment, frustration, even abuse. It is evidence of the alienation of man under capitalism. But the wheel turns and the rim on the ground revolves to the top before it once more descends. It may be that the time is propitious or will be shortly for publication of your manuscript. Editorial review of it may make it ready at the critical moment. In that connection you might also consider the preparation of an article based on the book which would appear over your signature and what interest in the book prior to its publication.

I see that you will not enlighten me about the two death certificates of president Kennedy. You scorn me for not investigating the problem myself. If I have no alternative I will have to do so. But why I should duplicate your work when you intend to disclose it in your book or when you deposit your files in a university archive I do not understand. Can you explain that to me? Isn't it a little bit like Nixon telling the House Judiciary subcommittee investigating grounds for impeachment of the president to rediscover for itself the material special prosecutor Jaworski has eked from the White House?

And why do you decline to comment on Admiral Dr Burkley's role in the Kennedy assassination? You say you "gave all of that to the incompetents in New Orleans." So you have disclosed it! Why withhold it now? What did Garrison and company do wit it?

Is what you gave the incompetents in New Orleans part of the public record? If you won't tell me what you told them and what you told them is part of the public record to whom can I apply for a copy or for permission to see it?

You know, it makes me uncomfortable to think of you getting up in the cold at four in the morning, after only four hours of sleep, to berate me by typewriter about my multitudinous imperfections of character and mind. Couldn't you manage at least six hours of sleep and letters which were less admonitory and more informative about the one thing we have in common - an abiding interest in the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

Amiably,

Thomas Stamm