

10/30/74

Dear Dr. Wecht,

On reading your "The JFK Assassination: Current Status" I was reminded that you had totally ignored my requests for information and copies of your writings, and had not answered the many questions I had put to you in letters dated Feb Feb 12 and 18 of this year.

Herewith I renew the requests and put the questions again. Your latest writing gives more point to the problem of Burden's second death certificate and his role in the assassination aftermath, especially with relation

to the autopsy at which he was present, and much else.
Your material makes it clear, although you
do not say so flatly, the Warren Commission
considered two contradictory autopsy reports and
discarded one, and concealed the existence of
the discarded "report," thereby avoiding embarrassment.

Why this should strike you as a "scientific
discovery" is remarkable. When you made this
discovery were you not already convinced of the
spurious ^{nature of the} case the Commission had manufactured;
of its conscious suppression of evidence; of its deliberate
misinterpretation of evidence? Had you not
concluded that the government was engaged
in concealing the motivation, source, and personnel

of the conspiracy which removed the head of state
by murder and cleared the road for military
adventure in southeast Asia?

But even in the narrower compass of your
concern with evidence, your emotional reaction
to the discovery of corroboratory material of
the villainy of the "President's men," is surprising.
Your writings had already demolished the
authority of the official autopsy report. Your
researches had demonstrated its inaccuracy.

You had applied the "flaws" of the
single-bullet theory of the ~~fatal~~ Kennedy
back and neck wounds and the Connally
wounds. Why didn't you draw the "only"

inference which the accumulated body
of evidence and research made palpably plain —
that the "first" autopsy report was discarded
and concealed because it ~~was~~ did not fit the
requirement to "find" a lone killer solely
responsible for the assassination; and that
the "official" or Humes/Hoover autopsy report
was drawn to fit that requirement? Why
did you recoil from that obvious conclusion
and, sickly o'er, to paraphrase Hamlet, the
truth with the "hope that it means no more
than that the autopsy team had blundered
badly and found it necessary to rewrite their
report at a later date with the Commission

and the FBI consenting to a cover-up of that fact on the ground that the later report was the correct one and that that was all that mattered."

Let us not overlook the light which the present sheds on the past. Let us bear in mind that the president who admits that he deceived the nation about Nixon's guilt was a member of the Warren Commission and voted for its dishonest report. And used classified information to write a portrait of Oswald as an assassin, thereby extending the cover up of the assassins of President JFK and their employers and sponsors. - Very truly yours

Thomas Stamm
2705 Bainbridge Ave, Bronx, NY 10458