

February 20, 1974

Dear Mr Weisberg,

I am glad it was not your purpose to offend me. And I regret you will not share the information you have with me, even to the extent of enlightening me in matters about which I am in the dark and seek light. If I had information about the assassination of president Kennedy you needed or wanted I would give it you freely. I would be motivated by the desire to have the truth established. I do not have the ambition to be the first or the only one to do so. You see, I have been studying the assassination since 1963, have written a number of pieces about it, some dealing with evidence, some with motivation, have had nothing published; and do not plan on seeking publication now or in the foreseeable future which must be short as I am ten years older than you. Moreover, I do not believe that anyone can have a property right in truth. Whoever comes into possession of truth, whether by his own effort, skill, art, or thought, or by that of another, by purposeful search or by accident, by any means whatsoever, including even theft, incurs an imperative obligation to offer it to his fellowmen, and even, if necessary, to thrust it on them. To know truth and withhold it is precisely what the American government did through the agency of the Warren Commission about the assassination of president Kennedy, the Vietnam war, and other matters. It is what Nixon strives so desperately to do to stem the flood of Watergate revelations. It would be a cruel irony if fate cast you, too, in that role - to have the truth and sit on it. It would be little consolation that the government did more than merely withhold the truth, that it lied and distorted, and falsified historic events.

If the muse of history has chosen you to be the instrument of revelation, fine; so be it. If, on the other hand, you have appointed yourself to play that role, you and all of us who want to know the truth about the assassination of president Kennedy are in a dilemma. If I understand your letter you are prevented from disseminating the truth because of poverty and inability to secure editorial help. I am not able to do anything about the first and you say you would not accept help of this kind if it were offered. But I can help editorially. I have had some experience in editing, years ago on labor publications, and afterward as an encyclopedist and in preparing book manuscripts for publication. Perhaps we could collaborate in preparing a first chapter of your book and seek a publisher. There are indications in the news interest in the assassination is increasing once more as the 1976 presidential election approaches and the question of Senator Kennedy's possible bid for power hangs in the air.

But even if you don't want my help I see no reason not to correspond about matters of mutual and absorbing interest. I don't want to take or steal anything from you. I want only to know your thought, at this time about the very puzzling, at least for me, duplicate death certificate which was, you wrote, not "merely signed" by Burkley." The problem fascinates me.

And then there is the doctor, a rear admiral no less, possibly out of the top drawer of the military-industrial complex, whose shadowy role in the immediate aftermath of the assassination, made darker by the studied neglect of him by friend and foe of the Warren Commission alike, badly needs illumination. What about him?

Sincerely,

*Thomas Stamm*

By the way, it was not I but Dr Lattimer, as my letter made explicitly clear, who thought the Burkley death certificate was of little or no importance. That's one charge you made to which I can plead, "definitely not guilty." Please accept this correction as an evidence of my editorial acumen.