

Dear Thomas,

3/25/74

Today bore too many urgencies for lengthy response to your 3/22 and the other letters to which I have not responded.

I confused you and William in my haste. It is the same Occam, he of the Razor.

In the work I have done I have learned that his preference for the simpler solutions is more often applicable than that of the ancient Chinese sages.

Why not try this on Burkley and Camelot?

You postulate the needlessly Byzantine.

You have not dropped Burkley. Between us I am.

The Occam philosophy is relevant. Ptherwise you go in circles.

Believe me or not I will not go into those things and if you persist I will not respond. I have undertaken too much and there is too much I will not be able to do. And there is no offense, nothing you can contribute on St. George, to whom you needlessly attribute dragons.

The book you describe on page 2 I had researched before the end of 1965. Other things took my attention. Perhaps my judgement was ~~fact~~ flawed, but I will yet write it. If I don't have to spend too much time in childish indulgences of the self-important whoses importance to themselves lies in their self-concept not in their labors.

Do you really believe the imperialist state was decapitated? Or do you believe the decapitation was for the imperialist state. (The word no longer has its traditional relevance to me.)

You have said that you will preserve confidentiality but as I understand you on the city directory business only. Therefore, and please do not make a special trip, I would appreciate the Mexico City listings for Paseo de la Reforma, years 1963 and 1967-73.

Your P.S.: You assign Burkley a role it was not necessary for anyone to fill and without probative evidence that with or without need he filled that role.

This is complicated enough. Why complicate it more? I know that lacking specific knowledge the temptation is great but temptation is neither fact nor reason.

Thus spake William of Occam.

Sincerely,

June 12, 1975

Dear Harold,

I hope you are recovered from your recent illness and are up to corresponding with your usual abusive vigor. A number of developments are worthy of your wrath. As an investigator of historical truth you know, I am sure, Longfellow abused poetic license in *The Landlord's Tale*, which is part one of *Tales of a Wayside Inn* (1863-74), in assigning Paul Revere the role of midnight messenger "on the eighteenth of April in Seventy-five;" and that Revere's Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer, Esther Forbes, established his true role as the lantern signalman in the church belfry (Paul Revere and the World He Lived In, 1942). I take it for granted, for the same essential reason, you are disquieted by the current journalistic abuse of historical accuracy in accounting for release of the transcript of the Warren Commission executive session of January 27, 1964, in June 1974, as the result of your suits under the Freedom of Information Act, without reference to your loss of those suits in the Supreme Court and the subsequent unexpected declassification of that transcript. Your own speculative explanation of that strange twist, by the way, in the introduction to *Whitewash IV*, while flattering to your self esteem and not impossible, lacks any factual basis, is implausible and farfetched. At any rate, you should be doing what you can to set the record straight in the various forums to which you have access. I doubt you can count on a biographer doing so in seventy or eighty years from now.

Since your expensive entanglement with the Federal courts and beneficence at the hands of the Archives the transcript of the executive session of January 22, 1964 has been declassified. Do you know why? I assume you have a copy and have studied it well. I invite you to read the accompanying correspondence with the National Archives relative to that transcript and tell me what you think. Do you know who "A" and "Q" and "Sides" are? Do you know how many Warren Commission sessions were held?

One again I return to the subject of Burkley. Since our last exchanges on that theme I have pulled together from a number of sources, as I wrote you I would when you refused to be helpful, a body of material suggesting the admiral-doctor was a link between frame up in Dallas and frame up in Washington. This, in turn, raises the larger question of the role of the navy in the assassination of president Kennedy. I will send you this material if you want to receive it and if, in return, you will undertake a forthcoming, detailed, and documented critical verification or disproof of it, in whole or in part. I believe you have the means to do it. Let's make discussion of that material a collaboration.

Hopefully,

*Thomas*  
Thomas Stamm

*This in cf. less  
in that full under  
M. Bess's. I did  
not answer*

10/20/68

Dear Mr. Stamm,

Try looking at it this way: If the same number of frames of motion picture film pass through a projector whose speed is fixed at 3.5 second and in 5.0 seconds, then the rate of speed of those requiring only 3.5 seconds is 30 % greater.

If in the reconstruction, Shaneyfelt had exposed film at a rate of 24 fps for 3.5 seconds and projected this at 5.0 seconds, the result would be the same as if he had projected for 5 seconds what he exposed at 24 fps.

Two factors complicate our considerations: Projectors, of course, can be varied but is there any reason to project film faster? This has the effect of shortening the apparent time for the assassination. Zaprunder's camera has no fast-motion setting (about 12 fps on most cameras), and has an animation, of single-exposure setting. More, it appears to have no 25 frame setting. From the instruction book (I have a duplicate camera) the speed at slow motion is 48 frames per second.

It also will not help when I tell you that the version of the Zap film you saw was a 16-mm copy of a copy, the first two times duplicated so that it would be seen at fast motion. What constructive purpose this serves is lost on me.

We are, in any event, left with an intolerable 30% error that is acknowledged.

The manner in which the camera is motivated lends itself to the kind of unintended error I speculated about. If you push upward on the control, one frame passes the lens. If you push downward, it is for "normal". If you push downward on the hair more, the camera switches to slow motion, without skipping a frame. If the speed varied at all, I'd say that under the tension, Zap also tensed and skipped into slow motion.

I have no reason to believe Shaneyfelt's explanation of anything or to believe he did not, shall we say by accident, reverse the actuality.

Barret did say 24fps. It is his addendum that states the fps.

Contacting people like Zap serves only to confuse them more and make more unlikely the extraction of truth. He in particular was brainwashed. Peter Kihss spoke to Zap, who said he'd never been interviewed by the FBI. Look what he said on CBS.

Design of the Zap camera permits going from normal to slow and back, without interruption....No comparative studies....Do continue to regard this as an open question and study it as you can. However, how can you say that an acknowledged 30% error in reconstruction, from which all conclusions come, does not "justify impeachment of the government's case on this ground"....You will find that as early as WHITEWASH II is ~~is~~ also pointed out discontinuous forward then backward motions of the head. Interestingly, there seems to be no 284 in #885, rather 283 duplicated!... Shots were earlier, as I said (47) and I now have additional evidence I'll publish in Post Mortem...Keep it up, it is important. Everything must be closely examined. I'm trying to cover too much but have no alternative...Please excuse haste.

Sincerely,