Wallace Wilam
360 Greenway ~~Blvd~~ Ave., #4
Dyersburg, TV 38024

9/29/94

Dear Wallace,

Thanks for your 9/24 and the interesting enclosures. I was pretty sure that you would not object to my giving Lattimer a copy but I wanted to see if he would do what I did not expect him to do, ask you for a copy. Which is what he had been avoiding. I have not heard from him either. He is afraid to ask you for a copy. I did not give it to Agel because I do not know what if any relationship he has with that racist Lattimer. I remember his 22 fires and they may all burn but he was wonderful to me in and after 1966. He got Whitewash its first attention in New York and let me use his office and his phone as my own whenever I was there.

Artwohl has phoned and has been here. There is nothing he will not stretch to appear to justify the official mythology and strangely for a bright man, seems to believe it. I think he was made that way by the nutty theories.

I suppose that Lattimer is aware of what I said about him in Post Mortem. He has not had a word to say about it or about any of my work.

Agel was trying to get a friend of his on New York Newsday to write an expose of Posner. I suppose he did not succeed and I did not expect him to because of all the papers that went ape over Posner, it did more than any other.

If we later discuss any of this, remind me that I have a Thorburn file in my file on Posner's book and will have this there.

Thanks and best wishes,

Harold

360 Greenway Ave #4
Dyersburg 38024

September 24, 1994

Harold Weisberg
Route #12
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg (a term I use here to indicate admiration, not distance):

I have no objection at all to anyone giving my material to Lattimer, whether it was Agel (who truly is nuts--I had a telephone conversation with him about LHO shooting at Jackie) or Posner and Loomis (to whom I also sent copies--after it was too late to include the info in Posner's revision).

I will probably attempt to write a book about the medical evidence some day, but I have no objection at all to anyone using my material at this time.

I am sending you on an accompanying page some comments on the Lattimer article and his responses. You may pass these along to Lattimer and others, if you so desire.

I am also enclosing an electronic communication by Bob Artwohl, who is one of the shrill defenders of the single bullet theory. As you can see, Artwohl, who is obnoxious but no fool, realized the Thorburn flaw earlier (He's probably the only one of them who has actually read the original article.). He is distancing himself from Thorburn. But not very gracefully. Notice his statement that it "sort of looks like a Thorburn's position." Notice his assertion that there could be such a thing as an instantaneous neurological response, one that required no elapse of time. This is an absurdity. Finally, his claim that the brachial plexus is stimulated is inadequate. There are 2 brachial plexuses, one to either side of the spinal cord. How could the pressure cavity to the right brachial plexus cause Kennedy's left arm to abduct? Besides, 20th century neurology texts tell us that brachial palsy causes the arm to fall limply to the side.

Wallace Milam

DR. LATTIMER HAS APPARENTLY DECIDED THAT MY CRITICISM OF HIS FINDINGS CONCERNING THE ALLEGED "THORBURN POSITION" IS AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT HE CALLS "NIT-PICKING." LATTIMER HAS APPARENTLY ALSO DECIDED THAT SINCE I HAVE DONE NO BALLISTIC EXPERIMENTATION OF MY OWN, I AM NOT QUALIFIED TO JUDGE HIS FINDINGS.

* Instead of refuting my claims about the deficiencies in his Thorburn findings, he has attempted to evade the central issues and to argue irrelevancies.

* Whether his articles were read and critiqued by a ballerina, a blacksmith or a ballistician, certain issues and questions are raised, issues which Lattimer apparently refuses to address:

a. Did Lattimer add the names of neurologists Schlesinger and Merritt to the 1977 BULLETIN OF THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE article in which he first introduced "Thorburn" without the two neurologists having had any actual input into the writing of the article? (We have a taped conversation in which Schlesinger states that he never read the finished product and that Merritt had "nothing at all" to do with the article.)

b. Did Schlesinger and Merritt file signed statements with the publication, saying that they had read the contents of the article and concurred in its conclusions? (Such a step is required of scientific publications, and irregularities in this regard are considered violations of scientific canons of ethics.)

c. Did Lattimer ever actually read the 1889 Thorburn article before he misrepresented its content both in periodicals and in his book, KENNEDY AND LINCOLN? If he cited Thorburn without having read the article, this action surely represents scientific irresponsibility. If, however, Lattimer read the article, then his MISREPRESENTATION of the content of the Thorburn's article can be nothing less than deliberate misrepresentation.

d. If Lattimer did read the article, why did he ignore glaring differences between Thorburn's victim and President Kennedy, differences which rule his conclusions invaiid?

e. Are the captions used by Lattimer for Thorburn illustrations in his writing the same as those in the original Thorburn article? Did he change those captions? If so, why did Lattimer alter Thorburn's original captions when he falsely presented Thorburn's findings?

f. Why did Lattimer assert that certain damage to Thorburn's victim (damage he claimed paralleled damage done to Kennedy) was reaffirmed at autopsy the following day, when (i) Thorburn's victim did not die for 26 days after the accident (ii) the actual autopsy described damage in an area and of a nature significantly different from the damage done to Kennedy's spinal cord?

g. If Lattimer actually read the Thorburn article, how did he confuse ABDUCTION of the arms of Thorburn's victim with ADDUCTION of Kennedy's arms?

* Is it "nitpicking" to point out that, in his writing, Lattimer has moved the alleged site of damage to Kennedy's spinal cord about to suit his current interpretations? Is it "nitpicking" to point out that two neurologists had their names added to an article in which they apparently had no input? Is it "nitpicking" to show that Lattimer ignored (either deliberately or through ignorance) the content of the original Thorburn article? Is it "nitpicking" to point out that Lattimer changed the captions which accompanied the original Thorburn article--and that these changes did not accurately

reflect what Thorburn had written? Is it "nitpicking" to point out that in his writings about how Kennedy's wounding was an "almost classic example" of a Thorburn reaction, Lattimer NEVER ONCE quoted directly from Thorburn?

Dr. John Lattimer may well have had a distinguished career within his medical field. At the same time, he has been accepted as a source of definitive (and oft-quoted) information by the defenders of the Warren Commission. In article after article and in his book, KENNEDY AND LINCOLN, Lattimer has committed error after error. One can turn to any given page of his work and find errors and flawed claims. His writing has been characterized by carelessness and disregard for the factual record. Yet this has been condoned--and, in many cases-- praised by those who need his shrill voice. It is time to say "Enough" to John Lattimer's "scientific" charades. Lattimer's recent performances, especially his Thorburn mis-representations, must be exposed. It is time to say, finally: This emperor has no clothes.

Subj: Thornburn's Position Section: Medical Evidence
From: Bob Artwohl, 71712,2151 #24640
To: Tony Pitterese, 74032,3333 Tuesday, May 31, 1994 08:16:13

Tony,

This is from an earlier post I worte:

1. JFK was not exhiting a "Thorburn response." He was exhiting an immediate response to the bullet passing through the base of his right neck. It sort of looks like a Thorburn's position, but it is not a truly what Thorburn was describing, which is a much delayed reaction (days to months) following a low cervical cord transection.

2. JFK's reaction to the neck wound was, for all intents and purposes, instantaneous to the hit at Z-223/224. As the bullet passed through his neck, the pressure cavity caused an immediate and wide spread stimulation of all the nerves in the immediate vicinity, that is of the brachial plexus, the large groups of nerves that emerge from C5 - T1. These are the nerves that supply motor function to the arms.