5/24/69

Dear John,

Thanks for the return of the Lattimer piece. If you do not have his 1966 scrivening and want that, I have it also.

By now you should have the memorandum and a subsequent note.

You write, "he has visited here and we went out to do some shooting and I gave him some ammunition and later sold him a gun. We agreed on many points but not the essential ones. I knew he was writing this article but he never gave me any details and certainly never let me see the M.S. He tried to persuade me not to testify in New Orleans and has never communicated since." All of this I find intriguing. I wish you had told me when he visited you and if he had made a special trip or was in the area. All of his writing was well in advance of the New Orleans trial, though possibly not before you and the Garrison office had been in touch.

Understanding Lattimer in this affair is not easy for me because he is a busy professional man with a reputation to uphold and he converted himself into an instantaneous ass-kisser who did the shallowest, least significant writing that is irrelevant and immaterial, that addresses nothing save the factxthat bullets can fragment into small pieces, which was a well-established fact in any event.

Had you seen his first peice, you'd have been suspicious of him. What he does there is say that the government says its account is right, therefore it is right. It, like the second, has much error. If he knew anything about the subject he would not have made these errors, unless he begins with dishonesty. As a man from a discipline opposed to such frivolous, irresponsible approaches, he thereby raises questions about himself and why he does such things, for his writing is not consistent with a scientific approach.

Can you shed anynlight? Did he indicate why he got involved, what, if any, his special interests or connections (as with any of the people involved), whether he is anything but a physician at a college hospital, etc.

It just doesn't make sense to me, unless he is a fool or has connections of which I have no knowledge, that he would engage in what amounts to self-defamation by the kind of writing that bears his name, by the kind of irrelevant "research" he has touted.

Thus far, the pictures we ordered from the Archives have not arrived. We should be getting Dick's memo soon.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER
RAINBOW BOULEVARD AT 39TH STREET
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66103 • AREA CODE 913 • ADams 6-5252

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY AND ONCOLOGY

May 20, 1969

Harold Weisberg, Esq.,
Route 8
Frederick, Maryland

Dear Harold:

Many thanks for your letter of Saturday February 17 which arrived this morning.

Am returning herewith Dr. Lattimer's reprint from Int. Surg. He has visited here and we went out do do some shooting and I gave him some ammunition and later sold him a gun. We agreed on many points but not the essential ones. I knew he was writing this article but he naver gave me any details and certainly never let me see the MS. He tried to persuade me not to testify in New Orleans and has never communicated since. I have a Xerox copy of his work.

Shall look forward to the results of your work with Bernabei and to your comments for my lawyers.

Sincerely,

John Nichols