

6/12/72

Dear Jerry,

I giving me Sylvia's piece in The Texas Observer yesterday evening, you said, "I know you won't like this." You were correct, based on my general attitude, which I've expressed often enough, and based on my own refusal to engage in such meaningless scribbling except for pay. A writer writes for a living and to live what he might otherwise prefer not to do, does do. However, I also have other objections after reading it in haste last night, a few I didn't expect to have. I have never regarded the deliberate and unauthorized and uncredited use of the work of others in a sense calculated to represent it as the work of the person whose name appears with the writing as ethically or morally commendable. No matter how often it is repeated, the measure by which it is judged does not change. Nor is it influenced by the pose or reputation of the one who does it. In addition, there are a few factual errors, one a bit unkind to Lattimer, over which I shed no tears, and the other another non-accident of a kind Sylvia has repeated in dealing with who did what when. Cyril did not apply to Marshall for access to the autopsy film in 1966. I know as does Sylvia that I was the first, the morning it was in the papers that this stuff had been deposited in the Archives, when I appeared in Bahmer's office and went thru the formalities. Moreover, as late as after Graham's story on the contract appeared, Cyril not only did not have a copy but was so ignorant of how to get things he didn't even know he could get this from the Archives by writing them. He didn't even write the Times for a copy of Graham's story. He asked me to get that for him (with three secretaries of his own yet!). I bought him a copy of the original, for which I await repayment (which I note only because of some of his less warranted recent self-justifications) and, to the best of my knowledge, even his thanks. It is I who sent him the copy of the panel report, from New Orleans the Monday after its Thursday night release, and he didn't understand that, so I had to explain that to this eminence of forensic pathology. I made a tape for an entirely different reason, to keep a record of the Halleck proceedings, so you can hear it. Thus I tell you that entirely aside from my basic reasons for opposing all such fustings into windstorm (and you know the last attracted a hurricane), which can have predictable consequences (witness the accuracy of my forecast the last time), I also tell you with bluntness that despite his highest qualifications in his field, and this is sincere, he is as good as the best, I oppose his seeing this stuff because he just doesn't know anything of his own knowledge about the related facts of the case and has never taken the time to learn. So, I fear the consequences on this basis alone. There are the others of which you know. But I am beginning to wonder why Sylvia, with her rather better than average record of accuracy, has this lingering penchant for non-accidental misdating. I haven't the prerequisites for plumbing the human mind, haven't tried it with Dirhan or Bremer, so I won't with others. But in this case some reasons are fairly obvious, as the most casual examination of the new writings, as on those of the past, shows with consistency. I'll be content if there is no followup as the last attracted. HW

THE TEXAS

OBSERVER

A Journal of Free Voices

A Window to the South

May 26, 1972

25¢

See pp 22-24



And all without billboards

(Please see p.3)

The case of the urologist apologist

By Sylvia Meagher

New York

The first non-governmental viewer to inspect the JFK autopsy photographs and X-rays, Dr. John K. Lattimer, announced that they "eliminate any doubt completely" that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin. The anticlimatic news appeared on the front page of the *New York Times* on Jan. 9, 1972, in an exclusive story under the by-line of Fred Graham. Until the preceding week, the *Times* pointed out, only representatives of the government had been given access to the autopsy photographs and X-rays and not even the Warren Commission or its staff had seen them.

Who is Dr. John K. Lattimer? A prominent urologist, attached to the

22

The Texas Observer

CLASSIFIED

BOOKPLATES. Free catalog. Many beautiful designs. Special designing too. Address: BOOK-PLATES, P.O. Box 28-1, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387.

MARJORIE ANNE DELAFIELD TYPING SERVICE: Complete Typing Service and Editing. Duplicating (printing, multilith, mimeo, ditto), Binding, Mailing, Public Notary. Twenty years experience. Call 442-7008 or 442-0170, Austin.

WE SELL THE BEST SOUND. Yamaha pianos, guitars; Moock-Kung-Aulus recorders; harmonicas, kalimbas and other exotic instruments. Amster Music, 1624 Lavaca, Austin, 478-7331.

THURSDAY DISCUSSION GROUP meets at noon weekly at the YMCA, 605 North Ervay in Dallas. No dues. Everyone welcome.

NOTICE - Please take notice that the law partnership of MULLINAX, WELLS, MAUZY & BAAB has now become a professional corporation under Texas law and the name is MULLINAX, WELLS, MAUZY & BAAB, INC., with address and registered agent, Oscar Mauzy at 1601 National Bankers Life Building, Dallas, Texas 75201.

CENTRAL TEXAS ACLU luncheon meeting. The Renaissance, 801 Rio Grande, 2nd Monday of each month. From noon. All welcome.

McGOVERN photo button: \$1. Mobile: \$2. Proceeds to campaign. McGovern Committee, P.O. Box 472, Vermillion, SD 57069.

RAZA UNIDA PARTY: People's Coalition seeking social justice needs your donations. Posters, decals, ribbons, buttons for sale. Box 271, Crystal City, Texas 78839.

WISH TO OBTAIN the June 27, 1959, issue of *The Texas Observer* pertaining to Roy Bedichek. Ruth Keenan, 825 Harris, Austin. Phone 477-0968.

Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons. There is no reason to doubt that he is a highly competent urologist but every reason to deny that he is qualified to evaluate the JFK autopsy photos and X-rays. He is not even eligible to see those materials under the terms of the agreement governing access to this evidence, which stipulates "recognized experts in the field of pathology or related areas of science or technology."

UROLOGY IS as far removed from forensic pathology in the examination of gunshot fatalities as pediatrics or psychiatry. The fact that Dr. Lattimer examined gunshot wounds while in military service during World War II is irrelevant. It means only that he was trying to save lives, not that he tried to determine whether the bullets came from the right or the left or from a treetop or a trench. Urology is the branch of medicine that deals with disease processes of the genito-urinary tract. A urologist never moves above the umbilicus. He cannot claim the smallest degree of competence in the field of forensic pathology, which is a highly specialized branch of legal medicine requiring five years of special training followed by continuing work on official medical-legal investigations. A cardinal rule in malpractice is that physicians do not involve themselves in diagnosis, treatment or testimony in a court of law in any specialty in which they do not qualify. That tradition is steeped in wisdom, founded on logic and understood by all physicians.

It is amazing that Dr. Lattimer, who is accredited only as a urologist, should have ventured to examine the JFK autopsy photos and X-rays, which he himself acknowledges that he was not competent to interpret. It is even more astonishing that Dr. Lattimer then rushed on to the front page of the *New York Times* with categorical pronouncements which went far beyond the semantic hesitations of forensic pathologists who had earlier reviewed the same evidence for the government.

In contrast to the equivocal and qualified language of the three original autopsy surgeons who conducted a review of the photos and X-rays in 1967 and the four-man panel who did the same in 1968, Dr. Lattimer has made emphatic assertions which verge on the omniscient. He tells us that a bullet entered the back of the neck at a point even higher than ever claimed before, which happens to coincide with the point of entry on a sketch used by Dr. Lattimer in his lectures on behalf of the Warren Report as early as 1969 or some three years before he saw the autopsy photos. He does not explain how this bullet high in the neck produced holes in

the coat and the shirt more than five inches below the top of the collar, except to offer the lame suggestion about the garments riding up that was discredited long ago.

Perhaps Dr. Lattimer confused this bullet wound - originally located in the infra-scapular region or the lower part of the big wing bone on the back, then moved up several inches to a point immediately over the top of the shoulder - with the bullet hole in the back of the head, near the occipital protuberance and slightly above the hairline, as it was described by the autopsy surgeons - although later that wound too was moved upward by *four inches*, by the four-man 1968 panel headed by Dr. Russell Fisher. Dr. Lattimer describes a halo-like bruise around the neck wound as proof that it was a wound of entry. Such a bruising effect or ecchymosis is also found at wounds of exit, but, then, a urologist has no reason to know that.

LATTIMER INSISTS on a back-to-front bullet transit through the neck because he wants to demonstrate that the shot came from the sixth-floor window of the Book Depository. He argues that the bullet had to come from behind the President because it was on such a steep trajectory that if it came from the front it could only have come from the floor of the car. But since the trajectory is fixed and absolute, the bullet had to end up in the floor of the car, under Lattimer's thesis. Instead, as he seems to have overlooked, it stopped in mid-flight, reversed direction, and struck Governor Connally at the armpit. In other words, Dr. Lattimer is hoist by his own canard.

WHY WAS LATTIMER, a urologist and apologist for the Warren Report in writings and lectures over the last six years, selected to view the autopsy photos and X-rays in violation of the agreement under which they were deposited in the National Archives? Eminent forensic pathologists who applied to see those items back in 1966 and again in mid-1971 have not been given the same opportunity. Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, preeminent in the field of forensic pathology and president of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences as well as coroner of Alleghany County, Pennsylvania, is still awaiting the courtesy of a reply from Burke Marshall, the representative of the Kennedy family, with whom the decision ostensibly rests. Rumor has it that Burke Marshall has only one-third of a secretary at his disposal and has therefore been unable to answer letters from Dr. Wecht - although the lack of secretarial assistance did not obstruct Dr. Lattimer nor visibly retard Marshall in his various activities. Perhaps the discriminatory and discourteous treatment

received by Dr. Wecht stems from the fact that he has the highest expertise and a sceptical, critical mind which he has no hesitation to speak.

Seven governmental experts and now one private urologist have been allowed to view the controversial autopsy photos and X-rays. The 1967 three-man panel made findings that contradicted the original autopsy report and testimony. The 1968 four-man panel made findings which contradicted the 1967 panel and the original autopsy findings. Now a urologist-apologist has come along with findings which are in conflict with those of the 1968 panel, the 1967 panel and the original autopsy.

Isn't it high time that an independent expert from the other side of opinion is allowed into the picture? What is there to fear, if everything is above-board and full of the rectitude that is claimed for the autopsy and the Warren Report by its apologists?

I have been certain all along that the government has dirty hands in the autopsy and in the assassination and would never open the door to Cyril Wecht or any other non-apologist. Burke Marshall has not replied by Dr. Wecht not for lack of secretarial service but because he cannot find any legitimate reason or any pretext to deny his request and because he does not dare allow an independent, outspoken, highly qualified forensic pathologist to view the photos and X-rays. After all, even the Warren Commission itself could not be trusted to look at those materials. □

Youth did it

Dialogue

Sublimation-gratification! After years of self-flagellation, the superior minority is heard. Sitting back in my uneasy chair, looking to my soul for an answer, I discover that once again I've avoided the obvious. Ms. Farenthold didn't make it because of my discontent, but because a together youth got it together far more speedily than I ever could and aided me in promoting the kind of political utopia that I could only hope for.

I'm not sure the why is important — maybe because I'm still caught up in the "what happened." The essence being that not only do I support Ms. Farenthold, I strongly desire a change in a sick societal structure that I helped build. Naturally, in self-protection, I don't accept total responsibility for the sickness in the state or nation — but I do accept responsibility for myself and am committed to the progressiveness of Ms. Farenthold. I wish I could do more.

Ms. Pat Huzarevich, 1930 Rockridge Terrace, Fort Worth, Tex. 76110.

On the bandwagon

What we are presently seeing is Dolph Briscoe riding aboard the bandwagon of "state reform" and many Texans are following, cheering him along. But if my memory serves me correctly, it was Ms. Farenthold who was responsible for exposing scandals such as Sharpstown, which made the people of Texas aware of the drastic need for reform.

While Ms. Farenthold was busy fighting corruption in Austin, Dolph Briscoe was sitting out on his million-acre ranch. When Mr. Briscoe speaks of reform, the record shows that he has a long way to go to measure up to "That Woman for Governor."

Frank Prasifka, 7100 Hwy. 290 E, Austin, Tex.

Write-in candidate

Let's organize a write-in campaign for the man who well-nigh single handedly rid us of such evils as Barnes, Smith, Shannon, Martin & Co., Inc., et al.

He valiantly fought the good fight and smashed the way open for Sissy. We owe ol' Frank Sharp a turn.

FRANK SHARP FOR GOVERNOR!

Louis Garner, 709 A. Graham, Austin, Tex. 78705.

More Moll

I also subscribe to the Sunday *New York Times*, the *Atlantic* and *Harper's*, as well as

various professional journals. No one (at least since John Fischer quit writing "The Easy Chair" in *Harper's*) gives me as much pleasure as Molly Ivins.

Two sentences into any article of hers and you don't need to look for the M.I. at the end — the writing is distinctive, clear, informative and (bless us) fun. What a marvelous thing to be able to say about a reporter in 1972. In Texas, yet.

More Moll Ivins!

And, of course, more *Observer*.

Joyce J. Griffen, 602 East Cherry, Flagstaff, Ariz. 86001.

Turning off the Lord

We received the excerpts from the *Observer*. You have clever writers.

Please get a clever editor who will edit out your use of the Lord's Name "in vain." Besides turning some valuable readership off, anyone dealing with politics needs His Help, and that's just not the way to get it.

Anne Simmons, 4422 Wigton, Houston, Tex. 77035.

Yea, Rindy

I finished reading "Country Karma" by Dean Rindy in the April 14 issue and longed to get back to Texas and get my boots dirty. Rindy does an excellent job of portraying beautiful Texas as it really is.

Non-Texans should read that article and forget about Dallas and the assassination. Congrats to Rindy and keep printing those kinds of articles.

PEACE, Leon Barish, Box 2245, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 21218.

'Provincial'

Your article on "The Abilene Three" made such a point of the provincialism of Abilene, I can't resist remarking on the provincialism of an art page editor who would title an exhibition of the highest quality of crafts "Artsy-Craftsy" (March 3 issue). We feel fortunate that 22 of the craftsmen live outside of Texas and are not likely to see the *Observer* since that expression usually designates such things as crocheted antimacassars!

Meda Johnston, Texas representative American Crafts Council, 2415 33rd St. #2, Lubbock, Tex. 79441.