9/29/94

Dear Wallace.

Thanks for your 9/24 and the interesting enclosure. 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 did not proct him to do, ask you for a copy. Which is what he had been avaiding. 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 fire and they may all born but he was wonderful to me in and after 1966. He got Whitewash its first attention in New York and liet 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 strtch to appear to justify the official mythology and stangely 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. "e has not had a word to say about it or about any of my work.

Agel was trying to bet 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 thes, remind me that I have a Thorbirn file in my file on Posner's book and will have this there.

Thanks and best wishes.

Harolp

3 40 greenway duty

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

Wallace milan