

Dick - please send this to Sylvia after you read it. Thanks -
PK

Harold Weisberg
c/o G. Frederick, Inc. 21701
August 20, 1972

fuell
Dear Dr. Morgan,

Under the headline, "Report Says Doctors Erred in Site of JFK's Wound", this morning's Washington Post cites you as the expert and says you have made a four-year study of the evidence.

The story bears a closer detailing. It does not so state, but the implications are that this is the reporting of a speech you made or paper you presented. It is presented in a format indicative of condemnation of air-service reports.

I have had a long and continuing interest in this subject. I write to ask if you can provide me with a copy of your remarks, of any others on the subject you have made, and to ascertain if you plan a larger presentation of the results of your study. If you do, I would like to know when you anticipate it may be available.

Thank you very much for anything you may send me.

Sincerely,

Predictably, what this story does not say is that Morgan was an member of an official panel which said it confirmed the "medical findings" of the WR and confirmed the doctors he now, finally, says "erred". Also predictably, the story says that because the Report was wrong it thereby becomes right, the reason being the Saperstein film, which shows "The jurching of the President's body backward...was caused by body spasms after the massive wound was inflicted."

After four years of silence it is, obviously, no more than a coincidence that Morgan has seen fit to make comment just before Cyril is going to see the film that shows this error, which is not new and which Cyril missed when he examined Morgan's own report. And so we have another facet, and with it another of the kinds of things so many, finding foreign to their own life experiences, reject when they hear them from others. To those few to whom I will send carbon, I remind you that this is exactly the kind of thing I have been trying to get you to understand is inevitable, exactly the kind of reason we must be silent until we have a) something that is really worth saying and b) has some prospect of being heard so that it will not be lost in that saying. In addition, it shows what some of you have persistently refused to even consider, that in our position and given the clear record of the press, everything we do and say must have a context, the unwelcome word I use over and over and over, without response from any but one, who has come to understand it. Earlier today I wrote Phil reminding him of Santayana's quote about learning from history. Well, I'm sending a carbon to Bill only, so don't take offense. But for Christ's sake if not ours or yours, when the hell will you open that fine mind and let a few ideas that don't come from texts and labs into it? I'll probably write other letters on this later today, after I think about it a bit. I have just seen this in the paper and felt I had to write Morgan immediately. I don't think it would be unwise to expect more of this. So, aside from anything he might say, Cyril has already been refuted and to begin with he will have to argue that what Morgan says can't be true, the third strike before the first ball is thrown under most circumstances. All I can say is that God was kind to the "critical con unity" to attack only genius to it, only open minds, only the unselfish, only those with foresight, clear vision and more than understanding, the lust to understand. Thus in his albeeing wisdom, he eliminated its need of enemies.

I will be ungracious. I did tell you so!

HW