

97 Beaumont St.
Newtonville, Mass
August 2, 1967

Dear Harold,

I heard your recent broadcasts on the Steve Frederick show, and as usual, your presentation of the factual material was excellent. I had a meeting with him yesterday, and he loaned me his copy of "Photographic Whitewash".

May I expect to receive a signed copy of my own? I have not yet finished it, but I have certainly seen enough of it to know that it represents yet another of your extremely valuable contributions, for now and for the historical record. You have my sincere congratulations.

I'm sure you won't mind a few points of constructive criticism. First, the title is definitely misleading in that the phrase "--suppressed Kennedy Assassination Pictures", following the main title "Photographic Whitewash" gives the unmistakable impression that the book is made up primarily of actual photographs of the assassination scene. Obviously it is not, and in fact has far fewer photos than Whitewash II. Of course, you are referring in your title to the fact that the book is made up of photographs of documents pertaining to assassination photos. But by a logical extension of this interpretation, even a book that contained only text, and no photos or documents whatever, could be described as "photographic", in the sense that some type of photo process is used in making the plates. Your book is much too good to allow readers to be disappointed as a result of a mistaken impression that it contains many actual assassination scene photos. Therefore, I strongly suggest you amend the title accordingly in any future edition.

Re frames 314-315 and their transposition in vol. 18, this you discuss in considerable detail on pgs. 24-25 and 145. You stress the significance of this, explaining that "Had not Frames 314 and 315 been reversed in the Commission's evidence and had not the Commission ignored the unmistakable evidence of the motion picture, it could never have falsely concluded that the fatal injury also was inflicted from the rear and was also fired by Oswald."

All the more my surprise and disappointment that you failed completely to credit me with this discovery, especially since you said you would do so when we discussed the matter in a phone call in May. (You will recall you told me you had been under the impression that it was Dave Lifton who first noted the reversal, an erroneous impression created in you and others by his exchange of letters -- through a friend -- with Hoover. I informed you of the facts; that I had originally observed it shortly after the volumes were released; included it in my unpublished paper, "Hypotheses re the Zapruder Film", completed in March, '65; and showed it to Dave Lifton at that time, some nine months prior to Dave's correspondence with J. Edgar. I am quite certain Dave will confirm the facts as I have stated them.)

I feel confident your failure to credit me despite your assurance you would do so is attributable solely to the tremendous pressure of the amazing quantity of detailed work in which you are constantly engrossed. However, now that I have reminded you of it, I'm sure you will want to correct this oversight in future references, for historical accuracy as well as fairness to me.

On the other hand, your references to me alone in connection with the Moorman images (pp. 34, 106) could well lead people to believe I discovered them. Of course, I do think they are extremely important (specifically, #2 and #5 -- see enclosed correspondence with Midgley), and I believe they hold tremendous potential for another stage of breakthrough. I have also done much work with them, by way of presenting them in more advantageous forms, circulating them, and pushing them for publication. But as I have told you and others whenever the subject arises, it was Dave Lifton who made this crucial discovery, and therefore should be credited accordingly. Incidentally, I'm wondering why you didn't include these images, in various stages of blow-up, in your book. I think they belonged there, and would have caused quite an additional stir (so far they have only appeared, in very poor form, in the June 2, '67 issue of the Harvard Crimson). Did copyright problems present an insurmountable ~~xxx~~ obstacle?

In your discussion of frame 202, I feel it would have been appropriate to credit Lillian Castellano with her very important work in proving it, and not 210, was simultaneous with Willis 5 (unless, of course, she doesn't want her name used; but I don't think that is still the case).

Regarding Bullet 399, here again I must voice my surprise and disappointment that you failed to mention "The Bastard Bullet". The logical place to have done so, if you so chose, was on pg. 16. Besides your own letter of endorsement, an excerpt of which is included at the front of my published version, you told me that newsmen to whom you have showed it have commented favorably. You yourself have described it as follows in letters to others:

(to Mr. Cutler", 1/6/67) "Because of your interest in it, I tell you about a monograph just published by Rendell Publications, (etc.) . . . Ray Marcus has drawn together much of the available information about this bullet and its strange career. No one else has done as much with it. I read it in rough draft and cannot praise it too highly . . . I hope it achieves publishing success for the time has now come for specialization in aspects of the evidence . . . its success might encourage others."

(obviously, one important aid in achieving "publishing success" for such specialized studies would be to make reference to them in the more general books, which, by their nature, normally receive wider distribution)--RM)

(to Joe Dolan, 1/13/67) "I understand Ray Marcus, author of what I hope will be the first of a series of monographs of specialized aspects of the deficiencies of the Warren Report, is to be on your program Tuesday. His appropriately entitled "The Bastard Bullet" traces what he aptly terms "The Search For Legitimacy" in a painstaking way. The result is an important contribution to the available literature. I hope your listeners . . . will get and read his work carefully. I think it will excite them as a worthwhile piece of non-fictional detectiveing. . . . There is, in all the many important things Ray really looks into exhaustively one in particular you and he can present in detail to your audience. That is the result of the so-called tests at Aberdeen Proving Grounds. Ray has shown that even with a stacked deck the government could not deal out the hand it turns up in the Warren Report."

Since I know you were being sincere in your assessments quoted above, I can only assume, again, that it was the press of your extremely heavy workload that caused you to overlook mentioning the B.B. in your book.

Similarly, you will remember that after your three-hour appearance on the Mort Sahl radio show last December, which I had arranged for you, I pointed out to you that despite much conversation on the program about 399, you hadn't mentioned my monograph. You apologized for this oversight, and told me you certainly would refer to it in your future appearances, when appropriate context presented itself. I'm sure you must have done so; and yet, on your recent 6 hours on Steve Frederick's show, you failed to do so; again, despite much conversation about 399.

Even though I am certain you will agree that the sale of serious books and articles on the assassination is a perfectly legitimate undertaking, I hope you will believe me when I say that my motive in raising this matter is not primarily due to a concern to sell books (I have less than 200 to sell at any rate, and anticipated correctly when I printed the 1000 copies that I probably would need no more. The private publishing, the relatively high price in relation to form and volume, and the very specialized nature of the subject allowed for no illusions that my monograph might be a big seller).

Rather, -- and at the risk of appearing immodest at agreeing with some of your assessment of it -- I believe it does make some contribution; and therefore deserves to be read by those seriously interested in the case, and especially by those with a specific interest in 399.

I am sincerely sorry if this letter appears to you to have a general ass-chewing tone. I certainly don't mean to be destructive, nor do I write in anger. As you know, I have told you on more than one occasion that, considering combined quantity and quality, you have made the greatest contribution to the body of writing comprising the critics' case.

Nevertheless, since differences and misunderstandings between critics on substantial questions properly belong to the historical record of this case, I feel justified for that reason, as well as ego considerations, in calling the foregoing to your attention.

With Best Regards and Congratulations to Lillian,

Cordially,

