Dear Dave,

Thanks for your lengthy, welcome but unnecessary crediting to Ray of the reversal of rames 314-5. That it is credited to you is an error that it entirely my fault. In the course of conversation not related to the book and before its publication, I learned of this error from Ray and, in the press and I regret overly-fatigued state in which I now am and have been just made a mistake. My presumtpion is that I mixed this up with the Moorman men.

For whatever good an apology does, I have already given him mine. It was not deliberate. My respect for Ray and his perception is great, as is my liking, and I would not abuse him knowingly.

I meent nothing dispersging or offensive in the use of the word "woman". I am surprised that you find offense in it. I think women are wonderful, got bless 'em.

As I look back on the recent past and compare it with the great desire to award credit for original discovery and publication, I am only alightly less than attounded that there was no outcry at the obvious plagiarisms from my work, the purpolning of my lines in my appearances, and the great willingness of some to with great generosity award to others what I first published. I am no less surprised that the equally obvious boycotting of me in the left-progressive press did not inspire a literary uprising on the west coest.

Your comment on the book is sound. I did not have proper access to those pictures. have been able to lay the foundation for making them available. I was responsible for Willis taking his unpublished slides to LIFE, for example, and I turned my leads and scurces over to Sprague, whe, I believe has done very well indeed. Willis' own modest estimate of the worth of his film is only \$50,000, for which, with cheracteristic generosity, he includes the "rights" to his testimony. The DCA people have their backs up, but Sprague has seen the essential footage, and it is what point out in WWI. I meant the subtitle as a headling, "The government) Suppressed Kennedy Assassination Pictures". I believe most of these pictures are now available, however, and also believe many will be published this fall.

I discovered lest year and entirely by accident that in the slides Frame 317 is also misidentified. It is somewhat earlier. I called that to the attention of Johnson and the projectionist, in the presence of Mike Berlin, of the ew York Post, whose undying gratitude I was then earning and is recorded for posterity in his series in that reg. Larry rown, whose book is to be published by Arlington Press, told me several weeks ago that it is still wrongly identified. Brown is radical right. Type is now, if on schedule, being set on his book.

Agein, themks for your willingness to set the record straight.

Sincerely.