

1249 HI POINT ST.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
DECEMBER 11, 1967

DEAR HAROLD,

~~HERE~~ I FIND THIS A MOST UNPLEASANT TASK, BUT I REALLY FEEL YOU HAVE LEFT ME NO CHOICE.

I HAVE NO INTENTION OF EVEN ATTEMPTING TO RESPOND, IN A DETAILED FASHION, TO YOUR FOUR PAGES OF RARELY INTELLIGIBLE GIBBERISH (DEC 6, 67). YOU HAVE ADDED MORE--BUT UNNEEDED--EVIDENCE TO THE AMPLE ALREADY AVAILABLE THAT YOU ARE A BOOR, A BORE, AND AN INGRATE; AND, SAD TO SAY, ONE WHOSE VERACITY I NO LONGER CAN RELY ON.

SINCE IT IS DIFFICULT TO MAKE SENSE OF SUCH A CONFUSED PISTACHE OF BOMBAST, BALONEY, SELF-PITY, AND SELF-PRAISE, I WILL QUALIFY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS AS INDICATED.

IF, BY YOUR LETTER, YOU MEAN TO DENY THAT IN MY CAR, ON THE NIGHT OF NOVEMBER 8 (1967) YOU PROMISED TO REFRAIN FROM CHALLENGING MY CLAIM TO PRIORITY IN DISCOVERING THE DOUBLE HIT; AND SPECIFICALLY, THAT YOU WOULD REFRAIN FROM DOING SO IN YOUR LETTER TO THE SAT EVE POST, THEN YOU ARE LYING. AS YOU WELL KNOW, FOR I SO TOLD YOU, THIS WAS THE SOLE PURPOSE OF MY ASKING TO SPEAK WITH YOU IN PRIVATE. I TOLD YOU I INTENDED TO WRITE THEM, CLAIMING PRIORITY OVER THOMPSON, AND THAT I DID NOT WISH TO DO SO UNTIL I WAS SURE THERE WAS NO MISUNDERSTANDING BETWEEN US. MY PURPOSE WAS PRECISELY TO AVOID A WRANGLE BETWEEN US ON THIS. YOU QUICKLY CONCEDED YOU BELIEVED I MADE THE DISCOVERY BEFORE YOU, AND PROMISED YOU WOULD NOT CLAIM PRIORITY IN YOUR LETTER TO THE SAT EVE POST. AND WHAT DID YOU DO JUST FIVE DAYS LATER? I QUOTE FROM YOUR LETTER OF NOVEMBER 23 TO MICHAEL MOONEY:

" HOWEVER, THIS INCIDENT ALSO PUT YOU IN A POSITION TO KNOW THAT EVEN HIS CLAIM TO DISCOVERING THE DOUBLE HEAT SHOT IS NOT THOMPSON'S. YOU MAY RECALL THAT I PERSUADED DICK TO PERSUADE YOU TO COME DOWN SO I COULD SHOW YOU THINGS IN THE ARCHIVES. FOR HIS OWN REASONS, DICK CUED ME OUT, AND I BLUNDERED IN WITH THE EQUIPMENT I HAD PROMISED TO HAVE TO SHOW YOU THINGS JUST BEFORE YOU LEFT. BUT I DID SHOW YOU THIS. HAD I NOT YOU'D STILL HAVE KNOWN IT BECAUSE I ALSO PUBLISHED IT A YEAR AGO (WHITEWASH II, P. 224)."

YET, YOU HAVE THE UNMITIGATED GALL TO STATE IN YOUR LETTER TO ME:

" IS THERE ANYTHING IN EITHER OF MY LETTERS TO DISPUTE THIS, OR TO DENY YOU PRIORITY OF DISCOVERY, IF THAT MEANS SO MUCH TO YOU? I AM UNAWARE OF IT IF THERE IS."

IF BY THE LATTER YOU MEAN TO SAY THAT YOUR STATEMENT TO MOONEY DOES NOT IMPLY YOU WERE THE ORIGINATOR OF THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT, THEN HONESTY COMELS ME AGAIN TO SAY, YOU ARE LYING.

YOU SAY, "AS YOU HAVE TRIED TO HELP ME IN SMALL WAYS, SO I HAVE TRIED TO HELP YOU." THE SMALL WAYS THAT COME TO MIND IN WHICH I HAVE TRIED TO HELP YOU (THE CASE, REALLY) ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. A FULL DAY-AND-A-HALF SPENT IN PREPARING COPIES OF THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS:
 - A. A COPY OF MY "HYPOTHESES RE: THE ZAPRUDER FILM"
 - B. PHOTO PANELS JFK-1, JFK-2, JC-2, JC-1; AND ACCOMPANYING NOTES

- C. A COPY OF MY DEALEY PLAZA MAP, WITH WITNESSES AND LIST.
(FOR THE ABOVE, I ASKED AND RECEIVED THREE EXTRA COPIES OF WHITEWASH)
2. TIME SPENT ARRANGING APPROXIMATELY FOUR RADIO AND TV APPEARANCES FOR YOU LAST JANUARY, TO PLUG YOUR THEN NEW WHITEWASH II.
 3. TIME SPENT ARRANGING YOUR LES CRANE TV AND ARBOGAST-MARGOLIS RADIO SHOW HERE LAST MONTH, TO PLUG "OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS", AND IN TRYING (UNSUCCESSFULLY) FOR THE STEVE ALLISON RADIO SHOW.
 4. PLACING, AND COLLECTING FOR, TWO DOZEN WHITEWASH II'S WITH A LOCAL STAND, FOR WHICH A CHECK WAS MAILED YOU.

WHAT YOU HAVE DONE FOR ME IS AS FOLLOWS:

1. GAVE ME A QUOTABLE WRITTEN PLUG FOR "THE BASTARD BULLETT"
2. SENT ME COPIES OF TWO ONE-PAGE FBI REPORTS ON UNDERWOOD AND DILLARD, RE THE TAGUE CHIP-MARK.
3. PLACED ONE-TO TWO-DOZEN "BASTARD BULLETT" IN WASHINGTON BOOK STORES (AT LEAST, I KNOW YOU WERE GOING TO MAKE THE EFFORT. IF SO, I GUESS THEY SOLD NONE, BECAUSE THEY NEVER SENT ME ANY MONEY)

NOTHING ELSE COMES TO MIND, UNLESS PERHAPS:

4. YOUR COMPLETE FAILURE TO EVEN ONCE MENTION ~~XXXXXX~~ "THE BASTARD BULLETT" (WHICH CAME OUT SOON BEFORE YOU ARRIVED LAST JANUARY) ON ANY OF THE TEN OR MORE SHOWS YOU PARTICIPATED IN IN L.A., IN JANUARY AND NOVEMBER; AND THIS DESPITE THE FACT THAT IT WAS I WHO ARRANGED MORE THAN HALF OF THEM FOR YOU.
5. YOUR COMPLETE FAILURE TO MENTION IT IN "PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH", DESPITE YOUR PROFOUND APOLOGY TO ME, AS I DROVE YOU TO THE AIRPORT LAST JANUARY, FOR YOUR FAILURE TO DO SO ON YOUR L.A. RADIO-TV APPEARANCES.
6. YOUR COMPLETE FAILURE TO DO SO, DESPITE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY, ON THE TWO RADIO SHOWS WE HEARD YOU ON IN BOSTON THIS SUMMER (SIX HOURS ON STEVE FREDERICK, AND SEVERAL HOURS FROM NEW YORK).
7. YOUR FAILURE TO CREDIT ME IN "PHOTO.WW" FOR THE DISCOVERY OF THE 304-315 TRANSPOSITION, DESPITE YOUR STATED INTENTION TO DO SO.

(TO REFRESH YOU ON THE ABOVE, SEE MY LETTER TO YOU OF AUG 2, '67, AND YOUR REPLY OF AUGUST 7, '67).

AGAIN, RE THE DOUBLE-HIT, I FIRST OBSERVED THE DOUBLE-MOTION IN MY SMALL 8x10 PHOTO PANEL, JFK-1, IN SEPTEMBER '65; AND CONCLUDED A DOUBLE HIT HAD BEEN STRUCK WHEN I MADE A 20x20 ENLARGEMENT IN DECEMBER '65.

ALTHOUGH, THIS TIME IN WRITING, YOU DO ACCEPT MY EARLIER DISCOVERY, (PG 3), YOU NEVERTHELESS CLAIM FIRST PUBLICATION. EVEN IF TRUE (WHICH IT IS NOT) WHAT WOULD THAT MEAN AS BETWEEN US, WHEN YOU HAVE CONCEDED THAT I DISCOVERED IT FIRST? ALSO, I REMIND YOU MY "HYPOTHESES" WERE MAILED TO YOU ON JULY 11, '66, WHICH BY THEN CONTAINED THE DOUBLE-HIT, AND THEY WERE RECEIVED BY YOU. YOU CLAIM AN EARLY DECEMBER '66 PUBLICATION DATE (WW II). I ENCLOSE A COPY OF AN INTERVIEW OF MINE IN EPOCA, (ROME), OF NOVEMBER 27, '66, WHICH INCLUDED THE DOUBLE-HIT.

I ALSO NOTE THAT ON PAGE 222 OF WW II YOU DO NOT SPECIFICALLY STATE A DOUBLE-HIT HAS BEEN STRUCK, ALTHOUGH, IN YOUR VERY BRIEF PASSAGE SPEAKING OF THE DOUBLE-MOTION, A DOUBLE-HIT IS IMPLIED. IT IS STRIKINGLY UNCHARACTERISTIC OF YOU TO BE SO BRIEF OF ANY SINGLE POINT, LET ALONE, ONE SO IMPORTANT, APPEARING FOR WHAT YOU BELIEVED TO BE THE FIRST TIME. FURTHERMORE, I CAN FIND NO REFERENCE TO EITHER A DOUBLE-HIT OR A DOUBLE MOTION IN PHOTO WW, DESPITE NUMEROUS REFERENCES TO THE ZAPRUDER FILM. THIS IS A CONSPICUOUS AND INEXPLICABLE OMISSION, UNLESS YOU DIDN'T THINK MUCH OF IT BY TIME YOU WROTE THE LETTER.

I MUST REMIND YOU, THAT FOR ONE WHO HAS CLAIMED TO HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT FINDS IN THE ZAPRUDER FILM, YOU HAVE BEEN EXTREMELY EVASIVE WHENEVER I ATTEMPTED TO DISCUSS THEM WITH YOU, IN WRITING OR IN PERSON. LAST JANUARY AT BILL O'CONNELL'S, AND AGAIN IN NOVEMBER AT MY HOUSE, THIS WAS ESPECIALLY NOTICEABLE. IN FACT, YOU BECAME VERY ANGRY WITH ME WHENEVER I BROUGHT THE SUBJECT UP; BEHAVING IN A PARTICULARLY OAFISH AND LOUD-MOUTHED MANNER; AND DESCRIBED EFFORTS TO RECONSTRUCT A SHOT PATTERN FROM THE ZAPRUDER FILM AS "JAMES BONDISM". STRANGE BEHAVIOR, FOR ONE WHO CLAIMS TO KNOW SO MUCH ABOUT THE FILM.

THE REASON I TOLERATED YOUR OFFENSIVE MANNERS WITHOUT STRONGER REACTION WAS THAT I FELT SUCH BEHAVIOR WAS AN INDICATION OF A PECULIARLY ECCENTRIC PERSONALITY; AND I DECIDED TO MAKE ALLOWANCES. I REALIZE NOW THIS WAS AN ERROR ON MY PART; AND, TO THE EXTENT THAT MY PASSIVITY MAY HAVE ENCOURAGED YOU TO MAKE AN EVEN GREATER ASS OF YOURSELF IN THE PRESENCE OF MY WIFE AND OTHERS, I APOLOGIZE.


ALTHOUGH I DO NOT ACCUSE YOU, NOR DO I BELIEVE YOU TO BE A "SELLOUT", NEVERTHELESS YOU WERE SAYING SOME MIGHTY ASININE THINGS EARLIER THIS YEAR WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN INTERPRETED AS AN UNPRINCIPLED BID FOR RESPECTABILITY. I VOICED MY DISAPPROVAL TO YOU AT THE TIME (JANUARY) AFTER YOU SAID ON SOME OF YOUR L.A. RADIO-TV APPEARANCES:

1. THAT THE COMMISSIONERS WERE AMONG THE MOST HONORABLE, TRUSTWORTHY, AND DEDICATED MEN IN THE COUNTRY, AND THEY WERE NOT TO BLAME FOR THE FRAUDULENT REPORT (YOU EVEN WENT SO FAR AS TO SAY THEY WERE NOT TO BE FAULTED FOR THEIR GENERALLY LOUSY ATTENDANCE AT HEARINGS -- THEY WERE, AFTER ALL, VERY BUSY MEN!).
2. THE KENNEDYS, AND BOBBY SPECIFICIALLY, COULD NOT BE BLAMED FOR NOT HAVING LOOKED AT THE EVIDENCE, NOR FOR HAVING FAILED TO TAKE A POSITION FOR A NEW INVESTIGATION ONCE IT BECAME OBVIOUS THAT A FRAUD HAD BEEN PERPETRATED. (YOU WERE STILL ATTEMPTING TO PEDDLE THIS HOGWASH ON THE STEVE FREDERICK SHOW IN AUGUST).
3. YOU SAID ON THE AIR IN JANUARY, THAT YOU WERE CONFIDENT THERE WAS NOTHING SUSPICIOUS IN JACK RUBY'S DEATH, BECAUSE YOU HAD BEEN ASSURED OF THIS BY HIS LAWYER IN CHICAGO (I FORGET IF IT WAS ELMER GERTZ, OR SOL DANN).

I TRUST, FOR THE SAKE OF TRUTH, YOU ARE NO LONGER PUSHING THIS LINE.

YOU SAY; "IF YOU EVER WRITE ME IN THIS VEIN AGAIN, I WILL NOT ANSWER".

I ACCEPT THIS AS A PROMISE, NOT A THREAT. IN THE PAST, I HAD DECIDED THAT THE ONLY TRANSGRESSION BY ANOTHER CRITIC I WOULD DEEM SUFFICIENT CAUSE FOR ME TO SEVER RELATIONS WOULD BE AN OUT-AND-OUT SELL-OUT, ALA EPSTEIN OR THOMPSON. IN YOUR CASE, HOWEVER, YOUR BEHAVIOR TOWARDS ME, AND THE FACT THAT I NO LONGER FEEL I CAN RELY ON YOUR WORD, ARE SUFFICIENT CAUSE FOR ME TO WANT NOTHING FURTHER TO DO WITH YOU. SINCERELY AND REGRETFULLY,


RAYMOND MARCUS

P.S. --

YOU HAVE DEMONSTRATED GREAT ABILITY AND DEDICATION; AND YOUR WORK CERTAINLY REPRESENTS AN INVALUABLE -- AND IN MANY IMPORTANT AREAS -- A UNIQUE ~~CONTRIBUTION~~ CONTRIBUTION. HOWEVER, YOU DO YOURSELF, YOUR COLLEAGUES, AND THE RECORD A GROSS INJUSTICE BY YOUR CONSTANT SELF-PUFFERY; AND STATEMENTS, ~~EXPLICIT~~ AND IMPLICIT, SAYING THAT ALL OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS ARE MINOR COMPARED TO YOURS. TO MOST OBJECTIVE OBSERVERS, THIS IS DEMONSTRABLY UNTRUE, FOR OTHERS HAVE ALSO MADE CONTRIBUTIONS -- AND FREQUENTLY IN AREAS WHERE YOU HAVE NOT BEEN AS STRONG.

YOUR CEASELESS ALLEGATIONS THAT ALMOST ALL THE OTHER CRITICS HAVE STOLEN YOUR MATERIAL, I KNOW OF MY OWN KNOWLEDGE NOT TO BE TRUE IN MOST CASES. ALTHOUGH YOU NAME ONLY ONE OF THIS GROUP, LANE, I SEE NOTHING IN HIS, MY OWN, ~~XXX~~ MAGGIE'S, PENN'S, LIFTON'S, SYLVIA'S, OR VINCE'S WORK THAT I BELIEVE WAS TAKEN FROM YOU. TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU CAN DOCUMENT INDIVIDUAL CASES, THEN SUCH COMPLAINTS ARE CERTAINLY JUSTIFIED -- BUT YOU HAVE GAINED THE REPUTATION OF ALLEGING VIRTUALLY EVERYTHING OF VALUE WAS FIRST DISCOVERED BY YOU. THE REPETITION AND FREQUENCY OF YOUR CLAIMS DEADEN THE SENSES. THEY MAY HAVE THAT EFFECT ON FUTURE HISTORIANS ALSO.

THEREFORE, YOU WOULD DO YOURSELF AND THE ACCURACY OF THE RECORD A SERVICE BY REFRAINING FROM SUCH CHARGES UNLESS YOU PROVE THEM; AND, TO AT LEAST REDUCE IN STRIDENCY YOUR AUTO-CONGRATULATORY PAEANS.

R