

Dear Ray,

Your letter of 8/2/ arrived today (8/7). I'll answer it briefly, for I've taken too much of today in a long reply to Sylvus, who complains because Farrell has asked Garrison to write an introduction to my New Orleans book.

I was aware of the ~~poss~~ possibility of misinterpretations of the subtitle of ~~FF~~. However, the only ones who have mentioned it are a few of the critics. Selecting the title and subtitle took much thought and perhaps I reached the wrong decision. What you say may be true of those getting it by mail but not those who see the book in a store. It is the constant problem with a headline. The alternatives would not fit in the space. I think most people will understand that that this means is that "(The Government) Suppressed Kennedy Assassination Pictures". That is what the book says I think there is no doubt, proves.

It was not deliberately that I failed to credit you with the reversal of ~~names~~ 314 and 335. Nor did I forget. From your letter, I seem to have erred and given you credit for the wrong thing. I changed what I had written after we spoke. I did not also intend the slight of Dave, but then, no one deserves it more for what he did in Ramparts, crediting everyone else with what I had first published and not crediting me with it.

Ray, I do not think I can make anyone comprehend how far past simple exhaustion I am. I hope to feel more agile if I get to be 80 that I now am. I have gotten fat and soft from lack of exercise and weakness from lack of this and rest. I drive to get this done, for with all due respect to everyone else, no one is doing it and no one is helping me with it, either.

If I do not mention your monograph, it is only because I forgot to. It is not in my mind when I get on such a show. In those six hours, how little chance did I have to mention my own newest book? I got not a single order from any of it, including a very effective one on KSL, the Mormon Church station, which very reasonably impressed the conservative elders. The station got calls from the executives before they hung up after I was finished. But not a single order, and there is no book on sale in their vast area. This is one of the problems heavily on me. I must pay for all of this and we have living expenses and no income save from my writing, which right now means only new debts. Please try and understand it is not deliberate, for as you well know, when I can think of it in advance and can make the time, I do try.

On the book, by now you should have the one Bill sent you. I aired some to him and I didn't have your address. When I asked your address he sent it instead. Sent that to me and I'll happily endorse it I am still flattered when I am asked.

On EOS, I offered to credit Lillian, even though I reached the same conclusion independently and, as you know from my writing by other means, those no one else used. What I used of hers was Clint Hill's shoulder. Even though I had discovered the missing frames myself, I also forgot it until Sylvia called it to my attention. When I wrote and asked her if she wanted credit, she said it was Lillian's. Lillian then wanted no mention. I think perhaps she regret I did not use more of her work. But I did offer, and in this case it was my own that I simply forgotten. I did not see it in the pictures but when I first read Liebler's interrogation of Marquardt.

Similarly, let me be blunt but I intend no impoliteness about Sahl: my trip then was in lieu of promoting my own book and getting it out. I remember, WWII had just been printed. I had aired some to Alder, but it was not anywhere else available.

I went out then because I expected other things to happen in the east to launch the book that didn't I thought I could then afford to do what Bill and Maggie in LA and Hal and others in SF had been asking me to do, come out and tackle Liebeler, who then had Lane on the ropes. I gave up the Pyne TV show to face him on Lomax. The SF people were to pay my expenses, and they didn't. Haven't yet. What I did on the Sahl show sold me no books for they were not there to be sold. It was for all of us and it was, if you recall, a stalwart defense of Lane as I felt I could defend him and a deliberate provocation of and attack on Liebeler, who merely fled. It did me no financial good and it was not for that purpose. Not that I do not appreciate it as an effort by you. It would be good, however, if you'd tell me how he and Lane reciprocated: by pretending the opposite of what is true, that what Harrison is into somehow is Mark's. Sahl said he was coming west and would come see me when he was in Washington. He didn't phone. He would use me on TV. He didn't. He has not been honorable on this. He has been Mark's pluggar, and anything else has been incidental.

Now there is one other thing on 399 that you must recall: none of it is news to me as it is in your monograph. I wrote the essence of it in early 1965. This is not to say that I should not plug it; I should. I just have to remember to do it when I'm under the kind of pressure those shows present; I have, recently, on Jack McKinley's show. It is just a question of remembering it under pressure. Try a few of them, when you are trying to cover the whole field, and you'll see what I mean. It is not deliberate, Ray. When I have time and can think, I do. I went to Bobbs, Merrill and Random House and offered to promote Sylvia's and Maggie's books, and I mean it. I just cannot remember everything anymore. I'm really that exhausted.

I do have to sell books, and I regard it as legitimate for you and for me and for anyone. You have helped me sell mine, and to a limited degree, I have tried to help you sell yours. The situation is different because of the magnitude of our investments. Right now I am about \$35,000 in debt and about to go much deeper. Dell has violated their contracts and I may have to sue. I have not yet gotten the sales accounting due in April. And from my fatigue, I have a rather large number of other and pressing worries.

Whenever I can and it occurs to me, I do plug others. Did I not mention Sylvia's and Maggie's books on the Fredericks Show? If not, I did it on EBL. You know the kind of letters I have written for you. I also suggested you use some of my material, for I seem to recall I had something on 399 you didn't. I rarely tell how I think I forced it and the curbstones and other things out to where we could see them, and there are other things that, for selfish reasons, I'd like to say that I just do not get around to.

But, just to make the books balance, show me the letters you wrote Lane, who you once defended to me, asking him why, when he has used my material that is not in his book, he hasn't credited me with it, or where he used my material by adding it to his book, he didn't credit me with it. Or to Sahl on this N.C. bit, where all Mark, who deprecated the false Oswald story and all that relates to it, when down and whored around, asking why he didn't credit the one man who did bring it out.

What you do not know is that whenever I travel I have at least a couple of copies of your monograph with me and I try and interest media people in it. They are never out of my attache case. I do try. But do not expect me to always remember it. And do try and apply the same standard universally. Hey, I try and lean over very far on this. I have gotten some stuff for Maggie that she asked for. I will not use it unless she says so, and I will not be resentful if she doesn't. It should be her literary property, for my function was merely that of a messenger. The same with Jones Merrill, who means less to me. When others have asked for my material, the only ones I have asked credit from is CBS. They didn't use it instead. They didn't really dare use it for they knew where it led.

There is also something you should consider: this is not a static subject. Much of the early stuff is dated. It has been well exposed. I never raise the 399 thing

myself, without hint or inspiration, because in my own work and mind we are well past that and that kind of evidence. Think about this. It is no longer new or news.

Please understand none of this is bitter or rancorous. It has seemed to me from the first that you seek to apply standards to me that you do not apply to others, beginning with your rather undiplomatic glorification of Mark when we first met. Mark's only contributions are exclusive of his writing. That contains nothing new that is viable.

Tell me, did you write him after the Esquire interview? Do you know they offered me clobber space for what they learned themselves when they started checking him out. I declined it. Do you know they had a hell of a time correcting his errors. Much of it is not accidently. He is, to him, his one kind of God, and to me his own kind of amoral man. Nor do I recall you or any other sending me copies of any communications to him or any of the media.

Now here is a man who to me is a whore and a crook. I spend my time and inadvertently my own money to help him (to help what we all want and his friends who have become friends of mine) and I do not sell my books as I could by clobbering him. I sit in silence while he goes around, after emptying my pockets, picking up my chips, and you read me lectures. Show me one to him.

But believe me, Ray, I have plugged your monograph, I will when I remember it, and you and it deserve it. I have plugged it on radio. I have flashed it before college audiences, Roterys, Chambers of Commerce, etc. At least one FFA and at least one country club and the Ohio AP Editors Annual Convention.

For the lack of credit in FF, I am really sorry. If I did not intend credit I would have left it out. It was an honest mistake that, had I not been so tired and harassed, I would not have made. It is not deliberate. I cannot keep all the things in my mind that I should. I am really very, very tired.

I got farther with Widely than I. He hasn't answered me at all.

Please excuse my not correcting typos. I have yet to write Maggie, Shirley and two others whose letters came today and it is supper time. By the way, Joesten's new book is out in England and I heard from the man that publisher seeks to get to distribute it in the US.

Best to you all. Hope to meet again soon.

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-fiction detecting. . . 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,

