Lear Rey,

Your latter of 8/3 arrived today, rather good time. I have not, nowever, received your latter of the day before. Glad to get your address. If you gave it to me earlier, I mislaid it. I wented to send you s copy of PLOTHERIC .HITLERIE. then I cak d bil for it he instead sent you a copy. Hope you have it by now.

I am last in your letter. DidII make a mistake in bestowing vredits? As the mass of exterial accumulates iam my hear, it finds less and hass a space. I find I am forgetting what I havefinished with in my effort to hold what I am working on. It is not always succe athl in the latter case. My recollection is that I changed what I had written in PW to be consistent with that you wrote or cold use. My initial information on this, as I recall it, camefrom Paul Hoch. By the way, last year I discovered that 217 in the dides was misnumbered. It still is, - understand, although I called it to the proper stantion.

I do have your photopenel and it is possible I first noted this frame reversal there. I do not now recall. Did I give wrong gradit.

I have a camera like Zapruder's now. I'll use it to the it works.

de stay to, busy an too tired. Nop you gue tell an prospering. Did two shows for Steve Fredericks a week ago. Te liked them very m ch. However, a go, not a single order from them.

Deat regards,

8/5/67

Dear Harold,

Ż

In my letter to you of yesterday's date, I stated that I had noted the frame reversal of f 314-315 in my "Hypotheses re the Zapruder Film", completed in March '65. That statement was in error, and I want to

In checking through my Hypotheses this morning for **solve** something else, I saw that my memory had deceived me, and that I <u>did not</u> mention the reversal at that time, and therefore, I **w** must assume that I had not yet noted it. However, soon after my paper was finished I made up my photo panel JFK-1, a copy of which you have, which shows enlarged portions of frames 310-321.

As you can see, the 314-315 reversal <u>is</u> noted in the caption of this photo-panel; although I cannot now recall if I first noticed it as I was making this <u>kp</u> panel, or had noticed it previously. I did not date the photo-panel at the time I made it, since questions of credit and possible disputes over authorship of discoveries had never entered my mind. Sometime later, I assigned a date to it of June '65, which I believe was the <u>latest</u> date it was made. What is certain is that this panel, along with notes for same, was included in packets of other photos and data sent to several dozen people around the country, including most of the other critics of whom I was then aware. My carbon copies of the letters of transmittal are dated Akgust 30, '65.

At any rate, none of the above changes the essence of what I said about apprising Dave Lifton of my discovery, many months before his exchange of letters with Hoover, as I am confident Dave will verify should anyone care to ask him.

Ihave sent him a copy of the subject portioha xxxxxx only of my letter to you, and am also sending him a copy of this one.

Sixnx Sincerely, P.S. sim ce Nov have said et I ledging P.S. sim ce Nov delivery bilityicknew ledging put mail delivery bilityicknew time or toilet pour mail ble rette your if time detailet question appre this, not permit a detailet receiver from does