

Dear Dal,

10/16/93

At ~~the~~ the ungodly hours of 5:07 a.m., having just finished a bowl of cereal after ~~read~~ reading and correcting about 8,000 words of Chapter XXIX of Hoax that I wrote yesterday yet without enough continuous time to return to Chapter XXX before I leave for my early-morning walking, thanks very much for your letter of the seventh and the copy of the Fraser Coast Chronicle. Convulsed hours, no? But I cannot help it and they ~~substantially~~ enable me to be more productive. I'm nearing the end of the draft of the book. It is about 160,000 words now.

The articles are good. Thanks for them! The errors are minor. I correct them for my future writing. The paper should get a good reaction and those pictures should appeal to other papers.

I like the Postscript and thanks for it. But the FOIA paper <sup>is</sup> as a third of a million pages, I do not have a law degree and my committee work was before World War II. NEVER AGAIN! is due to appear next year, not next month. In what you wrote there is only one minor error. I was not allowed to see the clothing ~~it~~ itself and I had to sue to compel them to take comprehensible pictures they then would let me study. They did that and instead <sup>of</sup> the clothing it was those pictures of it that I do not have that I did study. I've written Burke Marshall, representative <sup>hears</sup> of the ~~chair~~ of the JFK estate from whom permission to <sup>s</sup>ee anything is required, to ask him to let me now have those pictures. He has had time to answer me and he has not. I may yet comment on that rather pointedly to him. And perhaps in print. Outrageously bad behavior causing reflection on the victims.

~~CCCC~~ I'll read and correct this later. Maybe the papers from Australia will be in today's mail. There is a target date for Hoax, April, which means copies available in February. Considering that I've not yet finished the writing and that they have engaged a woman to do the retyping in New York and after that the editing, etc., that does represent an effort to <sup>really</sup> rush it. I am not in a position to judge the <sup>w</sup>riting but I believe the content, with any attention at all, will cause several scandals not the least of which should be in publishing ~~circles~~ circles. My weapons have ranged from a scalpel to, in your terms, perhaps a pike. At least a ~~braxx~~ broadax. And not on Posner alone. Random House, those who <sup>proved</sup> the pre-pub blurbs, and of them in particular the one who is a respected professional historian, Stephen Ambrose. And broadly, the major media. I believe the work is absolutely solid, not in any sense overstated and I prove Posner a ~~theif~~ repetitiously.