

Dear Richard,

3/6/94

Last year, when I read the first of the retyping of the ms. of Case Open, I phoned because of the multitudinous problems that came, I presume, from Raphaela's lack of familiarity with the computer. You were not in. David was on another call. I ~~explained~~ explained the purpose of my call ~~briefly~~ briefly because he was on the other call and I said it was important that I see all retyped copy. You did not call back. Thereafter I wrote about this several times, without any response. And now I find all those ~~flaws~~ flaws added, in most exaggerated and disasterous form but not here alone in Chapter VII, Ignoring the ^{tr}uth.

I've checked the copy of what you sent me 1/20 that I returned to ~~you~~ ^{you} with these corrections on it. They were not made after I spotted them and indicated them!

It not only looks terrible and creates confusion where there was ~~none~~ ^{none} and where it is so important to the book, it entices ~~radicula~~ ^{radicula} for sloppiness at the very least.

I have no ^{idea} why all those inappropriate dashes were added. ~~A~~ ^A spot check of ~~which~~ ^{what} I returned ~~indicates~~ ^{indicates} reveals I corrected them. Why they were added escapes me entirely. Why the periods in the copy where there is verbatim in the transcripts of testimony ^{is} a ^{colon} ~~period~~ I do not know. That is one I've not indicated because I think there is less chance of it being held against the book, less chance of it being noticed. But the indentations in particular are essential, and why that was changed I have no idea. I indicated them also on that retyped copy you sent 1/20/94.

This is a particularly powerful chapter, devastating to Posner as little else can be, and I think that aside from the general belief that a book should be clear and not go out of its way to appear to be sloppy and a cheap job, the power of the chapter and of the book should not be undermined by what those looking for something to criticize have it handed to them on a platter.

It took time to do checking that should not have to be done in page proofs and it was unpleasant.

I've just begun VII, That Dubious Epitaph, and I find that in the very first sentence that in the proof

makes no sense, the correction I made was ~~made~~ made only in part and then incorrectly, as with the highlighted copies attached you can see.

Then, again highlighted, the sentence I added

and the paragraphing are ignored. And in the same first graf an important sentence I added was not picked up and added, copy highlighted attached. Paragraphing again ignored. Should I not now wonder whether this was done throughout? Or rather not done when it should have been? I can't now go back and do the proofreader's or copy editor's job. But when I had to check, as with a grammatical error, I found other corrections I noted ignored. This continues to be a real exasperation I cannot conclude on this page.

Best
Harold

Although I saw no reason for or sense in some of the editing, I made no complaint, much as I believe it seriously damaged the book. However, where I could ^{reference to} spot what had been edited out, I indicated that. I have not tried to be attuned to this because there is already much to much to have to be alert for in ^{these proofs} (page ~~proof~~). However, when I came still again to the utterly irrational inserting of dashes instead of paragraphing on proof page 150 and saw that when I noted that something had been edited out that was unheeded, I got the copy, page 208. I had indicated still again that those dashed be removed and that the quotation be indented. It was indented and the absolutely senseless dashed remain. Certainly the one you had go over this is aware of what direct, ^{l/} verbatim quotation requires. And in the two lines above it, what by normal concepts should not have been edited out was edited out I noted. Yet that, too, was ignored.

This also is true of pictures. I wrote many times about them, without a single response. I do not know what you are going to do about them. But how do you look when what is edited out is treated as though it had not ^{and is in the book} been edited out, or when you refer to pictures not in the book?

This inconsistency in direct, verbatim quotation of ^{more} ~~parts~~ that is within a paragraph of text, all of which I caught on the copy, makes you (plural) look like amateurs, cheapskates, sloppy, inexperienced and other not nice things. And that is assuming that now, at the cost of cash an time, the dashes also are removed. As I have done with every piece of paper sent me from the first! The cost of not paying attention I cannot estimate, but it is a waste of time and money. In ^{d/} ~~curring~~ my time and my being exasperated by all of this- what I would not expect from a reasonably intelligent high school student.

On the next proof page, at the end of this direct transcript quotation, where the page number was on a separate line in the copy I indicated for it to be moved to where it belongs, at the end of that quotation. Instead it as just eliminated! I've added it back on the proofs. This is the way books are published, Richard, with corrections being ignored? What kind of people do you have on this?

There is much more I've marked on the proofs. I do not take your time for them separately. I write you separately ^f to alert you to the potential harm to you, to C & G and to the book from what this represents.

I add, two other things. Not knowing that the reference to the longer ms would be added here, ^{at the end} I added it to the Author's note. I think it is better there. And as I think I noted in returning the corrected proofs, the book just drops death without any ~~year~~ conclusion at all. ^{This reflects} ~~The reflects~~ badly on all of us. I think some roundup kind of conclusion is an absolute need. Not having it is to invite contempt and ridicule and to diminish the book. If you do not select something from what you have and cut out and if you want me to write something, let me know and I will. But in this form it is really ridiculous. Especially with this content of the book.

Best
Harold

~~XXIII~~ - THAT DUBIOUS EPITAPH

Posner's "He Had a Death Look" chapter begins as a dull rehash of some of what is known about the medical evidence to which he adds sharp criticism of two of the most successful conspiracy theory books, David Lifton's mistitled BEST EVIDENCE, Macmillan, New York, 198?) and Harry Livingstone's self-published HIGH TREASON. In none of this is he original and his criticism is less than with the knowledge of both the case and the literature he could have made.

Contention between the commercializing extremes of theorizers does no good and it has done and continued to do harm. While enriching them it confuses the people even more, helping to bury truth deeper and to protect those who failed in diverse ways.

~~The "He Had a Death Look" chapter~~

Posner pretends to get into the specifics of the medical evidence with the sub-chapter title "The Neck Wound" ^{wound} (Page 305), but in only one page he is already arguing against the actual evidence with such irrelevancies as quoting Dr. Malcom Perry, who had stated at the official press conference death that this neck wound was in the front, as saying he ^{4/1} did not know where from the front it came. (Page 305). Careful to avoid

~~4/102, This is still another of his interviews conducted to ruin the case (Page 551)~~

the largest and most definitive published sources of the medical evidence, my books, especially POST MORTEM, he makes the most astounding and stupid factual errors. In his trying to argue against the established medical fact that is uncongenial to his concoction, he states that "less than

1mm of metallic dust particles was evident on the Xrays of the President's head. ^(page 307) The first of his sources (page 551) actually ^{Testified} said there were some forty(!) such particles ! This also was known from the time my 1965 book was completed and, as Posner had it more extensively in my 1975 POST MORTEM. *Of this citation is, actually, the very testimony in which the chief out of prosecutor said there were 40 such fragment in the brain!*

There is nothing in this chapter worth any time and taking the time for other than to expose its lack of honest intent. Little more of that is now needed. Besides, in the ^{his} next chapter it is relatively spectacular, even for the Posner we have seen to this point.

The killer chapter as it is designed to be, is titled with the supposed words of the other assassination-shooting victim, Texas Governor John B. Connally, "My God, they are going to kill us all!" That on this Connally was instinctively saying there was a conspiracy -- "they" were doing the killing -- was lost upon Posner. He set out with the pat formula^f that the fame and money was in arguing there had not been a conspiracy, whatever the evidence showed. This is his chapter of his ultimate proof. (Pages 321-342). *S*

Not to take it out of order but to set the tone and establish Posner's concepts of truth, accuracy, honor, ethics and morals that we began with a small part of this his intended killer chapter, with his pretending that he and he alone made an amazing and entirely new "discovery", the unprecedented, revolutionary discover coming from what he, Dick Daring, saw in that amazing, unprecedented "enhancement" of the Zapruder film. That turned out to be a calculated theft from a story by a 15-year old boy,

P. 100 P. 102

208
~~336~~

from the TSBD building. In the beginning of this selection "that Liebeler might mean by "to Tague's left" and "back" depends on what Liebeler was careful not to ask Tague, which way he was looking at the instant in question. But it soon becomes apparent that what Tague was really saying is where those shots came from is what to Posner is the infamous Grassy Knoll. And as readers may recall, that is precisely what Zapruder told the Secret Service.

also edited out

middle of

Mr. Liebeler: Immediately to your left, or toward the back? Of course, now we have other evidence that would indicate that the shots did come from the Texas School Book Depository, but see if we can disregard that and determine just what you heard when the shots were fired in the first place.

Mr. Tague: To recall everything is almost impossible. Just an impression is all I recall, is the fact that my first impression was that up by the., whatever you call the monument, or whatever it was

Mr. Liebeler: Up above No. 7?

Mr. Tague: That somebody was throwing firecrackers up there, that the police were running up there to see what was going on and this was my first impression. Somebody was causing a disturbance, that somebody had drawn a gun and was shooting at the crowd, and the police were running up to it. When I saw the people throwing themselves on the ground is when I realized there was serious trouble, and I believe that was after the third shot was fired.

5/7 afterthought on the many styles of direct quotation in the proofs:

What I believe is the first is closest to correct. Indentation.

As I indicate in what I wrote earlier, following this, even the proper period after the name of the speaker, was replaced with a colon. That is not verbatim.

Some of this, and where it is not brief, is not indented.

Some has paragraphing replaced by dashes, after I corrected that every time!

In one instance the direct quotation is in italics. It was not in the original.

I do not think that needs changing, nor that all those periods should be put back in instead of the colons the copy editor put in.

But I do think this sloppiness makes you all look bad. Me, too, I guess. Very bad, very amateurish and unprofessional and if there is trade talk about it, very cheap. Frankly, I cannot understand it, how it could even happen.

To begin with dear Raphaela, who Lil and I think is a very fine person from our little contact with her, had problems with her first computer experience. But when I caught this and did the copy editing, how that was ignored I cannot explain or understand.

What remains of what I wrote is powerful. I think the word you used is "strong." With any attention it should be very controversial. I think your interest, really all interests, requires that there be no invitation to niggling comment. Posner's personal record is of attacking instead of responding. Giving him and those who support him the opportunity to ridicule can be very hurtful. I'm sorry about the added cost and delay

this entails but the plain and simple truth is that I caught it at the outset, made many efforts to eliminate this and other problems, in the end did the copy editing, and then that was largely ignored. Even a grammatical error I caught was not picked up by the copy editor!

On attention, and please regard this as confidential- I told you I would be sending copies of Selections to some on the Post, among others in the press. Two of the men on the Post must somehow have talked about it. One phoned me. They are coming up a week from today. Jeffrey Frank wrote the critical review of Posner's book. Jefferson Morley wrote that fine article on John Newman of which I sent you a copy. (If that is what led to his doing the Oswald book, fine, I'm glad.) I did not ask why they went to come. Each has given me different compliments although we've never met. I will mention Case Open to Frank. I think both are on the Outlook staff. If you have not read the long draft of a possible magazine article that would promote all the books, it is a natural promotion for the coming Newman book, too.

I think it will be helpful to all interests if you communicate a little on Case Open. I do plan to make files on various subjects that may be of some use when the time comes, so I can show them or send copies, by subject. Even if not in the book now.

Best,

Harold