

11/4/71

Dear Ned,

I have awaited your letter of the 2nd before writing you. It has just come and I lay all other things aside to make immediate response. I had involved but one other critic in any of these matters, Gary, and that only after you did. I have no complaint about that and, in fact, think it was a good idea. I had just assumed you would. Because you involved Jerry and Howard, and because you sent them copies, I also will. I will address no other critics and I think you should not for a number of reasons, one of the more obvious reasons being they all have enough trouble and not enough time.

Rather than the paranoia you seem to find in me, my fault lies in the opposite direction, a willingness to trust almost anybody and, except where I have basis not to, the unquestioning acceptance of the word of those I trust. One of the consequences is a keen disappointment when I find the word breached. I have no objection to your styling this as an immaturity, especially considering my years and experience, but it is the way I am and if it leads to pain it also leads to good with some people.

I have lived so long with futilities so numerous and different that what would have depressed me at your age has virtually no effect on me today. The one I find difficult to accept is that which wastes any of my time, especially if it accumulates to an amount of time I could have put to a constructive purpose.

There are several things about your self-disclosures that did surprise me. I attempted to address some of these when you were here. You are also hard to get through to, and I think you not only didn't understand but more, didn't want to.

Over the years I have detected and have had specific complaints made about what in one of its more charitable representations is described as a sort of fatherly attitude on my part in my relations to other critics. There is validity to this, if I think there is not to its being a complaint. My years alone have afforded me the opportunity to see and learn what others have not, as has my experience, which is unique among the critics. This does not mean that I know what others cannot, see what they cannot, etc. It does mean that while we are all the creatures of our own experiences, I have been provided with the opportunity to have more experiences and of these, a higher percentage that are relevant in this work. One of the few compensations of years is the understanding they make possible. They also wear us, both ways. One of the results of my experiences is that it is a futility for you to try and convince me that your preconceptions, what you learned in college, or what you prefer to believe, especially after the least amount of time in the ciled of anyone who might presume to call himself a critic, has more validity than my experience alone. When you got to this point in our discussion, I was satisfied that what had begun to dawn on me was the fact. At that point I realize that your continuing changes in your own position and formulations made the project a futility and, as you may recall, my concern, ultimately made explicit, switched to you and how you may ultimately come to think of yourself in all of this. It hasn't changed, and I would like you to think of it a bit. It makes no difference to me whether or not you do, and it certainly can't have any effect on either my decisions or my prospects.

As I address your letter, which I shall do paragraph by paragraph, more of this will become explicit, but not all of it.

Let me begin with our original understanding. It was simple and acceptable to me. In fact, the only changes in it I recall making were in your interest, not mine. You would finance the printing of a private edition of the full Post Mortem in return for the right to condense it into more popular form. Your role is that you described as that of editor, and you were so self-effacing - to begin with - that you wondered whether it would be proper to include your name in that condensation as editor. It is I who assured you you should, remember?

Now in all of this, including your letter of 11/2, you make no reference to any of my feelings, reactions or attitudes. To this moment I can think of no single one. What I am

saying would lose no validity if there were one or two instances I have forgotten, for I am saying that in all of this you have been remarkably selfish and self-centered, something I say not to criticize you but so that, perhaps, you will think about it, in the sense of physician, heal thyself. You refer to your emotions when we had that long discussion without any reference to mine or, in fact, with no recognition of the fact that I could have felt any. In your thinking, why not switch roles and then think?

Let me cite a few examples. You confessed feeling anger at having been "put down". If I understand this new slang, it means not that I insulted you but that after this part of our discussion was over, you had no answer to what I had argued. My response was that you ask yourself if you had not been a bit arrogant, and you agreed you had been. What was it about? Your insistence that your unique intelligence and your experience that you described as of not more than six months in which under undefined circumstances you had discussed whatever your discussed with at most 200 people in but two cities had greater validity in permitting appraisal of the political, media (broad sense) and popular attitudes toward the subject. (I note in passing that Howard undertook a limited aspect of this, from his own experience, which is considerably greater than yours under any representation) To describe this as no more than arrogance is charitable. I have had contact with more than that many people in publishing alone. I have had contact with more than that many people in the press alone. I have, as I remember telling you, had contact with more than that many people on a single night and on numerous occasions. In fact, I have had contact with more people by far on this subject that you in your own city, Minneapolis. I have had about ten times as much an expression of opinion as you claim in letters from strangers alone (a rather remarkable outpouring in the context of other opinions you also expressed, based not on fact but on preconceptions that are invalid). One of the things of future value to any archive, in fact, will be just this, something I am surprised did not suggest itself to a scholar. My first TV confrontation was aired to end at 2:20 a.m. on a Sunday morning, 225 miles away. From a minute of two thereafter I did not get a chance to return to sleep because of the calls from strangers who first had to learn where I lived by calling the station and then had to learn my phone number, which the station did not at that time of the morning have the ability to make available. Or, they had to have recalled the one reference to my address on that show. There is much after the foregoing that I just ignore. You ask me to forget my experience and assume the validity of your naive? Your experience, less by far than that of any critic, has greater validity than mine, which has been intense, longer than that of any other, and at least as diversified as anyone's? To add irrational to arrogance is not to exaggerate. But what you should consider is whether you would have even dared take such a position if you were not a man of wealth holding a carrot out toward me and I not a pauper because of the work I have elected to do. You may not have had this in your conscious awareness, but is it not time to ask if it was in your subconscious?

You seem not to have realized it, but your abandonment of it in your letter indicates you now do, but your insistence that nothing could happen until you had a \$10,000 advance from a publisher and that is escrow (I've never heard of any agreeing to that—that just say it) was either an astounding ignorance of that to which you pretend knowledge or a mechanism for killing our agreement while pretending not to. As I then told you, this meant, in real terms, that a publisher would have to expect a sale of not less than 40,000 copies, a rarity on any subject. That a new precondition, Ned? So, either, despite your long and insistent protestation of media attitudes, this means you are astoundingly ignorant or were stipulating what you knew had to ~~kill~~ kill the deal or what is worse, had designed a mechanism to permanently suppress this work.

You gave me to understand the great sacrifice you were making in laying your thesis aside (your great dedication on this is the latest change, added after your letter was written and retyped). It is, indeed, a sacrifice. But compare it with what not I but my wife alone has sacrificed and be ashamed! All your money can't buy what she had done, what she has lived through and still does! But you alone were suffering this great sacrifice, huh? Is arrogance the right or an unkind word? Or selfishness? Have you, while protesting your anger, asked yourself how I felt? What had you, what do you still propose? What for your money I change my beliefs, what my fairly extensive work has led me to believe? You have asked me, for money, to change and to permit the change of what I have written. In fact, you persist in that in your letter. It did not, but could wound more to humiliate me? I made my choice before you

were born, I suspect. Chrysler tried to buy me in the summer of 1936, when I was investigating them. If I am today impoverished, it is not because I could not have accumulated a fair amount of pelf. But my point here is, ask yourself if I gave you more offense than you gave me. And who made the changes in our agreement that made this in any way an issue? Have + in the slightest departed from my word or even suggested it?

All that was in your mind is your own great sacrifice in delaying your thesis, and you have now changed on that, I think this is wise. When I suggested you had required a fair amount of work and time of me, you passed that off as something I would have done anyway. True. With the first part of the book, just the copyrighting I delayed for more than a year. But I venture to say that "il and I have spent more time on the mechanical needs of this book since your offer than you have on all you've done. and with the book now not going to appear at this time, I may not only be wasted but may, in the end, cause even more work, and an enormous amount is possible. Things, including our understandings, do change. If I have to make any change in the pagination, have you any idea the amount of work that alone can mean? Do you realize that because of you "il has reindexed this thing? Have you any concept of the work that required of her? Or what we both gave up to do it, to keep our part of the bargain? Or to limit this much more, what we had to give up in our own interests in our own litigation? You displayed an unseemly and rather callous selfishness. You have, in fact, as yet shown no signs of realizing it. Have you not thought yet that the only reason I had to copyright the new last part is because you have parts of it and had my permission to show them where you had reason to feel it might do the joint project some good? We did discuss this on your previous trip. You then offered to pay the cost of the xeroxing of six copies. When you spoke to Martin, this seemed to require a seventh, as I wrote you without response. I made and paid for the seventh. A trip to Washington is a major cost for me now, but I made it. The six dollars for the copyright fee is about a third of what I had after the grocery-shopping when you were last here. These terms are strange and foreign to you, fortunately for you, but they are the reality for us. I suggest again that you engage in a little self-examination in this entire matter. And on a very simple basis, one where ego and meotions might not as readily involve themselves, on your not sending me the cost of xeroxing (where your arithmetic when you were here was faulty) on your return home, as you said you would; or when I wrote and told you what I had done and what it had cost; or after I hinted when you were here last.

Then there was the matter of the Kennedys and your own beliefs, which we explored at some length. At the end all you could say that could reasonably be expected is precisely what "obby did and is in the book. Not a solitary thing more. I rather surprised you by telling you to just drop it all, but you, not I, refuse to. Ought you not be asking yourself why? Or, as an ethics major in particular, how you can at one and the same time go to Teddy's office as a friend and fight with me, without nothing more than an entirely unsupported suspicion, to engage in a childish effort to pin a bum rap of them which, were it at all material, would be irrelevant in this book except as an indulgence of your preconceptions and possibly prejudices. Show me another relevance. What I have said of the Commission and the executive branch remains true even if your suspicion could be proven 100% correct. Again, I challenge rational dispute, not some whim, which is all you have to date advanced.

This is not to say that the passages you do not like are not subject to criticism. As I told you, I could have, with plenty of cause, teed off on your fellow board member Katzenbach. He should have told Willens to engage in sexual self-gratification at the first suggestion Bobby would be called as a witness. A witness to what? The ripples in the water at Hickory Hill at the moment the shots were fired? But why did I not go after your associate, not htn knowing he was? Simply because that also in context would be immoral, it not unethical. But you are the ethics expert. Ask yourself as I began above, how you can ethically have done both, or wanted to.

Have you asked yourself is any writer who does not dwell in or long to live in a literary bordello could accept your terms? How can an honest writer agree, as a condition of any publication of his work, to accept- and that without question or the possibility of question - the imposing of a doctrine not his on his work? Could you, really, have any respect for one who would? and could you, on the basis of anything but your wealth, ask it?

How many hours, how much blood, what significant part of your life have you put into bringing new material to light? How much has this great effort taught you that can't be taught in the finest colleges or to the best minds? Is there a second fortunate accident in your birth that, in addition to wealth, endowed you with a perception and an understanding denied mere mortals, the drones who do the endless and dirty work? Do you present yourself as having this inordinate intelligence, one that requires no fact, no experience, no knowledge to reach the ultimate and unquestionable truth? If I am not mistaken in my recollection even Howard was rather forceful in urging you to abandon one of your whims. Yet you persist in it even after I suggest it could kill me. You do not argue that point. You merely ignore it. Is such your concept of your sublime understanding? Now before consoling yourself with the false notion that I am again trying to put you down, a purpose for which I would not, as you should know take this time, face the reality, that I am trying to get you to think yourself and your motive through, to the end that sometime hence you may not find what you have done and what you now propose difficult to live with.

And examine that ego a bit. You phoned Howard. Save for the possible embarrassment that may have caused him, I have no concern or objection. But what did you ask of him? Do you not realize that he has read the two earlier parts of this book twice that I know of, each time making suggestions, and then came here and went over the new part with care with which you have not yet read it (for you do not yet begin to understand it)? What did you ask of him? That he confess to an intellectual dishonesty, writing one thing in his own work and agree to something entirely different in his criticism of mine? To what other use could you put his book? Aside from this, you do not understand the intellectual relationship between Howard and me. We do not argue in fancy words, we hold and express opinions vigorously, and we each change them. Except for my bones and joints, at my age I am much more flexible than you in all other ways. And on the question of intellectual honesty, you will find my few mistakes carefully preserved in my files. Did you for a moment stop to consider the position in which you tried to put Howard? What could he tell you? Other than he did. Putting this another way, were you not, really, asking him to become part of an assault on the integrity of his friend in which nothing but your wealth was a weapon? How could he think of himself if he had acceded to your request? You do not really understand those of us who have been in this a long time. When Viking came to me for help with Epstein's book because he is a lazy and underinformed whore, I took time and I did offer it. I did what he refused to do - for his book, which was in competition with mine when all the odds were his way. When Sylvia's and Maggie Fields' book were under contract, I offered to the p.r. staffs of both publishers (both of whom, by the way, had for frivolous reasons earlier declined mine), to engage in promoting their works in competition to mine without ever referring to mine. We old ones are such people. Howard's is the same attitude. So, ask yourself what you were really asking that he do, what you were asking of him.

I have ~~been~~ interrupted often, and I am again. As you know, I will not have or take time to reread this. It is prelude to specific response to your letter, to which I shall return after taking Lil where I must, but believe me, to this point all I have said is in the hope it can make you think and think dispassionately, for it had long been clear to me that almost as soon as you made your offer you regretted it and sought a means of withdrawing while not losing your self-respect. Otherwise, for example, you'd not have stipulated that the whole thing was conditional upon the simultaneous appearance of your condensation which you now, as I shall point out, conceive entirely differently. K can understand such pressures. They can be from your wife and she can be faultless. Or from your friends and associates of various kinds, or from your concern for Katzenbach and others. But with me all you had to do was say you had changed your mind. It is that simple. This elaborate structure demeans you and insults my intelligence. If one of us does not understand it it is you. So still again, I ask you the thing, and for your own selfish reasons only. I think and I have thought this is entirely unlike the real you, otherwise, when you phoned me with what is totally unacceptable to me I'd have told you to stay home. I couldn't sleep that night. I spent only two hours in bed. It was not over concern for myself, for my recent life has been full of such things.

Later. Sorry about the ribbon. In the natural light in which I was typing I didn't realize it had been knocked into the worn-out section (I hope!) Now for your letter. If you reread it you may find it a little schizo. For example, your first paragraph says "abridgement" and "along the lines originally proposed", which contradicts or is contradicted by what follows. There is, I repeat, no change in the original proposal made by me and I made it in full trust, assuming you meant what you said and would not later, dream up other stipulations and conditions. I agree it is impossible. I was certain it was unlikely as soon as you phoned me before your last trip.

agreed on your second graph. It is not the crux. Under the original proposal, however, it is the only thing that could have raised any problem(s). I suggest you reread the last sentence, one of the minor clues in your choice of words in this letter.

Each of the three points you list has a legitimacy. Each is also entirely inadequate insofar as each goes, we have no conflict. It is because you go farther than these points and because they are entirely inadequate that we have come to a disagreement. The fortify my belief that you have not, despite your representation of your intelligence, comprehended either the fact or the doctrine of PM. The alternative makes me shudder.

The variables in your second ought to make you think. It says nothing. Is one solid point a minimum? Minimum to whom? Logical and irrefutable to whom? You ought to try and talk to Liebelt, for example, sometime and see what he considers "irrefutable". Or some of the whore reporters and writers, where you should, from your limited experience, see what this is a naive, meaningless description. And if three points are the minimum necessary, why not do a magazine piece of say 2,000 words? Who decides these meaningless things, we/us, a publisher, the media, the public? And under three you find destruction unworthy of mention? Or faking? By this time in what I can hope you can agree is our state of knowledge, is as far as you can go saying that it was essentially and remains essentially the WC? To the point where you mention no other? I know you mean more than the WC. I am addressing the reflection of what I take to be your thinking and understanding.

Next graphs, last on p.1: It is not just McClelland, nor him plus Stewart plus "f. "uber, but also two other doctors who can't be questioned and who were there. How much more I might want to include can't be clear since I don't know your plans and couldn't. Consistent with this is your omission of any consideration of any areas of doubt. And I see no conflict in even your formulation of what you consider more convincing. I see nothing mutually exclusionary except in your mind. Not as a matter of space or literary or factual need, which does make me wonder. As does your persistence with McC, where the entire thing can be covered, as I told you in a graph. By the way, you raised this with Howard and his judgement is other than yours.

I think you get to the secret nub in the last words of the first line of the second page, "attention in any book I want to write." I leave it here. It is that obvious, and that utterly unlike your representation to me without which we would not have wasted the large amount of time we both have. Not at this juncture with the many other important things that press on us. You come back to this differently.

First full graph, pa. 2: We discussed the organization of the work as it now stands, the problems that presents, many as they are, and there is no disagreement that it is in its least desirable form. I know that at least as well as you. On this much there is no disagreement. Unprompted, because of my realities, I go into this in the Introduction you may not have read or may have skimmed it so fast, looking for only what you wanted in advance, that it didn't register. Regardless of whose criteria, if you regard a book or the purposes of a work of non-fiction as no more than "a logical argument", we certainly have a disagreement. I think, for example, that fact can be presented without argument and without the author drawing conclusions.

I take violent exception to your self-indulgence in describing the things about which we have disagreed as your "desire for precision". There is no single thing that can be so described, not reasonably, that came between us. And I think just about all the other critics plus some editors I know well will disagree with you and say that this is one of the flaws in my work, unvalued commercially, that I do include much that they consider could be left out for precision. The major disagreement between us, insofar as you said what is in your mind, is one of politics or propaganda, not precision, your desire-let me be blunt-to pin a bum rap on the Kennedys. Which to me, necessarily, includes exculpating just about everyone else, whether or not this is your intent, and I do not infer that it is. It is the present-day reality, the inevitable consequence.

If I do not say anyone isn't at some point imprecise, I can say that this is one complaint I do not remember ever being made against any of my work. I have, rather, been called a nit-picker because of my concentration on it. Howard and Bernabei read this part as well as the others. I recall no such complaint, and I hope you will not take offense if I suggest their intelligence compares favorably with yours and your factual knowledge unfavorably with theirs. \* mean no offense. But you should be facing things, not inventing them. These people have spent more time in this, have considerable original work and inquiry to their credit, and have read more than you, with at least adequate powers of comprehension.

You are correct in quoting me as saying that there are those who will not permit themselves to be convinced, but not in saying it is nitpicking to be factual and precise.

You are correct in interpreting my position on the role and limitations and responsibilities of an editor or an abridger, but you misrepresent my position on the subject in general. I made no precondition in this area except fidelity. This put you in the position of wanting infidelity to my work or disagreeing on what fidelity is. But on the one question that is substantial, McG, which can be disposed of in no space or time not being, before you had a chance to even argue your position, I immediately said, "take it out". It flowed you, as you acknowledged, and I do not for a minute, for reasons only some of which I then gave you, told you I thought it wrong and counter-productive. But I did even then agree to the total elimination. You would not accept it because for some reason I can't fathom you are after the Kennedys. No, this is an unfaithful representation.

Second full paragraph. I do not think you originally misrepresented to me. I think you changed without consulting or informing me. But if you should claim that you haven't changed, then I call a very gross and to us costly misrepresentation. I did offer you all the leeway in the world, subject only to fidelity to the work. The use of such phrases as "logical arguments" are really propaganda here. We never got to that. Where we addressed specific fact, you were without a leg to stand on, as with the Kennedys, when you were finished you admitted no more could be reasonably asked of Boboy than what the book says he did, consult his advisers and have them familiar with the literature. The problem here is that you now want and entirely new and an entirely different book, fact and doctrine.

Third full graph. Showing why and how the Warren Commission failed at this late date is suddenly a major objective of the stature you here give it? Even its defenders admit it failed. They say that although it failed, by accident it is also right. Unworthy of you.

How much pleasure do you think I got out of the discussion you found disagreeable? Was there any new element I introduced that would make it or did make it disagreeable? Don't blame me, Ned. Of course I express my views in an outspoken manner. What the hell do you want, that I should kid you? I'll argue the points I argued with you with anyone, and insofar as I have had a chance to test them, which I have to admit is not enough to be a real test, I have no disagreement with my position. But if you think you are some kind of great guy for restraining your anger, again I ask you to switch positions. You are the one who changed the agreement, and that without even a clue about it until you phoned. I spent an awful lot of time for nothing, and the nominal expenses are for me great. You make a switch and I'm not supposed to get angry but it is a great dispensation that you don't? What kind of thinking is this. When you prate the kind of thing you will come to know his nonsense, what I am I supposed to do, roll over and thank God for your great wisdom? Don't patronize me and don't deceive yourself. Neither accomplishes anything. You are in a man's, not a boy's league when you work with this, and don't expect kindergarten treatment. A man argues his own position, you are capable of it, and if you lacked arguments, don't blame it on anything else. Such discussions do and can lead to the resolution of differences if the parties discussing have any such intention. But compare two things, which should be comprehensible. On the first expression of your dislike of the Kennedy bit, I say out with it. But you argued and argued about a single lousy paragraph. If this illustration shows anything it is that you are determined that you will convert this into your work, with no thought to your limitations or who did the work, and no willing to change on even a paragraph. Yet I said without arguing throw out much more than an entire chapter which, but the way, LBJ has just reaffirmed for me in his book, not the condensation. So, I record disagreement with this graph, too.

One page three you make an offer under 1 and withdraw it under 8. How can we be even talking? You wind up saying that under the best of conditions I have to hold this enormous labor in total suppression until some unspecified time next year and then may learn that you are backing out entirely. \*read yourself, man. Would you accept this? Even broke?.

Examine your own vacillation on a single page! The conflict between the beginning and the end of this page is irreconcilable, and if you doubt my interpretation, consult the others to whom you have sent copies.

But stripped to essentials, you in 1 are offering to buy me. I am not for sale. And so far as buying that work is concerned, it cost me, in even my desperate condition, much more than \$10,000. I also suggest it represents a work the entire critical community, collectively, did not could and I also believe could not. This, too, is not for sale. But I think you should examine your formulation and your motive as disclosed here, not for me but for you. When I saw this I knew you couldn't be serious even if you really think you are 'and again I invite you to solicit the other three opinions'. I repeat this in an effort to make you consider, whether or not you believe it, that my purposes in writing you at this great length are not selfish but an effort to serve what I regard as your interest. I think Gary knew enough before you wrote this to be able to tell you whether or not he believes this, and I don't doubt that with this he will.

In this connection, why do you not ask yourself, if your motives are pure, why you didn't make me this simple offer: you would pay for the printing of the entire work in return for which you would make a condensation that can be more acceptable in the marketplace and can reach more people? Do you realize there is but one difference between this formulation and the one you originally made, that the unabridged could not be ~~published~~ printed until the abridged is? Do you realize that this at the very least means suppression of information of this kind for at least close to a year? If you are really lucky? Is this purity of motive, unselfishness, dedication to getting the fact about the assassination out? I agreed to your original terms, which I would not now do, but ought you not be asking yourself why you stipulated suppression before you started adding other unagreed to conditions? You were careful not to tell Howard this, or in his representation of what you told him he omitted it. But I gather from Howard's call that he understood what is utterly false, that you imposed no limitation on the appearance of the entire work. Thus he had to think I was nuts. But why not ask him now if he would agree to your conditions? Or Jerry or Gary, were they in my position or in their own?

In 2 you repeat suppression, this time stipulating a year. Examine yourself, your dedication and your purposes, not what you think you represent them to be to yourself.

Tell me any writer you know who would accept either four or your representation of what I did as no more than investigation.

It is of no consequence. But ask yourself what you would be doing to me, to us, to the discovery and acceptance of further truth, to the possibilities of even this work if you show this stuff to those who can be ruined by it while holding me back for a minimum of a year? And, can you not conceive that it can subject me to some jeopardy? How can you even think of this and not question your own motives in all of this?

As you gotta be some kinda nut to think that there can today, without some stroke of unlikely good fortune, to think there can be either \$10,000 profit or anything thereafter. Or rabid to think there with a very large cash return there can be any real profit from the unabridged version. But what you are saying is that you are covering yourself, not what you said to begin with, that you would put the money out. You began with 100 to show your good faith, then suddenly you developed real lofty principle, huh?

On the next page you talk about giving up a year of your time. If it requires that to do a complete rewrite, then you are in the wrong field. And if there were any rational way of calling the complete work that I'd like to see abridged, simplified and made more acceptable to more people "some commercial form", what the hell are we talking about to begin with?

I simply haven't time to carry this much further. There is nothing but fact that can persuade me to change anything I ever say. Under no other conditions would I ever permit use of anything I do that I can't agree with. You are talking about your book, not mine, when you talk about what you think. Frankly, I think you ought not be considering any kind of a deal for when you look back on all of this with some detachment you are going to be less than completely satisfied with yourself or I seriously underestimate, or should I say overestimate you? Your self-representation in all of this is deplorable, and I encourage you to give it no wider circulation than you have. I certainly won't. It will be ruinous to you, and that, as I began by saying and as I've taken all this wasted time to try and show you is not what I want for you.

7)))for the time Ned has already wasted for me is enough to have finished AGENT OSWALD and at least an appreciable part of Tiger. That is an enormous cost. I spent a month just typing corrections, and I spent that much time posting them. Plus other things, including his wasted time here. This has been a serious emotional drain to me, more than I think is here reflected.

Don't be kidding yourself about me and editing, either. Any can tell you how long ago I made what efforts I could. It is, to his knowledge, either kid-1967 or close to it. He also knows how I tried to arrange it - to have someone here, living with me at my expense when I can take care of myself without going into debt, so that the editing could be continuous, so that any disagreements could be ironed out immediately, etc. And I set no preconditions on who would do the editing except that it be someone of either sex who had done well in college and was reasonable lucid. Ask him.

and don't kind yourself on another point: I have always submitted my work as soon as possible to the critical analysis and comment of all the other critics who could take the time and who I considered even remotely qualified to have an opinion.

So, I repeat, much as I'd like to get this book you, not only do I find your conditions intolerable, but I think the last thing you want to do with what you have reflected is to enter into any kind of an agreement. Not to tell you this honestly and openly would be an act not of friendship. Quit before you hurt yourself worse. My loss, for me, is much greater, and I'll just have to accept it.

I think the P.S. unworthy of serious comment.

So, I think the thing to do now is for your to return the documents I gave you without keeping any copies, return the NCR copy of the new last part I loaned you, the xerox, and destroy any/notes you have made of any kind. I expect you without an agreement I accept to make no reference to the content of this work, to any of the fact in any of it. If you have sufficient interest to refer me to anyone you may thing may be interested, I would welcome that.

Since beginning this, I have asked all the amount on the check I issued for the xeroxing you said you'd pay for and required not only so you could have a corrected copy to work with but to protect the work because you were showing it to people. It is \$56.70. I may have remembered it a bit off, but that is close. If you don't want to pay it, don't.

I am depending upon you to preserve confidence on all of this. It was one of my original stipulations, as I am sure you will recall. I have enough worries without the potential of what you can attract to me. Besides, you have no remaining legitimate purpose.

You have given me another problem you are, apparently, unaware of. Do I stop in the middle of what you caused me to do or do I continue? If I continue, I give other things up, and if I do not, I waste a rather large amount of work as anyone at all familiar with commercial art will tell you. Not counting sleep and other things. And, because I took your word, others took mine, and they went to some cost and spent some time. There is nothing I can do about this, as they will know.

I can't waste time thinking of diplomatic formulations. Believe what you will, my purpose here is not to insult or offend you but to try and get you to think, to understand what you have done, to understand yourself. Were I not of this intent, I'd merely have written you no deal, please return everything. All that went before can serve no purpose if you do not at least think about it, long, straight and hard.

Best wishes,

PS to GRS, Hit and JP: I put no restrictions on your internal comments, if any, on this, or to Ned, but I specifically ask you you do not discuss this or any aspect with anyone else for the reasons explicit enough above. If any of you feels impelled to do, you might address in your own way what I have largely avoided, his proposal, in any of its forms, and my integrity, a consideration not only not mentioned but I think not ever, in any way, considered. GRS: I am not asking you to rush the NCR copy you have back. I'd like you to read it, but if there will be long delay, I'd like it. I now have but four copies, not nearly enough for any effort to do anything with it, as in some way I should try. One will go immediately to an editor known to one of you, not because his house will consider publishing but so he can make suggestions. Then there'll be three, and I need one to work with. I should have another one for a legal reading, and then there is one. This is how it goes.

bcc for GRS. I think Ned needs help, is in some kind of emotional trouble. I hope you can find time to satisfy yourself on this score, for I am not expert, but beginning with his call to me I have been concerned about it, seriously concerned. He did misrepresent, grossly, to HR, what his offer really was, and I think none of this is the guy he really is. So I have to ask myself why, hence my concern. I'll not engaged in long correspondence on this, if any (top)