

Peter Skutches
Richard Gallen & Co.,
260 Fifth Ave.,
New York, NY 10001

7/22/93

Dear Petter,

When I began checking the editing - as I told you, I'll do a complete reread on the proofs - it seemed OK. But the more I got into the JAMA stuff the uneasier I grew. By the time I was in Chapter IX I was disturbed by the extent of the cuts.

Today was one that gave me no time for returning to it but while otherwise occupied and I thought about it I came to believe that most of what was cut had to be repetitious. I assume it is true, but I do not know. And that leads ^{me} to believe it might be a good idea if the editor and I could talk so I could have a ~~bet~~ ¹ better idea of his/her rationale. I knew there was repetition but I had no idea ~~it~~ it is this extensive!

This gets to what has for years been a problem and now, with many other concerns, is more of a problem. I confabulate. I often cannot distinguish between what is in my mind and what is on paper. And ^{because} when I did those chapters about a year ago, I also do not have ^{now} a really clear recollection of them.

If they are only repetition, the book is better for their elimination.

But this leads me to another possible problem: often I am elliptical and often that is intended. There are little things here and there in all my work of this nature. This may not be apparent to the editor. Here I have in mind not JAMA but the rest of the book. There may be some things the meaning of which is not immediately apparent to the editor. For example, Wronc told me the beginning of the summer that he had just reread Post Mortem and was surprised at how much he perceived that he did not on first reading. I still hear that about my first book.

I will feel much better if the editor assured me that what he or she eliminated is repetitious and that the repetition was not intended for a different purpose than first use.

Best
Harold