

Mr. William P. Farley, Assistant General Counsel
McGraw-Hill, Inc.
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10020

6/23/89

Dear Mr. Farley,

After two month you now say you are responding to my letter of two months ago. Not my recent letter to New American Library, of course. Just like after ignoring my protests earlier persisted until you were contracting with NAL, when suddenly I got two letters from Davis. He was careless in the second and send me a xerox of the indecent page that was marked "legal."

You conclude by telling me you trust the proposed changes satisfy my concerns. You know very well from my previous letters that they do not and more, cannot.

To describe what is said about me on page 414 as inaccurate is to praise it. It is a complete fabrication, as you certainly should know by now. There is no way in which you can doctof it to keep it from being hurtful to me ~~know~~.

I recognize your and Davis' problem with this. No matter how much he believes it he and you have a phony book that was safe because there is little chance Marcello will sue. But there was no reason to believe that Marcello gave a damn about what the House assassins or the FBI said about him. So Davis used me as the basis for his complete fabrication to make it appear that the guilty Marcello was deeply concerned. And you and Davis do not want to be either honest or decent, preferring to have that feeble pag for what all is hung on it.

You do not believe, you now say, that you have hurt my reputation or caused me any distress. Having the dead man you describe as the mafia's top lawyer rummaging around my place for much of a year when it is totally false is not hurtful, no cause for distress?

You profess not to see my concern over what you change a little bit, not unusual for lawyers, ^{and} refer to merely as an "interview" Davis said he had with me. What he actually said is "formal interview." He never indicated anything of the sort and I assume the opposite.


In short, he is not content to defame me on a total fabrication, he has in addition the need to trade on my name.

^{you} He refer to his "appreciation" of me. Not only the foregoing is clear on that. There is also the matter that despite my several letters has been ingored: the assistant he had working here either sent him by mistake or misfiled the brief correspondence I had with Jack Wasserman. I asked for copies. Is that asking too much? Or are you and he afraid I may show it to someone who might ask me about the book?

If he wants to cite my published work, fine. If he wants to thank me for giving him access to the records I got under FOIA, fine. But I want nothing that in any way, no matter how indirectly, can be interpreted as associating me with that book.

cc:NAL

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg



McGraw-Hill, Inc.

1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Telephone 212/512-3625

William P. Farley
Assistant General Counsel

June 16, 1989

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I am responding to your letter dated April 22, 1989 addressed to John G. Wrede, President of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

As we understand it, you are concerned that the reference to you on page 414 of Mafia Kingfish is inaccurate and you object to Mr. Davis characterizing his conversations with you as an interview.

Of course, we have no intent to harm your reputation or to cause you any distress and we do not believe we have done so. Whatever concern may have been caused by the reference to you on page 414 of Mafia Kingfish, however, should be resolved entirely by the change indicated by Mr. Davis in his letter to you dated April 19, 1989. That change removes any reference to "foraging" and does not contain anything which we believe to be inaccurate or untrue.

With respect to your concern about the characterization of your conversations with Mr. Davis as an interview, we have difficulty understanding how this is inaccurate or how it could be construed as defamatory to you. Indeed, Mr. Davis referred to his conversations with you as a note of appreciation. While we believe that this reference to you can only be considered to be a positive rather than a negative remark, we have asked Mr. Davis to remove your name from the Acknowledgments section. This change can be made only in future editions of the work but we currently believe that the change can be made in time for the upcoming paperback edition.

We trust that these changes satisfy your concerns.

Sincerely,



William P. Farley

WPF/sd

cc: John H. Davis
Len Carr
John G. Wrede