

Dear Richard,

11/26/95

If in 1) in your letter of the 21<sup>st</sup>, on the title to be Selections from Whitewash this includes as the title as given at the top of left-hand pages, I agree, thanks.

2) is on Hoax. When we spoke I told you you could edit it as you see fit. That still applies. If you want to change the title, I agree to that. I plan to read the retyped draft, finish the new preface and when I am more fully aware of the impact of Case Closed on the commoration, add conclusions on that. You can take my agreement to your editing to include not using what I'll be sending. I have become an ever slower reader and I do not know how long it will take me to read the retyped ms.

3) Never again! From the time you told me you could be interested, about 7/4/92 as I recall, I did not look for any other publisher. There was no agreement on when it would be published. I do not recall that you made any response when I said about that that I would like it to be while I am still alive. While I regret that may not happen and the delay in its appearance there is nothing I can do, as a practical matter, about seeking any other publisher now. I am sorry that you appear not to see the importance in this book that I am not alone in seeing, that you did not understand what I did not articulate but hoped you would perceive, that I believe that credit for publishing it would be good for the publisher and I wanted you to have that credit. My recollections of that conversation are fairly clear. I recall the hope I expressed and I recall that you made no promises of any kind. I also asked for none. I do not and I have not alleged that you made any promise you did not keep. While I regret very much the continued delay, there is nothing I can do about it so I accept it but I have not and I do not allege that it represents any breach of trust.

You say, "I am annoyed at your distrust and would rather not publish any of the above than be the further subject of it." I got your letter day before yesterday. I delayed responding to have time to think of anything I said that reflected or even indicated any distrust of you personally. I believe that what I wrote is the exact opposite. I have not distrusted you and I have not to the best of my recollection written anything that can be correctly taken that way.

On what led to what you interpret as distrust of you I did not address you and C & G did make a promise it did not keep. If there had been what I believe is normal communication there would not have been any problem. As soon as I got the proofs I wrote, getting no response, I wrote two more times before Peter phoned me. You misunderstood my letters or they were not as clear on this as I thought they were.

I have not even asked you for a contract. When you offered one I told you that if you wanted one for your own purposes to send it but with you I needed no contract. I do not understand how you can interpret this as reflecting any distrust in you. I not only did not ask for any advance, when I believed I perceive that you anticipated unusual costs

I declined any advance. This I believe reflects trust, not distrust.

With Hoax, when Herman Graf told me it <sup>would</sup> be rushed for April publication, I not only asked for neither any contract nor any advance; when you had some questions about the first couple of chapters, without your asking for it I told you to feel free to edit as you wanted. That, too, I believe is the opposite of distrust. I think it represents the fullest personal trust.

It has never been a mere figure of speech when I've said that my life <sup>can</sup> end at any time and that there is what I want to do and what I do not want to do. The letter includes <sup>my</sup> leaving all any unnecessary problems. The former, as I believe I discussed with you without reference to any book, is to perfect the record for history to the degree possible for me. This entails judgments that can be wrong on what I do first and what I let wait. They also shift, change. But I do work ~~that~~ that as much as I possibly can every day. This means getting on paper as much as I can as rapidly as I can. I am certain, although it was not in my mind at the time, that, aside from my trust in you personally, it is a reasonably spontaneous reaction was to tell you to feel free to do what you wanted with Hoax. That gave me time for something else.

It was more of a factor than the loss of sales from C & G's use of the unauthorized title The Complete Whitewash because of the extra time that required of me to respond to the calls and letters about it. And, as I believe I did tell you, the much deteriorated condition of my health, including that I now cannot take any excitement as I once did. I did not exaggerate that when I referred to it. Actually, I understated it.

The last time I was in the bathtub merely getting out of it exhausted me so much, which means I'm strained my heart so much, I'll not risk getting in the tub again. When as I did yesterday I went to the basement, I had to stop and rest about five times in coming up. (John Newman, of JFK and Vietnam and his wife were here. I sent you the story on his committee appearance. I was able to help him with what he is now doing and for things like that I do take time because it is part of what I want to do with what time remains for me.)

We were both much disturbed by your annoyance at <sup>perceived</sup> my lack of trust in you because it just is not true. Let me give you a new illustration. Did I phone or write you to ~~say~~ say that you did not tell me the truth about Livingstone's book and what it says of me? Of course not because I did not and do not believe that you were not truthful about it, that you said what you believed was true.

The change in our relations perplexes me because I can think of nothing I did or said to cause it. It certainly is not something I wanted. are you not aware that I asked you nothing about a replacement for Helmut Wilson? That is why. But even then, if you will take the time to think about this, I manifested no distrust in you personally and certainly said nothing so indicating.

On that book, by the way, I have not been asked about it by a single reporter and as I told you, without that I have said nothing. It is even more irrational, more indecent and more hurtful than I had anticipated but I have not said a word about it. And unless I must will not. I do not, among other things, want to spend any time that way.

It is not easy to develop a mistrust of a friend who has been as good a friend as you have been and I do not mistrust you. I am very sorry you feel that way. I hope you can come to see that it is not true.

There is something unrelated that I learned yesterday that I think you should know about. Livingstone's man Waybright stole more than I had realized. He is the only one who could have done this stealing.

Herman has been working extensively and successfully in newly released CIA records, in particular about Oswald. He has discovered more than the story I sent you reflects. As he told me what he <sup>has</sup> learned I thought of two files in my office that hold information he could use. I once planned a book about Oswald, in the sense of a question. I had two files on that in my office, not in the basement FOIA files. They are both gone. That drawer was so stuffed I'd had to put some in the file drawer below it. It now is no longer full. For years Waybright is the only one who worked in my office files. He also is the only one in years who has been here with an attache/case for carrying the records he copied. He stole the other stuff for Lifton, without any question. And Lifton is and has been working on a book on Oswald. It is announced for ~~next~~ next year.

That file drawer is labeled "Oswald" and there is nothing else in it. And it is very close to the copier he used. It would have been simple for him to just put those folders in his attache case unobserved. and I am certain that nobody other than Livingstone's man could have done it.

My mind does not shift gears as well as it once did and I do not remember as well as I did. When as I had told "aphaela when she had offered to send me what she had until then retyped I told her I'd rather wait until I finished what I was working on and that I would then like what she had retyped. When I got no response to three requests for it, I hope you can try to put yourself in my position to understand my ~~concern~~ concern.

I do <sup>hope</sup> you can take the time to rething what you said. It is not so.

Sincerely,

Harold



Thrice weekly I have physical therapy after blood test, with at least a half hour to wait before the physical therapists open up. Ordinarily I sit in the car that time, read and listen to music. This morning I could not read. I tried to think of anything that could have caused ~~my~~<sup>YOUR</sup> consent. I cannot think of a word - had from you, verbal or written, about which I could have said anything to cause your expressed feeling.

This disturbs me because friendship and mistrust cannot coexist.

Hand

RICHARD GALLEN & COMPANY, INC.  
260 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10001  
(212) 889-9624

Nov-21, 1993

Oswald Harold,

Our publication schedule is in  
no way influenced by C & G and Henry.  
I'm sorry you think so.

1) Whitewash

It has been further delayed  
to again redo the cover to your  
specifications. It will be published  
in February as

selections from  
Whitewash

Selections will not be in the same  
type face size as Whitewash  
but will be above it.

The book will include your  
biography & a list of titles  
available from you.

2. Hoap

We want to call this Core 3 period  
Am I authorized to edit it as I see  
fit. If you agree it will be  
published in May. If not we  
should not publish it because it  
is very repetitive

3. Revered Again

It is not scheduled. But  
we hope to publish in September '94  
If you can find someone to publish  
faster please do so.

I am annoyed at your  
distrust & would rather publish  
none of it alone than be the further  
subject of it.

My best wishes for better health  
& strength

Richard