

Dear Dave and,

2/8/95

I have finished going over the [✓]tape notes for the last part of NEVER AGAIN!
As before, I merely turned pages ^{for} ~~except~~ was my response, which will be enclosed, ~~indicates~~
~~in the Afterword~~. I was merely turning pages ⁱⁿ this thick stack of them (~~the~~ last renum-
bered page~~s~~ is 792) by these ~~slips~~ ^{tapes} and sometimes a page or two before it is where
in this flipping it stopped. Sometimes I noted questionable editing on those pages.

I do not know, not having read it, how extensive what I believe is not mere copy
editing is in the book. When I ^{will} can she make copies of the pages on which I noted
content elimination.

There is nothing I can do about it as I say in what I ^{sent} the designed person
at Cartoll & Graf. But I find myself wondering why these things ^{were} done. It does not
seem to me to be the norm of copy editing. So I wonder if the copy editor did this on her
own and whether or not she did, with what in mind.

I observed something else in turning well past the last [✓]tape note to see if there
were substantive changes in the [✓]Afterword. There were only a few. I turned those pages
a page at a time, without reading them. But what I also observed, what I began to say,
is that all of the ms. had been retyped before I sent the Epilogue up. The Epilogue and
the Afterword are what I sent up. This seems to me to indicate that all the copy ~~was~~
editing was done before they got the Epilogue. I do not now remember exactly when that
was but it was ^{quite} ~~quite~~ some time ago, some time before I sent the Afterword, and that was
some time ago. In turn, this seems to indicate to me that publishing this book quite some
time ago was originally planned. As I remember the time, and I'm not checking the files
to get the exact date, Peter ^{skutches} for Gallen agreed that what I indicated should
be restored that the outside editor cut merely to make a smaller book would be restored.
If is my copy of this that must be in the cellar that I cannot find upstairs. After I
got ^{it} from Brad Rizzia, the Crenshaw/Shaw lawyer in their suit against AMA et al, what
did not indicate he had been given that copy, of the amended editing, that I wrote and
asked Gallen for a copy of it so I could offer it to the ARRB. He never responded and he
did not send it. I now wonder if this is the reason why. I should explain that I asked
Gallen to send the ms. to Rizzia and Rizzia also asked him for it.

Strangely with the first part, most of it, seemingly retyped long ago, it ^{was} a month
late reaching me, a month after I was told I would have it. That indicates that the retyped
ms. was not copy edited until recently, and as Raphaela wrote me, was taking more time
because it is so long. That seems further strange to me with March publication announced.
That the first batch had been sent to the printer before it was sent to me indicates a rush.
But I do not know what the internal situation with Gallen and C & G was that could have
delayed it, if that is what ^{they} did. For April publication if review copies are intended they
usually go out ^{at} ~~several~~ ^{or so} months in advance of publication ^{April} For April publication the
book should have been close to manufactured by now. After it is typeset it goes to the

indexer, the index has to be typed and edited. I cannot estimate that time. Then it gets set in type and that gets proofread. The rest of the book should be ready by then and it then can be manufactured. I have no idea how long setting type now takes with mechanization. I ~~do~~ go into this because of another possibility Jerry and I just discussed this morning. John Newman's book was announced for March. He has not yet finished it. He told me last week that he is having real trouble with the last 3-4 chapters, then not done. It seems impossible that it can appear next month. ^{My} ~~Jack~~ ^{ack} told me that Mary Ferrell was asked to read the manuscript. He said proof it. Proof would seem to indicate that the type was set on the part done, but that need not be so. All of this can indicate they are now rushing ~~NEVER AGAIN!~~ to issue it before ~~NEVER~~ April, ⁱⁿ when Newman's book was scheduled. This is just a guess. From the first on this I have been told nothing at all, in itself I think abnormal.

I ~~do~~ not now mean to suggest that the unjustified editing will ruin the book. It merely, the little of it I've seen, weakens parts and protects some.

I have written Herman Graf with two suggestions. One is to seek to place an ad in JAMA and the other is an advance copy to Hill Moyers. If JAMA refuses the ad, that can make a news story. I did not intend involving Moyers in anything, just to inform him. He is now back with NBC News as a commentator.

If this is as I suspect more disorganized than in my usual haste I am that is probably because I've having more trouble with the more seriously damaged leg.

Best,

Handwritten signature