

Dear Dave and,

2/4/95

Now I know ~~why~~ Gallen did not respond when I asked for a copy of the NEVER AGAIN! ms. as his Peter and I had agreed to it more than a year and a half ago. That is because they again have not kept their word.

We are having the predicted snow storm. It is barely daylight and I can't see how much snow we have but there is six inches on the bird feeders. It is predicted to last, this part of the storm, another five hours, with a fast-moving <sup>storm</sup> ~~front~~ coming up from the south, to create <sup>heavy</sup> winds, ~~blowing~~ <sup>blowing</sup>, and trees and branches down. I hope the wires stay up! Whether or not it gets as severe as predicted, it caused a frightened reaction yesterday. Stopped off at supermarket on the way back from Hana's and it took <sup>like</sup> at least 3/4 of an hour to come out with two gallons of bottled water. There was no grocery cart she should use, that much anticipatory shopping. When she was nudged in the checkout line, one of the three gallon jugs she had was <sup>knocked</sup> ~~knocked~~ out of her hand and exploded open.

It was late when I got to the mail. I saved the package from Gallen until this morning. I'll enclose Raphaela's letter. I do not get a chance to read and make any corrections because this first part has already gone to the printer! So, I just thumbed through it to the marked places where the copy editor asked question. My response is enclosed. But in thumbing I saw what I believe cannot be regarded as normal copyreading. Gallen has again <sup>cut</sup> ~~cut~~ just to have a smaller book and the hell with anything else.

It was in looking at this that I saw he had had it retyped and had kept that secret from me.

It cannot be, as Raphaela said, that what was cut was only repetition. <sup>Had</sup> that been the ~~case~~ <sup>case what was cut</sup> it would not have been before the typist to retype. Skutches and I had agreed on what was to be restored when they had an outside editor go over it two years ago. So the copy editor has to have removed what, <sup>to</sup> Skutches had agreed ~~what~~ what I asked be restored <sup>and</sup> is not repetition. I did not look for these things. I was merely thumbing to get at flagged pages. One removal is on the political composition of the Commission and on Specter's role in not calling Burkley.

There is nothing I can do about this, <sup>but</sup> ~~it~~ again raises questions about Gallen and ~~why~~ why he does this and in secret.

From the record with case Open it makes no difference if I read and correct, even actual typographical errors. The same with the proofs. I may ask for his word, little as it has meant, that if I find corrections in the proofs they will be made. Or I may just refuse to read the proofs because that has been a waste of time in the past.

They eliminated the subtitle. I <sup>asked</sup> ~~asked~~ that it be restored.

The copy editor asked for magazine page numbers, something I do not recall ever being cited. But eliminated page numbers on some of the few pages I had to look at when I cited Post Mortem, There may be a reason I did not see.

I suspect they are rushing it because <sup>EWING</sup> ~~EWING~~'s book is not yet finished, as he told me

when he spoke (excellently! about VII) at "Good Tuesday. He has three-four chapters at the end to do yet. He made it a point to tell me that his is not a book on the assassination. It is on Oswald and the CIA. I fear his troubles with those chapters may come from ignorance of established fact he cannot get from the nuts and theorists with whom he associates. Gary Mack told me he has Mary Ferrell proofreading it. I wonder if he meant "proof"? Gary also told me that Livingstone's book is due after mine and that it is on the faking of the Zapruder film and one other silliness that I've forgotten.

He also told me that the information is confusing, that in effect there are different versions of the same thing. So he is uncertain or confused about what he should say or how he should interpret those records.

I cannot understand how C & G can consider publishing Livingstone's non-existing case for the faking of the Zapruder film! Especially not without any checking. And a long time ago I sent ~~him~~ <sup>Carroll two</sup> not very clear xeroxes of that part of the film made from a video telecast of it. Can you imagine making changes in something as small as 8mm if full of anything so very much smaller than 8 mm and having it not show when the 8 mm is enlarged on projecting to 5 feet? And being able to recover and make identical alterations on all copies? When the government never had possession of the original and one copy made from it at the least and Time never had possession or any of the copies made at Westman Kodak, of which there are now records of there having been six?

I was interrupted by a kind neighbor plowing the lane before any more snow hits us and did not finish what I wrote Kent Carroll. I told him I had seen the original enlarged to 5 feet in width and there is not a visible hair out of place at the back of the head after the fatal head shot. and that <sup>back of the</sup> the head is intact in the original film.

(The drifting has begun!)



Ms. Jennifer Prior  
c/o Carroll & Graf  
260 Fifth Ave.  
New York, NY 10001

2/4/95

Dear Ms. Prior,

Enclosed are a copy of Raphaela Seroy's letter to me of 1/31, a page from ~~page~~ Case Open that should, with correction, be included in NEVER AGAIN! and my responses to the copy editor's questions. Raphaela asked me to send them to you.

It may seem strange to you that I tell you I cannot cite what is in my basement because I do not have access to it. Much of this is rather strange to me, too. Peter Skutches and I reached agreement on what would <sup>and would not</sup> be eliminated the middle of 1993 and he then told me the ms. would then go to the copy editor. If that had happened ~~then~~ I then was able to use the stairs a little and I also had a student part-time helper who had a little time in which she could retrieve and refile for me. The first knowledge I had that the ms. had been retyped was on opening the <sup>package</sup> from Raphaela. In a year and a half. Although I believe that citations to the issue of the magazine quoted should be adequate, I am more than willing to add the page numbers if and when that is possible.

If that is not too late.

We are in the early stages of what is predicted to be a severe snow storm. As ~~at~~ 5 a.m. this morning, I can see six inches of snow atop a bird feeder! The prediction is that we can get up to two feet of it by tomorrow, when winds of 40 mph are predicted. That means at the least drifting, and I've seen drifts 18 feet high around here, and possibly trees down. Branches down alone can interrupt current for ~~as~~ as long as it ~~take~~ takes to get a crew and for it to find the break. I do not know how long it will be before we can get out or anyone can get in. We are 350 feet from the country road on which we live. It is probable that someone can get in before it is safe for my wife and me to try to go out. With luck in two and a half months we will have ~~been~~ accumulated 165 years between us. And we both are limited more than by our years. Although it exceeds what is medically prohibited for me, from time to time I have to help her out of a chair. My typing, for which I apologize, is in part as bad as it is because I must keep my legs elevated when I am sitting.

Why in the basement?

I got about a third of a million pages of once-secret government records by a series of FOIA lawsuits. The only space we have for them and about 10 file cabinets of my own work produced is the basement. My small office holds 24 file cabinets of which seven are two-drawer. There is not even stacking space atop them. Nor space in them. So my current writing is in boxes atop these cabinets. If I live long enough to write another book I'll have to get the Case Open boxes to the basement to have room for another file box!

So please believe me, it just is not possible for me to get that letter to me from

the Norton vice president and executive editor as of April, 1966 ~~of~~ to those JAMA articles. I had NEVER AGAIN! drafted by the end of 1992. I then added a little, like the Afterword. That is why it is in the basement and Case Open is not. <sup>written</sup> It was earlier.

I'll read and correct this and have it ready to mail if someone comes in. A neighbor with boots may. But I cannot predict when we'll be free to move. Our lane is lined with tall pines on both sides. That will make it impossible for neighbors with snow plows on their trucks to clear the lane. Especially if there are the predicted drifts.

It is by no means certain that the one person who knows anything at all about the mass in the basement will be able to find that NEVER AGAIN! box, rather boxes. She has worked there only in research for an honors paper she is doing for the local college. Unless I hear from you that you will forget about those page citations, I'll ask her when it is possible for her to get here.

Because it may seem so unusual to you I explain why I omitted Norton's name.

I had some rather strange experiences in the nonpublishing history of Whitewash. It was by a long time, more than a year, the first book on the Warren Commission. (By the way, Gian Giacomo Feltrinelli has been dead more than two decades. I ~~do~~ doubt his publishing house exists now.) Yet I got more than a hundred international rejections without a single adverse editorial comment. Some publishers were honest with me and told me they were afraid. I can and did respect that. Pocket Books predicted it would be the best-selling book of 1965 until it reached Boris Shimkin. He then said, and it was true, he did not want to be the red flag before the charging bull of the Department of Justice. They had published a fraudulent book and six were under indictment. (Calories Don't Count.) He did not want to be the seventh. They introduced the book to Doubleday, with a strong recommendation of it, in my presence. Doubleday was honest, "Our decision was not editorial and it was not easy to arrive at." But most of the rest just lied or made up outrageous excuses. I print some of them on the inside covers. But on them also I omitted all identifications.

Those publishers had reason to be afraid. Norton was at the other extreme. What they wanted of me in effect was that I charge the government with conspiring to kill the President. So did Feltrinelli. Without evidence or <sup>reason</sup> ~~reason~~ to believe that, I was not willing even to suggest it. Thus I believed it would have been unfair to single Norton out. With Feltrinelli dead in a bombing case, it was different with him. He was very flattering, comparing me with Zola! <sup>of</sup> ~~for~~ all things. He asked me to <sup>w</sup>rite another J'accuse! His words!

Sincerely,

*Harold Weisberg*

Harold Weisberg

I do believe that the subtitle is necessary for several reasons. One is to identify this as an assassination book, not one on Kennedy. There are many people interested in the assassination who had <sup>not</sup> no use for JFK. Moreover, it is descriptive of the contents of the book and it is likely to mean something to those who will find no special meaning in Waketh the Watchman.



~~Preface~~

the Commission's lawyers, with mere "misrepresentation." If he'd read the book with an open mind, <sup>would</sup> he'd have known they lied there <sup>in</sup> heads off.

The book he wanted would have lacked credibility because no proof of any conspiracy was then available. Without the proof, ~~even though it was obvious that there had to have been this~~ conspiracy here exposed, I refused to state <sup>at all</sup> more ~~than the~~ available evidence permitted saying.

~~This towering "liberal" was clearly one of the Eastern Intellectual Establishment who had been taken over when with his ward-heeler's gut instinct Lyndon Johnson appointed to his commission Chief Justice Earl Warren as his Commission chairman. To this Establishment, Warren could do no wrong. [21]~~

If the first book on the Warren Commission, ~~which is what my Whitewash, the Report on the Warren Commission~~ was had said more than the evidence made available by that Commission justified, it would have been flogged mercilessly, and justifiedly. <sup>ably</sup> ~~That was not inconsistent with Johnson's objectives and those his advisers~~

~~21~~

~~This commission's composition is, I believe, without precedent in our history.~~

The party in power always has a majority on all appointive bodies. But Johnson decided on seven commissioners and he appointed an overwhelming majority of five from the minority Republican party. This virtually eliminated any possibility of any Republican criticism of whatever the Commission concluded.

The two Democrats Johnson appointed were southern and conservative. Neither was a Kennedy follower. Appointing them virtually assured there would be no southern and no conservative Democratic criticism of whatever the Commission evolved.

With Warren's cross-party appeal to liberals, Johnson pretty effectively eliminated any major criticism of the Commission and its work before its work began.

List of books, as in Case Open (enclosed) missing

Title page, subtitle, as I recall, The Government JFK Assassination Conspiracy, as missing. I do not make a major point of it but I intended title in italics.

22 Where I see that my reference to Frost was omitted, which does not seem to be copy editing, the copy editor says correctly that instead of the letter "In author's files it would be better to say, "letter to author from \_\_\_\_\_." I omitted this because I believe singling out a single publisher would be unfair. If you want it when someone is here and can retrieve that letter from the basement (I am not able to use stairs) I'll send it. It was W.W.Norton. FYI, it was what decided me to self-publish.

(I am merely turning pages to get to those with the notes attached <sup>but</sup> ~~but~~ in doing this I see the elimination of what I am certain ~~I~~ did not agree to and it is wrong, changes content and meaning, to eliminate-what is not mere copy editing. I refer to the middle of p. 23 here. I was turning to the note on 24. Unless what is eliminated here is a duplication, and eliminating unintended duplication is fine, this alters the content and removes what is important for reader understanding, the composition of the Commission and the influence that had, Warren on liberals.

24 asks for date of <sup>o</sup>Beltrini's letter to me. Also in basement and I'll get when someone is here who can retrieve it for me. These dates were not in the copy because of my lack of access to them.

Chapter II, page 3, the note reads, "Edition OK?" I think this probably refers to the Manchester citation just above middle of page, where (London, Michael Joseph, 1967) was added. The first publication ~~was~~ was by Harper & Row in 1967,

Chapter IX, page 11 at bottom, 245 written at top, "fill in page number" is the note, with 245 on it. As page 9 (243) indicates, this citation is to a magazine article. That file is now in the basement. But ought not the date of the article suffice?

Chapter 14, page 6 (310) "Pub info OK? Check FM." The citation is to Death of a President, published by Harper & Row, 1967. In being certain I understood this I checked back to page 4. I have questions about some of the cuts, especially the elimination of Arlen Specter's not calling Admiral Burkley as a witness.

Page 12 (316) asks for page of Burkley's report, 3 grafs up, It is Page 6.

Chapter 15, page 12 (335) asks if Manchester citation middle of page is OK. It is Harper & Row, 1967

Chapter 16, 4 (342) asks for page of cited JAMA article. Not accessible to me now. True also of page 5 (343)(344)(349)(353)(355)(358)(362)(363)(364).

Chapter 20, page 20 (405), the note reads, relating to line 4, "Rather unpublished?" Yes!

Chapter 21, page 3 (414) again asks for the page from JAMA.



RICHARD GALLEN & COMPANY, INC.  
260 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10001  
(212) 889-9624 FAX: (212) 889-0325

Jan. 31, 1995

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Here is a copy of the first half of the copyedited manuscript. The original has been sent to the printer. A few paragraphs in which a thought or idea was repeated in exactly the same language or metaphor were deleted by the copy editor.

Of the couple hundred copy editor's queries, those that could not be answered here are flagged. Most of them refer either to citations or to page numbers in the JAMA article. Please send your replies directly to Jennifer Prior c/o Carroll & Graf; 260 Fifth Avenue, 3S, New York, NY 10001. (Or, if you prefer, I would be happy to take your corrections over the phone before I must head back to Florida.)

The second half of the manuscript will be sent to you tomorrow or Thursday.

May all be well.

Sincerely,



Raphaela

enclosure