

Dear Richard,

3/6/94

Last year, when I read the first of the retyping of the ms. of Case Open, I phoned because of the multitudinous problems that came, I presume, from Raphaela's lack of familiarity with the computer. You were not in. David was on another call. I ~~explin-d~~ explained the purpose of my call ~~brief~~ briefly because he was on the other call and I said it was important that I see all retyped copy. You did not call back. Thereafter I wrote about this several times, without any response. And now I find all those ~~flaws~~ flaws added, in most exaggerated and disastrous form but not here alone in Chapter VII, Ignoring the ¹ruth.

I've checked the copy of what you sent me 1/20 that I returned to ~~you~~ ^{you} with these corrections on it. They were not made after I spotted them and indicated them!

It not only looks terrible and creates confusion where there was ~~none~~ ^{none} and where it is so important to the book, it entices ~~radicure~~ ^{radicure} for sloppiness at the very least.

I have no idea why all those inappropriate dashes were added. ~~A~~ ^A spot check of ~~which~~ ^{what} I returned ~~indicates~~ reveals I corrected them. Why they were added escapes me entirely. Why the periods in the copy where there is verbatim in the transcripts of testimony a ~~colon~~ ^{colon} ~~period~~ ^{period} I do not know. That is one I've not indicated because I think there is less chance of it being held against the book, less chance of it being noticed. But the indentations in particular are essential, and why that was changed I have no idea. I indicated them also on that retyped copy you sent 1/20/94.

This is a particularly powerful chapter, devastating to Posner as little else can be, and I think that aside from the general belief that a book should be clear and not go out of its way to appear to be sloppy and a cheap job, the power of the chapter and of the book should not be undermined by what those looking for something to criticize have it handed to them on a platter.

It took time to do checking that should not have to be done in page proofs and it was unpleasant.

I've just begun VII, That Dubious Epitaph, and I find that in the very first sentence that in the proof

makes no sense, the correction I made was ~~made~~ made only in part and then incorrectly, as with the highlighted copies attached you can see.

Then, again highlighted, the sentence I added

and the paragraphing are ignored. And in the same first graf an important sentence I added was not picked up and added, copy highlighted attached. Paragraphing again ignored. Should I not now wonder whether this was done throughout? Or rather not done when it should have been? I can't now go back and do the proofreader's or copy editor's job. But when I had to check, as with a grammatical error, I found other corrections I noted ignored. This continues to be a real exasperation I cannot conclude on this page.

Best
David

Although I saw no reason for or sense in some of the editing, I made no complaint, much as I believe it seriously damaged the book. However, where I could spot ^{reference to} what had been edited out, I indicated that. I have not tried to be attuned to this because there is already much to mch to have to be alert for in ^{these proofs} (page proof). However, when I came still again to the utterly irrational inserting of dashes instead of paragraphing on proof page 150 and saw that when I noted that something had been edited out that was unheeded, I got the copy, page 208. I had indicated still again that those dashed be removed and that the quotation be indented. It was indented and the absolutely senseless dashed remain. Certainly the one you had go over this is aware of what direct, ^y verbatim quotation requires. and in the two lines above it, what by normal concepts should not have been edited out was edited out I noted. Yet that, too, was ¹ ignored.

This also is true of pictures. I wrote many times about them, without a single response. I do not know what you are going to do about them. But how do you look when what is edited out is treated as though it had not been edited out, ^{and is in the book} or when you refer to pictures not in the book?

This inconsistency in direct, verbatim quotation of ^{more} ~~what~~ that is within a paragraph of text, all of which I caught on the copy, makes you (plural) look like amateurs, cheapskates, sloppy, inexperienced and other not nice things. And that is assuming that now, at the cost of cash an time, the dashes also are removed. As I have done with every piece of paper sent me from the first! The cost of not paying attention I cannot estimate, but it is a waste of time and money. Including ^{d d} my time and my being exasperated by all of this- what I would not expect from a reasonably intelligent high school student.

On the next proof page, at the end of this direct transcript quotation, where the page number was on a separate line in the copy I indicated for it to be moved to where it belongs, at the end of that quotation. Instead it as just eliminated! I've added it back on the proofs. This is the way books are published, Richard, with corrections being ignored? What kind of people do you have on this?

There is much more I've marked on the proofs. I do not take your time for them separately. I write you separately ^J to alert you to the potential harm to you, to C & G and to the book from what this represents.

I add two other things. Not knowing that the reference to the longer ms would be added here, ^{at the end} I added it to the Author's note. I think it is better there. And as I think I noted in returning the corrected proofs, the book just drops death without any ~~useful~~ ^{this reflects} conclusion at all. ~~The reflects~~ badly on all of us. I think some roundup kind of conclusion is an absolute need. Not having it is to invite contempt and ridicule and to diminish the book. If you do not select something from what you have and cut out and if you want me to write something, let me know and I will. But in this form it is really ridiculous. Especially with this content of the book.

Best
Harold

3/7 afterthought on the many styles of direct quotation in the proofs:

What I believe is the first is closest to correct. Indentation.

As I indicate in what I wrote earlier, following this, even the proper period after the name of the speaker, was replaced with a colon. That is not verbatim.

Some of this, and where it is not brief, is not indented.

Some has paragraphing replaced by dashes, after I corrected that every time!

In one instance the direct quotation is in italics. It was not in the original.

I do not think that needs changing, nor that all those periods should be put back in instead of the colons the copy editor put in.

But I do think this sloppiness makes you all look bad. Me, too, I guess. Very bad, very amateurish and unprofessional and if there is trade talk about it, very cheap. Frankly, I cannot understand it, how it could even happen.

To begin with dear Raphaela, who Lil and I think is a very fine person from our little contact with her, had problems with her first computer experience. But when I caught this and did the copy editing, how that was ignored I cannot explain or understand.

What remains of what I wrote is powerful. I think the word you used is "strong." With any attention it should be very controversial. I think your interest, really all interests, requires that there be no invitation to niggling comment. Posner's personal record is of attacking instead of responding. Giving him and those who support him the opportunity to ridicule can be very hurtful. I'm sorry about the added cost and delay

this entails but the plain and simple truth is that I caught it at the outset, made many efforts to eliminate this and other problems, in the end did the copy editing, and then that was largely ignored. Even a grammatical error I caught was not picked up by the copy editor!

On attention, and please regard this as confidential- I told you I would be sending copies of Selections to some on the Post, among others in the press. Two of the men on the Post must somehow have talked about it. One phoned me. They are coming up a week from today. Jeffrey Frank wrote the critical review of Posner's book. Jefferson Morley wrote that fine article on John Newman of which I sent you a copy. (If that is what led to his doing the Oswald book, fine, I'm glad.) I did not ask why they went to come. Each has given me different compliments although we've never met. I will mention Case Open to Frank. I think both are on the Outlook staff. If you have not read the long draft of a possible magazine article that would promote all the books, it is a natural promotion for the coming Newman book, too.

I think it will be helpful to all interests if you communicate a little on Case Open. I do plan to make files on various subjects that may be of some use when the time comes, so I can show them or send copies, by subject. Even if not in the book now.

Best,

Hand