

Dear Dick,

If you were an agent who spends his days doing what an agent does I'd respond to your letter of the 8th, which didn't get here until yesterday, differently. What you say is a close enough approximation to what I faced for so long with WHITEWASH. There never was a serious and adverse literary criticism of it. The most common reason alleged in rejection is that there was no interest in the subject and therefore no book could be profitable. As it turned out, the most profitable (and far from the best) was sixth or seventh in order of appearance and the one for which there was best prospect bombed in less than two months in hardback, despite much steam behind it. So, I can make my own evaluations of publishers and what they say. Often it is what they say, for their understanding and intentions have to be considered.

I think fear is the dominating consideration. Many will fear as you initially said, that Bantam will cream the market. I think the market will be good enough for more than one book to succeed in reprint. I also think a hardback can succeed without reprint. I would imagine that most publishers do not think this way. I would also suppose that with S & S in for ~~\$\$\$~~ \$55,000 for the Post boys' book, Pocket Books is taken up. Bantam also is. Avon has gone for an unconscionable bit of rubbish. The major mass markets are improbable.

However, on an unparalleled subject, to this day there remains a grand total of two serious books. On almost any subject the market should be greater than that. So, rightly or wrongly, I conclude that commercial fear is not the dismaying influence. It is precisely the fear I confronted with WHITEWASH, fear of the government. It is "safe" for S & S and Bantam because they are going to rehash what has already been published. I learned this early in a remarkable honesty from Doubleday, which frankly said its decision was not editorial and not easy to arrive at and that they'd have been much more willing if they could have faulted the book. (Thus you have never heard me say a bad word about Doubleday. They were honest.)

This kind of fear is legitimate. I know what the consequences can be. I live with them. I could say in spite of them.

However, there has never been a situation like this on in our history. What is new at ~~state~~ is the kind of society we will have. To put it more bluntly, whether your boys will grow into manhood in an overtly Ameriform fascist state. (Thus the ambiguity in the title. I am not a pessimist or I'd not still be trying.) I simply can't believe that there is no publisher with the principle to publish a book of this kind. I can easily believe that it is impossible for you, with all the other things you have to do, to pursue him, to seek him, rather.

One of the things that is inevitable if I do not persist is that there will be no book that is not some kind of coverup. The Post boys are so ultra-heavily indebted to the prosecution, meaning the staff DAs, the Department of Justice and the FBI, that as in all their stories, in their book they'll hide the extensive covering-up of which all have been part. Mollenhoff is a Nixonite who remained a Nixonite after he could ~~stand~~ the White House no longer. He will proclaim the Glorious Leader's personal innocence and will use his book to get even with the palace guard, his ancient enemies.

What we are really talking about is an exceptionally sick publishing industry in an extraordinarily sick country.

No, I do not think you have some magic potion. I do think that your interest would be restricted to a work that has best-seller likelihood. I don't think this is probable, in normal concepts, for a book without the probability of high mass cheap sales. I do think an approximation is not impossible and that it would depend on the publisher rather than the market. I go into these things on the off chance that at some point you may be speaking to someone to whom a casual mention might have some possibility, so you won't be as hopeless as your letter indicates. Personally, if I had the money, I'd be on the phone to editors who have been unsuccessful with me in the past. That is, in placing a book they wanted published. I'm too broke to think of it and I can't write all of them.

Because what you write is essentially what you said earlier, if I am disappointed I am not surprised. I do keep trying to keep up with developments and when I can write pieces to be worked in later. Thus I am taking in all of the Ervin hearings, for which I now suspend.

It troubles me that Manny has not delivered the complete files to you. On all matters. The promise was specific before I left New York. I have written him. Copy enclosed.

Manny's files may not have what relates to the moneys I believed are owed me as a consequence of their not living up to their agreement on the spurious Bringuier suit and for the purchase of copies of my edition of WHITEWASH. John Friedman and I had been dealing with them on this and Manny said to go ahead and see what they would do, that on those things Bair should have been willing to pay because there was no question. (This does not mean that we expected them to pay for the books short of court.) You had parts of this file first, from your Parallax days. You then told me that the contract for the original edition of WHITEWASH, which has no return provision, means they do owe me for all the copies they got. In any event, when you get this file and have time to go over it, let me know any areas of deficiency and I'll see if I have anything relevant.

I have just had a phone call from a book-purchasing friend who follows some of the things that interest me closely. He says that S & S had delayed pub date on the book by the Washington Post reporters to next year. If you recall the analysis I sent you as soon as I returned from New York, you may recall that I said all books latched to the stories that are appearing in the papers and on TV will have to be held and that it is possible for a hardback book to still be first. Pretty much the same is likely to be true of the Mollenhoff book, Bantam's now not "special". I realize that it is not possible to expect publishers to tell themselves that others can tell them what they don't know about publishing, but they lack experience with special-problem subjects. A "special" is a snap on a Candy Mossler story, or where there is a government report to be reprinted. With such projects, the main prerequisite is money. I have a long history of looking back with regrets that publishers are the captives of their own experiences and fears, this being no exception now. I could have completed a viable book and it could have been coming off the presses by now, and it would not have taken much of an investment by a publisher to make it possible. Once my wife and I, entirely alone, did a longer than average book, complete with 150 pages of appendix and name-and-subject index, in 28 days. This means from the time I wrote the introduction to the night the first 100 copies, with sewed binding, were delivered for use as press copies. Of course, there was no editing. But the book has survived the testing of time. I am still selling copies of it, as I am of the earlier works.

Best to everyone. It was a joy to see how your boys are growing and that now that they require less of her attention, Jill is going back to writing.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Gallen

ATTORNEY AT LAW

14 EAST 60TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022
PHONE 753-1713

June 8, 1973

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Coq d'Or Press
Route 8
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Harold:

Thank you for keeping me up to date with your thoughts on your Watergate book. It is still my thinking that the public is getting enough of the Watergate information from the media and that publishers who have not already committed for a Watergate book will not be deeply interested in contracting for one now.

Manny has not as yet delivered the file. The Dell information which you have given me is not complete enough to permit me to evaluate possibility of a recovery.

Hope all is going well..

Best regards.

Cordially yours,

Richard

Richard T. Gallen

Dick, Note to argue but to inform I enclose a copy of today's columnist column from The Washington Post. As you can see, he says that what is needed is exactly the concept of the book I have had in mind. He also says this has not been done. To carry this a bit further, a seemingly vigorous and militant concept again serves the genuine interests of The Establishment. (This was the unrecognized reality with my earlier books.) On even the use of the words "fascist" and "gestapo", both of which I have already, the most conservative have joined me. Eisenhower's Malcom Ross, now Univ. Minnesota president, describes The Watergate as an attempted coup d'etat. So, there is nothing that can be called radical in what I have in mind, either. 6/14/73