

Dear Jim,

The Scott-Hoch-Stetler anthology 5/2/75

The unnecessary vagueness and the totally unbusinesslike form contract which is not made a bit less unbusinesslike by Scott's handwritten note to me plus the utter insanity of some of his writing and its implication and that of others with whom he has been in association, required that I make certain stipulations in the letter ~~1~~ ~~xxxx~~ will attach to the form when I return it. If no copy is enclosed, it will be in the next mailing, after I'll retype it.

These people may see fit to tell themselves this is something else, but they are up to a rank commercialization. The subject leaves no alternative. It ~~is~~ also means they will be drawing on some awful rubbish. It is possible they will be including some plagiarisms, like Garrison's first half of Heritage being a direct steal from Tiger.

We can do nothing about these things. We are also in a position where we would look bad in not agreeing.

If they were not dominated by commercial interest there would be no need for being vague on the financial terms, to which there is no single reference in their contract. And with WWIV, when at least two of them know we have not received a penny and do have hanging bets, if they were decent-minded and not driven by the commercial possibilities, they would have offered to pay for your essay from any advance.

I do fear we will not be in accord with their doctrine. Thus I have also made a record separating us from it. Scott did, after all, suggest Nixon's involvement. and God! if they use Lifton!

There is the possibility of an imprecision in their indefinite language so I've specified that all use is non-exclusive. This also is not ~~xxxx~~ abnormal. There is this growing interest and it is not impossible that a major publisher may go for an anthology or that there may be a respectable work on FOI. We will not be foreclosed now.

You will find there is nothing exceptional in the terms I've stipulated. If they do not agree to them or if they raise any frivolous questions I'd rather be out of whatever they do entirely. I got no single order from the "ay David anthology and his uses, eminent an anthologist as ~~is~~ he is under his right name, were not helpful, to anything worthwhile.

I hope my apprehensions are baseless but this whole project has no good vibes for me.

How many people do you know who have written responsible on "The Politics of Assassinations?"

Do you think for a minute that they will include the politics of the current commercializers? Or not include those of the know-nothings?

Where can they find 50 decent selections on this topic?

The kind of concern I have is reflected by what I recall of three parts of three of my books, the Intro to WW, which goes into one kind of politics several ways; the Epilogue to WW II, which addresses still another; and the Introduction to FW, which provided the basis for all Garrison's sensational speeches, with direct cribbing of the lines he liked better, and by their lack of interest in any of this as part of whatever they mean by politics re JFK. Even the angled use of Viet Nam could be bad.

I don't remember Stetler, although his name sounds familiar. Lil wonders if Hoch rather than Scott signed the form sent you. And I wonder what this requires three people, why they dilute the return when one could do it easily and normally would.

No politics in LHO as a possible agent? None in the composition of the Commission? "one is Russell?"

Bad vibes but no choices. I think you should write a letter saying that if they get any advance because we ran all the risk, including even 100% of the publishing costs, you think you should receive pay from that advance. They all are independent, having paying jobs. I have raised no such question with Frame-Up, as you'll see. Their answer will be a means of measuring their intent. Don't insist. Just ask.

No good vibes,