

any loonies involved. And, of course, by linking me to the Sneeps and Freeds - by interpretation, you risk bringing Phillips closer to suing me (for which he's been collecting money for some time now.) So could you disentangle me from all that. For the record, and my book reflects this, I have no theory as such. I have, however, ^{reported on the} presented evidence that Oswald may have been in touch with an officer in US intelligence before the assassination, and that after the assassination that officer conspired to create false evidence linking Oswald to communist officials. Even if true, this does not necessarily mean there was a US intelligence involvement in the assassination, merely (perhaps) that US intelligence was involved with Oswald before the assassination. All I say is that the allegation is serious, and goes a long way towards standing up ^(the allegation, not necessarily the Phillips case) and I believe that it should be industriously investigated - which has not yet been done.

Page 3 para 3...first line....in with changes to accommodate my wish to be properly presented, would you pander to my old mum, and call me 'Anthony'. Cos that's the name the book's published under. Thanks.

Page 3...same para. Thanks for the puff. You may want to say that Schlesinger is the author of the official Kennedy biographies, and former Special Assistant to President Kennedy. Hugh Trevor-Roper (now Lord Dacre) was Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford University when he wrote the comment - he's since moved to Cambridge, and I know not what he does now. Perhaps you'd feel that Mailer could drop in favour of the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times.

Page 3...next para...I mentioned this on the phone. 'Summers is supported etc'. Fonzi and I have always stayed meticulously separate except for informational exchanges. I do not, in fact, go so far as him (even privately) in my ~~limited~~ suspicion that B is Phillips - for example. My position is as stated above. So can you clearly separate us - if only by omission. Fonzi is being sued by Phillips, I am told by McGraw-Hill. I am not - and inter to keep it that way!

Same para....Fonzi was in fact know as 'Ahab' for his dogged pursuit of 'Bishop', not the CIA as such. So perhaps you could say 'dogged pursuit of ~~the~~ ^{the} mysterious ~~undercover~~ CIA case officer alleged to have ~~had~~ had links with alleged assassin Oswald.' (This would ^{also} enable you to avoid the 'Summers-Fonzi theory' in the next par., which horrifies me, and would make me write letters to Editors on legal paper etc!

Page 4 line 5....I don't think it true to say - if you mean to - that P overthrew Allende. He was in fact chief of the Chile Task Force established to try to prevent Salvador Allende assuming the Presidency. In that he failed, but continued subsequently in CIA work involving Chile, and aimed at the removal of Allende. Whether, and how far, the CIA was ultimately involved, remains a moot point.

Page 4 line 8....'and Fonzi's projected book'. I'm not sure that Fonzi, after the Washington -an article(80,000 words) still plans a book. It'd be safer to say 'Fonzi's published research'.

BUT the main problem in this paragraph - I nearly missed it, and again it really matters

legally - is that 'Summers' book' does NOT take the allegation rather further. The whole point is that my book merely, reported what the Congressional Committee said in its published Report and volumes. And that's no doubt why Phillips has been advised not to try to sue me. (I will go further if the Observer ever print my stuff, but not ~~so far~~ ^{yet}. So, once again, please drop me here.

Page 4, line 11. Phillips, as I recall from the letters I saw, did not demand time. I think it would be fair to say he 'solicited' it, ^{or put himself forward} Two TV shows to my knowledge, 'Today' and 'Panorama' - in letters very similar to that written to Bradlee at the Post.

Page 4 last paragraph....I would respectfully suggest you peg Veciana a little more firmly to his former role. Founder and leader of Alpha 66, one of the most effective and strident of the anti-Castro groups in the sixties, and still operational today. What I'm getting at is that V deserves more than being labelled as just one of the thousands of exiles who will tell you tales in bars. He was a nationally known figure at the time (Life Magazine profiles, national newspapers all the time etc.). A C ban Arafat, if you like - certainly a Habash.

Page 4 8 lines up. Suggest 'It is Veciana who says 'Bishop' etc.....'

Page 5 line 1....again - not my theory. Perhaps 'A major problem, ~~text~~ if one supposes that Phillips is 'Bishop', is that Veciana himself says he is not. Yet the Assassinations Committee, and investigator Fonzi, suggest that Veciana may merely be un-cooperative, for reasons of his own. ~~XXXX~~ Carry on as was ^(have me not again - in a separate)

Page 5 ...first line of second paragraph...Suggest (in view of above) 'A second problem is that - not surprisingly - there is no corroboration of the key elements of etc''

Page 6 line 5....He went much further than 'thought it was Phillips' Even the Committee said 'almost positive', and I suggest you simply say 'and told the Committee he was ~~than~~ 'almost positive' it was Phillips.'

Page 7...line 17....suggest 'hidden from the Warren Commission following the President's assassination, and involved....

Page 7 line 20....spelling....it's Cubela (one l)

(David - you should know -merely for background - that Hunt was the best friend and confidante of Artime, who was supplying Cubela with arms etc.)

Page 8 (I'm a bit lost in the purple jungle, but would merely suggest that there's perhaps no need these days to suggest it's all an industry. If it is, it sure don't pay much! I refer to your line about 'surprisingly luxuriant assassination industry'. Koch, your source, is a pauper who has made next to nothing over fifteen years. Perhaps you could say something like 'surprisingly active field of assassination research'. (Now Snapp, I would guess, is in the industry. He openly admits in the article I've just received that he's after getting money to pay off his publishers after the disaster over the previous book income.

P 10...middle of page....This is certainly out of date, and slightly off anyway. Keuch has in fact been instrumental in commissioning the National Academy of Sciences examination of the acoustics research, and that is due in January. I have clippings, when I'm back at my London number, and furious quotes from Blakey about the whole FBI, JD, NAS fiasco.