

I have read about a third of Hunt's masterpiece.

You have a rare treat in store. Belly-shaking laughs he did not intend.

Rare psychological and political insights ("I have no politics.")

And in spite of all of this, some very important stuff that has been missed and I do hope continues to be so I can use it.

Whereas I thought the publisher was papers the press with proofs, the markings on the set I have are consistent with what I think I call from Szulc. Or, there may be only one or two sets kicking around. Some of the stuff marked is used by Szulc.

Don't be deterred by the Keystone Spooks quality. It IS worth the time, with that as a side benefit. I feel it has given me the answers to some questions. It will keep me from other things I should also be doing. I'm marking the proofs as I read.

I was wrong on the name "Bender" but I think you will agree correct in the analysis. I placed too much faith in Haynes Johnson, who omitted much.

I do expect you to see and understand what the Post and Szulc and UPI did not.

Now it becomes interesting how the proofs got out. I do not now think the publisher leaked them. I noted earlier it is inconsistent with standard promotional concepts. I think I then thought Hunt wanted it. Now I don't think so, but I could make a powerful argument that he did-and should have.

Some thing in this took me back to 1941, when I exposed or was part of the exposure on Diario de la Marina, the Riveras and our ambassador, Messersmith, as Nazis. Hope I still have it. When you come to it, you will understand better by my telling you this.

He uses incomplete names. If any mean anything to you, I'd like to hear.

In my view he had reason for fear and I was unaware of a legitimate reason, not the obvious one, when I commented on this, when he was in DC jail. If anything does happen to him, I'll have special reasons. What he says may control. Also the converse, the danger may control what he says. We'll see what you think. Best,

HW 7/14/73