7/16/73

Dear Dick,

I've crossed out the request that you ask Arlington House for proofs of Hunt's coming book because I took time to complete the 37 pages I have andthat is all there is to it, 74 short galleys. It is, in every way, a small book by a small man who views himself through a magnifying mind. It will be useful to me.

Also enclosed is a copy of another piece from yesterday's Book World. It deals with what we have discussed before, other Watergate Books. Only one of these in this piece is really ~~the~~ a Watergate book, the one by the Post reporters. It confirms what I'd heard, that it will be some time in coming out. It is not now planned for it to be completed in draft until three months after the end of the hearings. With the kind of book they are doing, which will be definitive in reported fact only, other things can well delay it further.

The Mankiewicz book I'd told you about before.

The Higgins book is a fancy potboiler, not a real Watergate book.

These things do, however, indicate a market and a lively publisher interest in the subject and its potential.

The one book that intimidated had been scratched, will not be done.

I spent the weekend collating materials and reading the Hunt proofs. I have some rather sensational things I'd forgotten. My mind can't hold everything any more. I am an old Nixon watcher, and I did have some information that turns out to be excitingly relevant that I had not mentioned to you or to Roy and Gross.

This is a other way of saying that aside from doing a book that will have meaning, what none of the others can have (from the descriptions, the authors and the situation), I am doing a book that, despite the extraordinary attention to the subject by the media and officialdom, will have essential fact that others will not.

And, as I evaluate the situation, the outlines of the incredible are appearing, a fix in which Nixon will be exculpated.

Unless.

I do so hate for circumstances to be slowing me down, from what would have been possible!

I should be more explicit about Hunt's book. It has absolutely nothing to do with Watergate. It has but one reference to it, a inadequate single footnote referring to a single character, Fiorini, saying later a Watergate defendant, not saying what Watergate is, or that Hunt was involved, or that his pal Bernie, identified as Barker, was also involved, or that they all copped pleas, etc. Poor a job of writing, recalling and editing as this thinness is, I suppose that prior to publication in November there will be a few added transparencies, more footnotes or a foreword. It is a bitter book by a bitter man for the bitter element of the radical right. He burns with wuch Kennedy hatred, it may interest you to know, that to the degree possible he avoids mention of the name! Instead, his most common reference is to The New Frontier. However, it provides someone with my knowledge a number of interestingx links with existing fact. His hatred of Kennedy, who he alleges double-crossed the noble, patriotic CIA (his part, that is, not those awful "liberals"), is such that when combined with his faking of cables chunterfeited to make it seem that this same assassinated Kennedy was repponsible for the assassination of Diem, it becomes quite provocative. He makes no case for the double-cross, and there was no double-cross.But it makes one wonder where Hunt was 11/22/63.

With what I have that others do not, he will add excitment to my book with his unexciting trash. Sincerely,