

Dear Jim,

Another of those things to which I'd hoped to devote more time is further analysis of Hunt's Where Murder Waits..

I did not mean to imply that he was in it Anti-Cuban refugee. He is not. He regards the committee as great people, real patriots. And the cause the finest.

However, what I find exceptional is the number of crooks and incompetents he has.

At each crucial point there is a no-good and he alone, Dick Daring, has to overcome some renegade Cuban.

He begins serving a great cause. Thereafter he is deterred by these baddies.

Does this not lend itself to the interpretation that at least in his own mind he has this view of his own disastrous Bay Pigs operations? Does it not seem to be self-justification? Would he not have succeeded had there not been this plentitude of the unprincipled at each turn?

He evolved a formula that permitted the hiding of his true belief, that JFK and those Commie rats of his were the cause of the disaster. This enabled avoiding the public feeling about the assassination.

Before he worked it over in his mind he was even truthful about such things as the failures of the air drops and the minute size of the anti-Castros in the hills. This is not what you find in Give Us This Day, for example.

He is anti-some Cuban refugees in real life and in Give Us. But they are political. In Where Murder Waits they are none political, his villains. In the novel he has no Monolo Ray, for example. So I find myself wondering about his hiding of his true belief where he does not in the diabolism crap. The RFK assassination was no ~~at~~ deterrent, if I am correct on the dates, and he was anti-black enough.

As I remember his Cubans who are not up to patriotic snuff, they are cowards and crooks and personal indulgers. Also lazy and undependable. Now I don't see that he could not have worked his political beliefs in without affront to public sympathy for JFK. His failure to do this strikes me as atypical. And of the motives that suggested themselves, self-justification seemed most likely.

It just isn't like him not to strike a blow when he can. We regard the others as low blows. But they are missing where he writes about this high point in his own career, his great failure. Do you think he had to be anti-JFK to say what he believed? I don't.

Whether this gives more meaning to Finis Farr or not I wonder. I also wonder is this is one of his creations, with the significance in some alegorical notion around a Farr, with the finis what he means.