

Last night and early this morning, when my mind wandered, it seemed like a long time since I'd heard from you. I hope it is merely that you are busy and there is nothing worth sending or saying, or that you are taking a vacation. I have two other purposes, the good news first. This a.m. I had a call from a major German publisher who is interested in world rights to the book and seems willing to make the cash and editing investments. We spoke for more than a half hour and he is to write further. We also spoke frankly. So, I feel a bit better and I know Lill does. She is working today but I phoned her immediately. We'll have to wait and see now. And work even faster. Work: if you can't read the note at the top of the letter to Sussman, it asks if you want copies of those documents. It doesn't tell him but I tell you the source, the register of wills files in the courthouse. At 50¢ a page Lesar did fairly well for a non-investigator (they don't teach this to lawyers). So, he didn't get the page on which the judge had written a personal note saying that accepting Buckley is illegal! I don't really know if there is significance other than as evidence that Hunt is a crook in the discrepancies in the two reports on the estate to the court. I do think her collection of unused airline tickets and the mystery about who would get the 10G is significant. So, if you want copies, I'll make them. I feel that because I'll not be able to carry this part forward, I should give it to the Post. If they don't I've lost nothing, if they do, perhaps it will lead to something. Some of what I added came from the one Bennett deposition I have. Lesar will take a personal crack at getting Nader's several, through a lawyer with whom he has had contact. He is also willing to file some FOI suits on this stuff I've been denied. And if the ACLU doesn't do it, once vs. CIA. It is an enormous amount for one man to undertake, but not impossible. And it all fits together. If there is no indication in of the shift I'm making in the order of contents, it is that I decided to tell more than the story of the caught crime at the beginning. From it, before going into what I've already done on Nixon, I'm going into the beginning of the cover-up, telling it in the story of the indictment, etc. The reason I didn't at first is because it seemed like a sharp break from the approach of handling the story as an analyst would. The reason I decided to do it is complex, but it is part literary, to excite interest at the beginning, part to prepare the reader for the kind of crookedness he would ordinarily not be willing to credit, and in part because without it I wonder if the reader will wonder about going right from the break in to Nixon's past. Anyway, I did come to believe that if the new arrangement does seem like a break, it can be handled in editing, with a few words I may not have included.

I hope you are both o.k. Best, HW 8/17/73

AUG 17 1973  
AUG 19 1973