

Later 7/18/71

Dear Jim,

I wrote Rothensetin a lengthy letter based on yours, with a few added comments, made as many copies as I could, but by the time I sent one to McG's AA and each of those I consulted, I ran out and asked some to forward to others. I think it is potentially very important, especially the Ocoam bit, which we missed, and the suspicion of necrophilia where KT claims to "political" necrophilia after the assassination. If you'd like, when I get a copy back I can send it.

Your Pentagon Papers letter of the 13th begins with a chronology that has significance as icing than as cake. It is more relevant to what happened if considered as the last of endless failures, still not ended.

Not disputing your interpretation but rather suggesting multiple purposes, note that Helms also defended against charges of domestic spying, surely known to most editors there to be false, made no reference to "operations", as though thus part of the iceberg didn't exist, and I know of no editorial eye being raised, and did all of this and more in the context of the Irvin hearings and the disclosures about the Army and FBI. I am inclined to think he knew, his boys having seen to it as part of their SOP, that there would be no significant CIA documents included. Some I know wonder openly if the CIA really tried to leak some of the papers. (Today's and late last night's radio news refer to a Detroit story not in the edition of the Post that gets here suggesting the protection of people, sources, is part of the justification for the attempt at prior restraint presented to the Supreme Court.)

When I can I'll make copies of the unidentified Helms speech I've finally received in an envelope with no return address, stamped, not franked.

The key thing is the word you use in describing the comments of the scholars I think are probably very interesting, "documents". They can communicate verbally when they have to communicate at all, and their major interest was determining the nature and course of events where they were happening, about which they were not about to say anything (The Wise & Ross chapter on Laos in Invisible Government, if you do not recall it, may interest you in this connection.)

I am fascinated by that of which I was not aware, the absence of any clear indications for the three weeks between the D and JFK assassinations. I would probably be particularly interested in what they have to say about this.

I think I would go further than you, as I will in TIGER, on policy being against any kind of SEAsis regime that the paranoids could consider "Communist", I think and think I can prove the basic policy was vs China, to which everything else was subordinated, and I do not mean mere "containment". Would not this ~~text~~ find some confirmation in the absence on papers on China?

According to Carl Stern, NBC Justice-legal correspondent, Justice is unhidden in its intents esp. re wiretapping and appeals, Burger is working with them without concealment, and there is an intent to change the basic meaning of basic law, without legislation. I agree with the thought on intimidation, one of the central themes of COUP. What it boils down to is that this is a crew of fascists determined to achieve what they can of an authoritarian society by whatever means they can, knowing, as has always been the case, that they are a minority and have to accomplish their ends by exceptional means. What makes it possible is the press.

I'd like to suggest another thought, that after Agnew's Des Moines speech he became the likely Republican second candidate, for inevitabilities are forcing Nixon to do what he had never conceived he could and the unregenerates cannot abide it. Agnew is an anything. His counter-policy statements and silences are, I think, significant. Best, HW