Dear Jim,

10/12/73

I'd like to take time for a lengthy, thoughtful reply to your 10/8, which I picked up at the postoffice this a.m., but I can't. Not only from the need of the two started chapters I'm working on (while it is in mind) but because of the foresightedness of my ever-lovin'. First she grabbed me as I was leaving bed to work about four and insisted I sleep longer. I did fall asleep and missed two hours, almost, just to get some sleep. And then she was the frugal shopper. She sent me to a local chain that runs specials in fish, for 18-20 lbs of mullet at 29¢, pretty cheap for here. That not only took time (spent reading the letter and the one to LP) but when I got home I was confronted by what I should have remembered, that she'd done the same thing last month. Rather I did on her command, and I forgot all about it. It took some doing to get 8 fish in the freezer compartment, already stuffed with fish. We'll have to cook four soon! Maybe Sunday, when Ian and Cris are coming, a welcome visit. Anyway, I don't have the time I'd like because I have to finish the chapter Lil is already retyping so if she feels like working tonight, after she gets home, I'll not slow her down. Something I found in the printed testimony that I missed and I think is significant. And the one almost finished is beginning to blur.

Janus/Peking Man/LP (haven't heard from him for a while): Your reasoning is solid. However, whether or not it was pertinent when the Greek bore his gift, I think it now is. The kind of need you visualize for a rapprochment with China is more reasonable still because of mid-East developments. This gives the USSR a real chance to damage us. I think they have squeezed all they can expect out of us, resent domestic intrusions, and now have an opportunity like no other. I've not had time to read the papers, but either one early a.m. while shaving, when I get what news I can, or from some other source I seem to recall we and they had a hands-off deal that we now allege they broke. Regardless, they have, seemingly, launched a massive rearming effort to replenish what the Arabs have lost. I read a book on the six-day war, and I am satisfied the Israelis, even without the element of surprise and notwithstanding what the USSR and native morale-builders and training may have done, have extracted enormous tolls on both the Syrians and Egyptians.

Few Americans (or any others) really understand the Israelis. On something like this they are and must always be unified. They can't lose a battle, for one major battle is for them the war and means anhiliation. They are quite capable of deliberate attack on Russian ships. I have no doubt they pinpointed the cultural building in Damascus, regardless of the innocence they pretend. They have little real choice. They have to deter, if not end, reinforcing. If I can understand their fear of preemptive attack, it has to have been extraordinarily costly to them and I think it was a major error because they can't expect international sympathy no matter what happens or what the real situation may be. Their longing for it is understandable, but it is not their usual hardheadedness. Oil and fantastic stores of US currency are the new difference. They underestimated it.

Meanwhile, low-point Nixon can't risk losing any support, and on Israel the entire US Jewish community is unified. It is the single unifying issue or factor. He may do as little as he thinks he can get away with, but he'll almost have to replace some planes from those we have in the Mediterranean area, and that is trouble for him, with the Arabs and oil and with the USSR, which can't be expected to forget that Israel is a virtual US outpost close to its heartland, a more legitimate factor than will be articulated. They also have prejudices and a need for self-justification in domestic areas.

To whom can Nixon turn except Mao, as you tick off?

Haven't read the Hoppe and McCabe or the othrr enclosures, but I will in-between, and I appreciate them.

CQ no sweat. Lesar as coming here Monday. If we don't speak first, I'll ask him. I think it would probably be best to wait until you get it and then add the postage to the $6 and mail it to him. It can await your getting.

Library: thanks on the Who's Who. If not too late, would you also please add Caddy? No word from overly-busy HR. The Nader people took some relevant depositions but won't let go of them and going to court and paying court charges for copying is out of sight. Odd how they and the Senate do not believe or practise freedom of information, for all the

noises both make....After Jim is here I'll write Sachs again. Want to consult first.

Hunt testimony: maybe before I get to that writing I'll find time to go to the committee's offices and consult the transcripts. I think those several places may be important and I'm sure at least two are. Note how neatly this fits with the rough rough I think I sent (Helms, Cushman, Walters) and Cox's refusal to let me have those 39 pp. of the "released" grand-jury testimony.

Agnew-GL deal: bearing on this his last speech, all praise for and defense of GL. Just before the deal surfaced. Agnew drove a very hard bargain and got what has to be a better deal than could have been expected or can be justified. Even Clark Mollenhoff was visibly and audibly outraged, if you saw the Richardson press conference. (Hope your TV is working better than you initially indicated, for it is quite helpful in these small but very meaningful ways, like seeing the face, not just hearing the words. Let me intrude here again, for you have not replied. If you have or decide to have an external aerial, boosters are available for the aerial itself and couplers are for more than one set. With one set you eliminate the loss in the coupler. You can have more than one end on the aerial with little loss, virtually none if a double-throw, double pole switch is possible. In any event, there is a standard spring-toother clip available. One at each end of the aerial and if and when you move the set, not unscrewing leads and screwing on again. They are like an old battery clip, easy and fast.)

Coup: I made a note on this yesterday, as much as I now can. In about May I think I felt that if impeachment were initiated, this was a likelihood. If his Supreme Court holds against him on the tapes, I don't believe he'll do it. That will make the kind of crisis not as easy for Congress to ignore. What then?

Army: is there any that is not by its nature amenable to an authoritarianism or is not subject to executive purchase? Hasn't she been paying them off for years? Do they dare risk a different kind of president? I think that part presents not the major problem. We may not have had it before, but then we never had a Nixon before, either.

Call-in KPFA show and caller-in with C-2 experience: why not suggest to d.j. that he ask her over the air to call back early in a show and make a show on it? WhenI did those things I was always able to have the caller asked to leave a number for an off-the-air callback. The only exception I can recall is the 12/66 old Dolan show, the guy who knew LHO. (I think Hal never forgave me for refusing to trace him down because I respected his desire for confidentiality and anonymity.) The full military subversion in the domes ic-intelligence operations was not exposed by either NBC or Ervin. They even spied on and bugged each other. I use a case of which I have knowledge from a first-hand source in this WC writing, a guy I know, kil.intel., who caught a CIC guy taping all his outfits phones. And they were at the home base, Holabird. Very early a.m., when it was expected nobody would be there. A solider could enter at will and did.

Don't forget inall your assessments that for a man like Nixon unless he is ousted there is and can be no defeat because ach failure is apparent, not real, each advancing authoritarianism in some way.

Back to the waiting. Many thanks.

Dear Jim, 10/10/73

Thanks for phoning last night to let me know how the hearing went and for the mailing that came this morning with the NYTimes Gerstein story and the T-P's story on the not guilty N.O. verdicy. I've not had time to read them. I have a few thoughts that might be of future value to us, so in the few minutes before the hearings start and those several thousand books get here, I note them in haste.

If I know Garrison and the government, and I think I know both well, and local power sources in N.O., I do not think for a minute that this decision ends it all. I think the federal and local prosecutors and Gervais yearn in common for vengeance and that he can do a better framing job if left alone. Because he and Jim were intimate for years and because the conditions or Gervais' leaving the office were not exactly as represented at the trial, I assume he may be in a position to do a professional job. I also assume that he very much wants to. Aside from this, there remains the income-tax case (and my farout source told me of this in mid-1968, when it was entirely unknown) and the civil suit, if nothing else is hoked up. Because there is no doubt that Shaw did perjure himself, I also assume that there is purpose in the risky civil suit, where Shaw s character is an inevitable issue, if Garrison knew how to use it.

There are things Jim can do. I'm not going to suggest them. He could use this partial vindication to achieve it in his JFK area, where he has done nothing but hurt us and interfere with the establishing and the accepting of truth. I have had have had several cases where he can accomplish this, as as in which I have done all the work, have cases already prepared to the degree one can be before trial. These will seem like inconsequential cases to publicity seekers, but they are quite basic and would be a major assault on the integrity of the whole Report and the Commission's work. However, with my experiences of the past, in general with those who yearn for much and are incapable of producing it anything and specifically with my N.O. experience and with Jim personally, I am not only not about to suggest it but I'll not give it is asked. He'll not. He'll also not remember the past and all the unkept promises and the screwing I had to take. This is partocularly unfortunate because the decision in his case and what I have coming out at the timeof the anniversary, which is beyond any question, even unreasonable question, there would be a natural situation for it.

And, my freebee days are over. I'm still out much money for unrestored expenses in N.O. and it is not because the money wasn t available bat because it was pissed away on evil projects from which in the extremity I had to rescue Jim.

However, the defense and initiative needs may at some point coincide, so in general you are aware of what I have in mind and am satisfied I can deliver. If you want specifics, when we have time I'll supply them.

My present intentions are to reserve these things and the unassailable proofs I have obtained, despite the handicaps to obtaining them Jim intruded, for my own future use.

If you decide to comeup, our schedules is as it was, with all working parts of Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and Wednesdays being the day part of the afternoon is taken up.

Hastily,

8 October 1973

Dear Harold:

Herewith an accumulation of stuff, including a copy of Peter Dale Scott's piece on Dallas-Watergate connections in the November Ramparts. Nothing else in this issue which needs your attention.

Before I forget it, we've decided we'd like a copy of that issue of the Congressional Quarterly containing the Watergate chronology if it's not too much of a damned nuisance for you and/or Lesar. I understand it's $6. There'll be postage, of course, and if you can estimate that, or obtain an estimate, let me know and I'll send you a check for the total. If this is workable without too much exertion, should I make out the check to you, Lesar, or cash ? No hurry, of course. Be sure to include any other costs in the estimate.

I hope to get to a library within a day or so to check on Mullen, Bennett and Cushman biographical sketches. Going out this afternoon on an errand, but it's Columbus Day for the Post Office, and the library may be closed also.

Unfortunately, we were paying no more attention than you when Hunt testified as to his connection with the Mullen agency. We have the tape for both days (both of which we watched, too) but cannot take the time to audit the whole thing and have no idea where this material would be located.

We did not catch all the nuances you did in his testimony, but did, quite independently, gather the impression that he was riding on a settlement or agreement of some kind. He seemed much less on edge, less resentful than one might have expected. We got the same impression you did of his attorney, Sachs. Very smooth and convincing.

We also have gained the impression recently that Agnew has some kind of a settlement or assurance. Whether it stems from the statute of limitations or from a much broader understanding with Nixon still isn't clear, but we suspect the latter because of Agnew's assured attitude at the dinner for the New Zealand prime minister (Dorothy McArdle, WXPN) and his support for Nixon offer p.28 his critical attitude implied at Los Angeles.

We never, of course, have thought of the Agnew business as anything but a Nixon maneuver to interpose the whole problem ahead of Nixon's own impeachment threat. To assume that the Department of Justice could take off on its own on such a dramatic move without WH understanding is nonsense to us. Incidentally, Hearst Jr. hinted yesterday in his column that he suspects such an understanding between them. I did not copy it for you because the hint is heavily veiled and is not supported in the rest of his piece.

If there is such teamwork between Nixon and Agnew, it fits like everything else into the apparent pattern of continuing to fight it out, confronting all possible opponents with outrageous challenges involving painfully costly answers, riding out every crisis as it arises with the enormous reserve of WH initiative options, in short, hanging on until the witching hour of 1976, by which time confusion and disarray will have become so pervasive that almost any solution will look better to most people than more of the same.

For some months I have tried to visualize what might happen if so much sensational stuff is disclosed that this holding pattern can no longer be maintained. The classic answer, of course, is a coup, but I always have had to ask how, practically speaking, this can be pulled off. I saw too basic difficulties: 1, to make a coup stick, you have to be able to rely on the military. 2, the public must somehow be capable of accepting it and not offer sufficient resistance to make the possibility of failure an unacceptable risk.

Both these factors are losing their weight as time goes on and confusion and stalemate spread. The military are becoming a body of pros since the end of the draft and already enjoy higher pay than the pop population levels from which they are drawn or volunteer. In other words, a privileged class, less likely to place anything ahead of their privileges, real or fancied. Furthermore, we are rich in precedents like Greece, Vietnam and most lately Chile where precisely this factor, partly created by our own military aid programs, has played all important roles in the establishment of dictatorships. As for the public, there can be no question that its demoralization is being deepened and widened. The enclosed McCabe and Hoppe columns under today's date (Oct. 8)express very clearly how deep and how wide.

The other day we caught the tail end of a commentator's talk show on KPFA, by someone whose name was not mentioned at the end but who apparently was dealing with civil rights problems or some such, possibly with specific reference to those of military personnel. In any case some woman called in, sounding middle aged and the non-nonsense - type. She wanted to know, what are we going to do about what is happening and about to happen. How are we going to avoid a coup ? Who will run it, General Haig ? "I used to work in military intelligence, and I'm telling you I cannot avoid knowing what is going on and what direction it's taking." At that point, the talk-jockey's time ran out and he signed off to make way for the next program. Anyway, it reminded me of the concern that I've had for some time. I suppose when this woman referred to things she noticed as a former G2 person she referred to seemingly innocent and unrelated bits that the ordinary person naturally would never notice or try to fit into a pattern. Things, for instance, such as obscure changes in the MP program, allocations, priorities and such which no ordinary person could be expected to regognize as having any more than routine meaning. I can think of none beyond those we already have noted, such as the federal influence over the police through LEAA and other devices. Anyway, I note all this for your attention and trust you'll keep an eye peeled. I take Chile very seriously.

I'll go through your Oct. 1 mailing again later and pick up any loose ends that have been neglected.

Best from us both,

jdw