

3/2/72

Dear Js,

Re Joy 27s, many thanks for everything, inc. stamps. With the gas I had to get after yesterday's trip to DC and other essentials, I came home from town with a roll I had just gotten and \$2.00! So, ~~xxx~~ I'll give 'til the roll and when she wants a stamp she'll not have to come to my office to get one. We have been working that close. This time of the year she has little to mail compared with other times, save when she pays bills, etc. But because she has no 8s this a.m. I got back a book I'd mailed on which she'd put a six and I was supposed to add an 8 and forgot.

Je's Constable: please don't waste any further time on this. To the degree one can be certain, I've decided who this is, one unknown to you and never met here, meeting all the intellectual and scholarly pre-requisites (Not Thornley, as I'd first consider possible), and when he first called, time coinciding, I either erased by re-use or mislaid the tape I finally began to make as he blabbed about the former connection he claimed with intelligence, translation of USSR intercepts re U2s, RB47s, etc. However, I remain with your fascination with constable part, same unfirmable feeling of childhood recall, and one other interest: this would make a helluva political novel, told essentially as it happened, and I have an editor friend who agrees and has a collaborator in mind, if he ever gets to where he can find time. Fact is that yesterday I mailed a letter reminding him that I hope to be in NYC soon and if this guy could still be interested, how about arranging a meeting? The timing would have been perfect if he had arranged this when I first proposed it. As a kid I was pretty good on features and my instincts for what can appeal seem to be reasonably good still, but the business has become unimaginative beyond my power to describe.

Clips: don't fret or stay up if I ask the return of something I've not marked. If it is really important, I'll mark it. One of these, from the mark I put on it, I know is what I wanted, and not for the Hughes file but for that on handwriting analysis. Realize this is the only real link between Oswald and the planted rifle, and the paper alone is enough to raise questions.

Before I forget, the enclosed carbon of a letter to my youngest friend talks of two shows in which I think you'll have interest. I will try to tape the CBC one in particular. Now I have a good supply of 90 cassettes and a few 102s and I'm saving those with audio-sensor, but I need 60s, so today a local store which takes BankAmericard has some cheap ones on sale, and despite all those resolutions, I'm going to get some, at 5-¢ each, which is pretty damned cheap. So, if I send you any such, don't spend a quarter of that returning. I've gotten my VOM back, and if it is not working well, but I can use it to run each tape through while I'm doing other things, so I'll know if any one hangs before using. Reasonably good chance of it, anyway. I'm also going to try to dub off one I have on a Sony, of Lattimer. Glad to get the note you don't want the tape I made for you for that tape is now in the machine, should I get a call of which I want a cassette. Don't expect, but keep it ready.

The one advantage of Lil's working, aside from the saw-belly (it ain't bacon) she brings home is that I have the mail early, can address it and then have relatively uninterrupted time for mail. I do enjoy your letters for a number of obvious reasons = the fact that you are the only ones of our age with whom I exchange ideas.

Jim's on Pacifica: I think we crossed on that, with my reporting what Bill Stein told me. He may be faceless to you, but he has tried to be a good friend to me. He was with SCLC and has experience raising \$\$\$ there, and he is with the foundation, and separately agrees with everything you said. He disagrees with you on news, believing that at KPFA is not nearly what it should and can be. Agrees on Thompson, too. It may be that there is something wrong with Lee but I'm inclined to the view that this is the way such groups and people worked years ago and it is possible for me to conceive it as the norm today, esp. where there are such problems. But I'd have to agree that this is the craziest kind of format for such a station. They also have nuts, one running one of their best talk shows at WRAI, a really arrogant bastard, but very popular and airing good stuff, esp. in an area where there is little of it an many people. Josephson or Jacobson, something like that.

Je's longer 27, all noted. On Ray, I've updated with carbons, etc. The announcement, if that it was, was also attributed on the 7th to the Commissioner of Corrections, Mark Luttrell. It was the fifth. I am increasingly coming to believe he was truthful in saying he didn't do it. I wanted to get other opinions, so I let other things go yesterday when I was in town and showed them to Paul Valentine, who covered the minitrial for the Post. I'd hoped Ben Bagdikian, who has just done a swell series on jails and had himself committed for a while to do it better, might evaluate, but he was away. Paul agrees that the kind of thing Ray says is possible and recalled several visits to a local maximum-security jail where it was not uncommon for it to take a half-hour to find an inmate in whom he has interest. They can't and don't keep track, so Ray could have been where he says an unless another prisoner saw him, not be able to prove it - if another prisoner's word would be taken. Add to this the timing-immediately followed by the long-delayed and adverse decision on his appeal and the interest in something happening to him and it all fits and gives him credibility. plus the warden has not answered my letter.

Don't return Wash Monthly. In fact, I think you should not worry unless I make for return, and as my files get less organized as they get more diffused, I think I'd best mark on them where I want to file on return.

China: where I haven't sent Post, it is because what they carried was on no special content. I may also send some that turn out this way if I get too busy to read. I've been reading them since I went there, to date. Several friends who get the Times tell me that when they are here and see the Post they see what the Times does not carry and that in some areas the Post is more honest! What this says ~~from~~<sup>for</sup> the Times!

Glad to understand about the bookshelves. What made me wonder is that nothing seemed to be vertical, and I wondered if he had in that room largely boxes mss.

I'm not without doubt that these events are irreversible. However, I also now think it provides a cover for more severe repression at home. What you attribute to Allen Jackson was inherent in much TV coverage and some independent radio I heard. The last rubbish I heard was Lisagor on the Vanocur NET special of which I wrote. I'm going to watch their daily listings through this period. We spend little time with TV, save for the net news. So we doublecheck the daily sreds often, esp when Hal is working.

I agree with your describing some of this as a tropism. It is a returning rather than a turning, and it also tore tissue, as you've have agreed, I think, if you saw while you heard some of the reporting I did. The fact is that in cont at there was remarkable little of this sneering and sycophancy, if any is too much. Many did do straight reporting and for the most part the slurs were restricted to reporting regimentation, etc.

Bandung(?) principles

I agree on five ~~principle~~ evaluation. I think I commented on it earlier. I think in retrospect we can assume more than you seem willing to. I see it was first Bandung, which is what I recalled. Let me note that there was a mysterious explosion in the plane carrying a Chinese delegation to it, then widely attributed to out spooks. What a difference, huh? I agree there is little chance we'll practise it and less than the general public will come to understand it, it is of enormous significance elsewhere, and I think this may be more than just your "western eyes" formulation that follows. I think this will include much of Western Europe, too. Agreed on rearranging regional matter that can follow. Note returns yesterday's Jamaican election, not noticed in my hasty perusal local paper. May be in Post, which I've not yet seen. On what could be expected at this stage, I'm willing to go farther than you seem to and think we have gone farther than you seem to. My wonder is to the GL and his entourage realize how far they have gone? If I'd sent you carbons of my earlier letters to Howard you understand that some time ago I felt the domestic problems are what GL find insoluble and that they are worse than we've been permitted to know. Not being able to do anything about them, he had urgent needs. This was the only direction in which he could go. F us C could hold out for and actually get more than W has been willing to give. Not because N sees the world, and its needs, or cares. His are present and urgent needs. I think if he is re-elected we'll see repressions like we've never dreamed of experiencing.

On Taiwan I take a more optimistic view or make that kind of interpretation than you do. I believe I wrote a bit on this earlier. Not in terms of expectable or close to immediate performance. But technically there is a decent and acceptable agreement. It may be years after Chiang has gone, I sincerely hope, to the reward he has earned. It is more than the mere opening of a door by a crack. It is recognition and a policy that can't now be changed so far as China is concerned, and the rest of the world, or here without the most serious approval. The treaty, as I recall it, is not mandatory anyway, so we can't even retreat to that. The problem that will be exploited by us, as elsewhere in SE Asia, goes back to how Allen Dulles hornswoggled JFK, what will do do with all those people (ref to Bay Pigs)? This the right can and will use and use hard. Unless some refuge is found for them or some kind of accommodation made, this will delay things long.

As it turns out, I was right in saying China would do nothing about SVN. I regard the report of the HongKong Standard as no more than a kind gesture by C. There was no chance C would or could do anything to help H with any of his SEAsia problems, and I think it impossible there is any implicit, explicit or inherent anti-USSR understanding, tho they seem to feel otherwise. Nor do I think they'll do anything at the UN they would not have done or the opposite. I think their policy will be unchanged.

However, I think that this also makes SVN less of a problem for Nixon. He'll have most of our men out by election, has already reaped a big harvest, and while I don't think I can make a fair estimate of what policy will be after the election, I think this does make it more difficult to reverse policy or increase such activity elsewhere. We have to get out, and I think even the military, for the most part - everyone ~~except~~ except the extreme of the right, recognizes it.

Your Nixon-On-His-Knees to the rest of the world (again, not just "Western Eyes"), agreed, too. I think you could have emphasized this more. I think after the elections, this will be better understood here. The Democratic reaction has been insane.

It was no real trouble to give you my reading on the TV coverage. It was almost non-existent on what I could say of ABC, but they are lightweight, minor compared to CBS, NBC, and I simply can't stomach Smith, who left CBS because he could not in his own eyes be honest there. He is worse than anyone on CBS ever was.

Bill Shea. Don't ake any time. I think he is some kind of nut, but the whole thing is provocative. Right one in Woodacres. My offer of copying was on chance he had been involved in anything that had come to your attention, for I knew he was closeby from postmark and zip.

Kutner: I think highly of him. However, when he didn't come here, before the time he had said I'd changed my mind about wanting to say anything. I sent word to this effect via Bill Stein, who was seeing him Monday. Unless there is to be pay for it, I'm not interested in writing or saying anything on the subject until there is something major or put together in detail. I think I can with some safety assume I've frustrated more than I could have expected to by staying behind the scenes, and if it changes, well, we'll do what we can. I do expect more in other areas, not medical. I've laid foundation possible, including in Vawter letter in ways I think you could not understand. I can go to court, a last resort, almost anytime and if necessary, would, immediately. I have long been hoping to be able to file a tort action to expand FOI concepts and with what I now have from Graham have a better chance. Also, their reaction to my button-pushing, as in changing regulations ex poste facto, each to cover an illegality and each to my personal damage.

Thumb prognosis. Use. X-rays normal on bones, rest can't be read until scar tissue down, expectation three months. I'm to see ortho surgeon again then. No forecast surgery, no forecast return more use of it, no sweat if it stays this limited way, if slight but annoying discomfort disappears. The fear of the general practitioner that there might be no trouble breaking the still-swollen joint is not shared by this guy, in whom I'll has greatest confidence, based on long experience with him. So, me for the woodchopping again when the weather permits. We are in cut third straight 70= day-and I have a 20" pile of now after that at the carport! Ground too wet for it now, but afterix lunch, if it is not

raining, I'll put boots on and pull honeysuckle. Forecast is for thunderstorms. My own, based on my pre-daylight hearing of Chicago weather, is that it will soon return to seasonal cold. Effective temp there 4 a.m. 10 below, actual I think about that above, with strong winds accounting for spread.

Ross Terrill is the guy CBS or NVC was using. I may have given you his name incorrectly. The marked part of what you sent (all that returned herein) is exactly what he was telling a vastly larger international TV audience....I do not know of any major media attention given to any of the professional sycophants on China. Noting that the Times also used Fairbank reminds me. Barnett got little attention, but he did a show I know was aired on a DC FM station. He is at brooking now....Jo spotted both clips correctly. I am keeping a plagiarism file. It has been much more extensive with me than you can imagine and has come to be accepted. Turner once said that he regard anything I publish as public domain. As has acted accordingly, too.

Despite what you have indicated, I'm sending some LIFE's. Mao is on this week's cover, those slips labelled as tags. I'll be reading only Mafia story. Some of the pictures will probably interest you, some of the expressions in particular.

Thanks again for all the trouble.

Best

27 Feb 72

Odds and ends to be taken care of, before filing.

Thanks for the two articles clipped from last month's Washington Monthly. Haven't had time yet to read, but they came in time to keep us from copying the Rothchild article for you! Don't subscribe to the magazine and don't often see it; this time it was quite by accident. Since we do have this issue, would you like to have the two clipped articles returned in case someone else could use them?

POW's (yours of 1/31/72). Yes, if you see anything on POW's and don't need, would like to have it. Our file on that is very fat by this time - get all that stuff in one place and it really smells. The first whiff came with the pre-Sontay ~~reads~~ bombing and it was strong enough to start that file off.

Irving/Hughes. (Your scrap-note, 2/3.) Thanks for your offer of Life thing on this but don't think we need it. Have quite a little pile now on Irving/Hughes and will keep clipping for a while, but think eventually will decide not to keep it. You want it kept for you?

Another note on this in the same mailing asks to have returned (if we don't need it) article by Stephen Isaacs. Don't need; returned herewith.

Still on the same subject, your undated note in mailing of 15 Feb asks to have returned two stories from "today's Post" - herewith. (Wonder how "herewith" came to be a word; must look it up.) We stamp your letters and notes with the postmark date, and as the mailings come in go through the clippings, setting aside those marked for return, with the others going back into their own envelopes. These two (on Hughes book, both Post 2/13/72) weren't marked, but checking postmark date on your note with that on the envelope, found them. The clippings in the envelopes are read as we have little scraps of time and then filed or discarded. As it happens these would have been put with the Irving/Hughes stuff and wouldn't have been lost, but I'm going to be nervous about discarding anything in case you just forgot to mark it.

Xuan Thui intv (scrap-note, 2/6). In this note you said you were taping the intv and asked if we wanted it. No need, here.

Ray (Your undated scrap, mailing of 24 Feb). In addition to copies of two clippings on Ray sent you earlier (SFEx 15 Feb, SFCh 17 Feb) we're including with this the only other thing we have on it. Had not yet come to that issue of the Times (the next one up is 20 Jan!) but looked through it and found this item, not even treated as "news" but included in a column of misc odds and ends. It gives the date Ray was caught as 7 Feb and doesn't attribute it directly to the warden, or even the "corrections official" mentioned. The two clippings from our locals which you have give the date as 5 Feb.

Pants (Yours of 2/9). Don't send! I have enough for me, can't think of anyone here who might use them, and it isn't worth the effort or the postage. If Lil can find someone where you live who could use them they probably would be more appreciated than they would be here, where they're so much more available. Thanks for the thought, though, and I agree it's a pity someone can't be enjoying them.

KPFA (Still yours of 2/9), and the connection you make - or possible connection - between the firing of Elsa Thompson and the station's earlier difficulties in getting licenses approved. I'm mortified because it couldn't have been more than two days before I wrote, that I was reading about those difficulties and their run-in with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee - and the prompt issuing of the licenses on the resignation of one of those the Subcom was after. And no ideas popped into this old grey head.

And getting greyer by the minute - it's almost 4 a.m. and we must get to bed. Will leave this unsealed because if we can pick up tomorrow better prints of the pictures we sent you of the two younger J's, will include them. If you'd like to keep them, be our guests.

27 February 1972

Dear Harold:

Again, this will have to be a sort of an interim letter, mostly to express our great appreciation for your trouble in analyzing the TV news coverage and in sending the many useful clippings from your local press. This acknowledges your mailings of Feb. 18, 22 and 24, by the way, and when I get time I'll study the Esquire article you sent and provide some sort of a reaction. Let me warn now that I'm too foggy on this whole case to be able to be of much help, but I'll certainly try.

Regarding the bookshelves behind Mao and Nixon: the Chinese bind their books often without hard covers. Hence they must lie flat unless they are boxed in sets, in which case they can stand vertically in the box without damage, as those in the left half of the picture are standing. On the right the volumes apparently are singles, lying flat with their bottom edge out. A good many appear to have slips of paper sticking out and folded down, apparently references or flags for references. Hope this explains what puzzled you. I can't see anything else in the picture that seems unlike any cluttered bookshelf.

We almost agree with you on your preliminary opinion, written, I believe, after the second day of the visit in Peking, that there has been an irreversible change in this country with respect to handling information about China. We'd agree fully if we hadn't been so bitterly disappointed with the post-war swing away from what had been, for all its shortcomings, basically a friendly policy. This was ruthlessly destroyed. We can hardly persuade ourselves that it can't happen again.

There seems to be no doubt that there is a rather clear understanding that it's okay to go ahead and treat China objectively again. I've seen nothing to pinpoint any particular official sanction, but have no doubt it exists and at least has been inferred by the reporters if not actually implied to them in briefings. One CBS reporter, Allen Jackson, said something to the effect that it appears that prior to the Peking visit the treatment accorded China by the media may have been wired more closely to official policy than some of us had thought. This is of course a pallid understatement of the quarter of a century that preceded the Peking visit, but it is interesting that it's said out loud. The truth is that the lid was off, with full rein given to hate and prejudice and distortion while any attempt at objectivity was heavily penalized in one way or another.

This is a very corrupt and confused society, but we think there is still a tropism toward the simple truth left in many people, including some reporters, and that much of the alacrity of the media in responding to the Chinese as human beings was just plain relief at no longer having to pretend to be reporting the news in terms of the accepted fairy tales. Aside from built-in Cronkite sneers, Severeid innuendoes and the manifest inability of many reporters to understand what they were reporting, we thought most of them seemed genuinely relieved to be able to do a relatively straight job without fear of reprisals.

For all practical purposes, the effect on public opinion in both countries is well-nigh irreversible in the sense that it is now okay to act and speak with the knowledge that the other country now officially exists regardless of the absence of diplomatic recognition, and this is indeed a great leap forward on both sides, taken deliberately and for self-serving reasons. Regardless of the differences between the reasons on both sides, this is a major accomplishment which it will be extremely difficult to undo completely within the foreseeable future.

We have not yet seen the text of the communique which was issued in Shanghai this morning (U.S. time) but heard a fairly complete account of it on KPFA. If the station quoted correctly, Nixon has joined in upholding Chou's five principles of coexistence first enunciated at the Bandung anti-colonialism conference in 1955. This apparently impresses no one in this country, but you may be sure is a blockbuster elsewhere, an enormous victory for the Chinese. If by some wild chance this country could be maneuvered into practicing this even part of the time, the way is open for the general rearrangement of regional matters I suggested in our last letter. No more could be expected at this stage. We have too far to go. It's still a major accomplishment if it means anything at all.

The lack of agreement on Taiwan was not unexpected, but this country appears to have recognized openly that this is a Chinese question, to be settled by the Chinese regardless of our sacred obligations to Chiang Kai-shek. Here again, a door has been opened just a tiny bit, for after all, who are we to go around interfering with other people's affairs? As I mentioned last time, Chiang already <sup>has</sup> signalled that <sup>he</sup> may be prepared to do business if the terms are right. If he means it, only the terms have to be settled. If he doesn't, he won't live forever.

Late last night the HongKong Standard reported that Nixon had conferred with high North Vietnamese officials in Peking, apparently during that hiatus last Friday when he ~~was~~ and Chou got together an hour and a half later than scheduled. That night, Nixon was sober and unsmiling at the dinner he threw for the Chinese, so it appears that while the Chinese may have helped arrange the meeting, the Vietnamese properly stood their ground and told Nixon they were not for sale, even in an election year.

In one sense, Nixon will appear to have been definitely worsted in all but Western eyes. He not only went to Peking; his emissaries in future will have to return, with no hint of reciprocal interest on the part of the Chinese. It cannot be overlooked that there is no hint that Chou has been invited to Washington, although he almost had to have been invited. Even people who notice this sort of thing, however, will be the first to applaud the opening of long-closed doors, the banishment of some of the myths and the ~~tentative~~ tentative and uncertain groping toward reality on the part of this country.

We want to thank you very much indeed for your thought in ~~giving~~ providing such detailed accounts of the various commentators and shows you saw on television, and for the very valuable clippings from your papers. Jenifer missed all the TV, and I saw only a few scraps, nothing that could be called representative. It is most useful to know how they handled it, and you provide a most satisfying impression. The clippings are invaluable, and we much appreciate your willingness to go to all the trouble. Our local papers are either too crowded with advertising or disinterested, when they are not being perversely provincial or pseudo-hip, to lay out a selection of accounts that can be trusted to be representative. We do get the NY Times, of course, but it's always useful to have a Washington paper to balance against the fount of all wisdom.

Going back through your letters to the first of the month, I FIND A COUPLE OF ITEMS THAT I can dispose of. (sorry about the caps).

We note the memo re one Bill Shea et al. All this is new to us, never heard of any of these people. The Marin County telephone book lists a Wm. Shea, 29 Rock Ridge Road, Woodacre, Woodacre is a hamlet about halfway between San Rafael and the coast, near Point Reyes Station, in country that has groves of redwoods interspersed with sheep pastures on the hills. Lots of retired people live there, some barely making it, others quite well heeled. We've no time these days to try to find out anything, but will keep our ears open for any of the names you mention. Don't bother with copying and sending all his stuff unless you figure out some specific angle where you think we might help.

In your letter dated 2/9/72 you mention Bob Kuttner's preoccupation with securing the last FM channel in Washington for Pacifica and suggest that this could have had something to do with the liquidation of Elsa Knight Thompson, pointing out that they have let one other person go in the past in a similar situation. We think it could, but that the picture is bigger than that. I'll try to be brief.

Last summer KPFA began to change, from its traditional format of classical, avante garde and jazz music to a good deal of rock 'n' roll, more emphasis on local news instead of national and international, and less solid panel discussions and interviews with experts in favor of more rap sessions, full of ers, ahs, wos and like you know mans. This trend has increased steadily and now has got to the point where they are broadcasting pro hockey games and so much rock 'n' roll that you can't be sure you've got the station tuned in because it sounds like any other rock 'n' roll, ~~commercial~~ commercial station.

We date the change from the time of arrival of Larry Lee, the young man who started the station in Houston in spite of two Ku Klux Klan bombings.



Soon after he arrived, as we understand it, Elsa (who was a BBC veteran and a real whiz at public affairs in addition to being a superb interviewer) was sent to LA to reorganize KPFA, which was having customary difficulties with financing and so on. She spent the summer there, did her job, and returned to be told KPFA ~~was no longer~~ no longer had room for her because of lack of funds, was given some sort of pension and dismissed. Her friends put up a frightful howl, but accomplished nothing except to make the new powers at the station appear more determined than ever to go on beaming the station at far out types with incomprehensible montages of music over news, two tapes being played at once, and other puerile stuff.

The station customarily gets only about half the money it needs from subscriptions and for years has had a fund-raising marathon in May to make up the difference. It's an ordeal for everyone, but they usually raise the needed money in two or three weeks.

This year, they apparently ran out of money sooner than usual and scheduled the marathon for the entire month of February, three months earlier than usual. They set out to raise \$115,000, which would have meant getting about \$4,000 daily. They've been getting an average of a little more than half that, and are talking about extending the marathon 10 days into March. It appears obvious their programming and arrogant tactics (they've let a number of veteran volunteer commentators go) has alienated the older liberals who are just not giving this time, and that the new audience to whom they are appealing simply doesn't have the money, if indeed it can comprehend that some things have to be paid for. They appear to be beaming their main appeal to the real bums who infest the shaggier ranks of our young people, phonies and bums who always have been there regardless of the length of their hair, and who always will be.

~~There~~ There have been much more obscure upheavals in the loose superstructure of Pacifica which is supposed to oversee all four stations. Several old-timers have resigned from the local board, also. The national board is almost all new, people no one every heard ~~of~~ of.

If the whole thing has not been infiltrated, it certainly acts as though it had. Lee would be the prime candidate. He's a former AP man in Houston. The regular AP man there I happen to know casually and happened to be here recently for an oil producers convention. I asked him about Lee. He said he was a brilliant young guy, thought a few seconds, and then added, "maybe a little too smart for his own good." If he was doing a job with Pacifica, he certainly earned a credibility cover with his job getting the Houston station started. Late last summer the Houston staff struck in protest against some management ~~change~~ change. Lee was sent back to make peace. He ended up on the side of the strikers, got it settled and came back to Berkeley, where he's obviously a prime mover in the new changes and appears likely to become station manager in April when the present manager says he'll resign, and has intended to all along.

Weak, penniless, disorganized as it always has been, Pacifica has grown like a plague, as evidenced by their audacity in starting such a station in a place like Houston. We can't have any firm conclusion about all this, but in the pinches Pacifica's supporters at times have accomplished some remarkable things. It may well be that the Pacifica claim to the Washington channel is viewed with very great misgivings. Pacifica has publicized things like the Washington demonstrations with remarkable success, for all its limited resources. It may be that someone has decided to go to work on it and destroy it from within, or at least weaken it enough to get it under control. The best way would be, of course, to find a way to make it seem to destroy itself. We're not saying this is what is going on, but the KPFA course seems firmly charted by new hands who refuse to listen to anyone else and now and then show utter contempt for those who built the station as an institution. We understand WBAI is flourishing on an even more conventional basis, with all-night talk shows and so on. All the stations exchange fewer tapes than they once did. More money is spent now on long-distance live hookups, which of course cost much more money. With KPFA still ailing, Houston virtually unheard from these days, and only an occasional tape from WBAI, KPFA itself ~~appears~~ appears headed for the rocks. If all this is accidental or the natural course of events, okay. It just seems awfully fortunate for those who have hated the whole concept from the beginning.

You might keep all this in mind if you ever see Kuttner again. Sorry to run on so long, but you might as well know what may happen.

That's about it for now. We're looking forward very much to your later assessments of the Peking visit and its probable effects, both here and there. On the whole, in spite of Pretty Pat's talent for putting her foot in her mouth every time she opened it in China, it appears that our GL got on the whole the TV exposure he wanted, but will pay for it in many other ways, mostly outside this country. In any case, things can never be quite the same, which is mostly good.

All the best,



jdw