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 ~~raids~~ 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.