

OCT 12 1973

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 to me 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/LF (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 rapprochement 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 annihilation. 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 other enclosures, but I will in-between, and I appreciate them.

CQ no sweat. Lear 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 Wader 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

LET?
\$2.00?

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, Chshman, Ealters) 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-toothed 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 he 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 G-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? When I 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 domestic-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 WG writing, a guy I know, kil.intel., who caught a CIC guy taping all his outfit's phones. And they were at the home base, Holabird. Very early a.m., when it was expected nobody would be there. A soldier could enter at will and did.

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

Back to the waiting. Many thanks.

