

JUL 23 1971

7/23/71

Dear Js,

Typewriter fixed, I hope, mail heavy with some remaining from yesterday, and the pressing thing I indicated, of which I may enclose enough to inform you if I can get to it today, I've separated your three mailings of the 20 into the letter, the notes, the clips separate from the affs, which will have to wait until I go through the others. The Penn thing is as sick as usual. It is not Alexander and would seem to be impossible for it to be Milteer, unless the other things we know of his whereabouts are wrong. Milteer is loaded and there would seem to be no reason for him to be so dressed. Goddamned ribbon still works its way through at the end when it shouldn't. Have you had this problem with yours? This is the first typing I've done since repair a few minutes ago, and it happened. Anyway, I'll read and respond to the letter simultaneously and go over the other things after I catch upon other mail.... Glad to have Jones' picture. I've seen it before, don't recall where.

On adm. objectives: it is the entire hearland of the south at least, in narrow political terms, as I see it, and more than this kind of political objective. I had heard that Gervais said he decided to work with gov't because son is prisoner, did not know the source was Wall, and don't believe it. I do not believe his son was captive when last I spoke to him, but it is entirely inconsistent with what he then said about the character of the war and the gov't, and I have yet to be persuaded that PG's role in this is as completely understood as it might be. I am full of respect for his keenness, his intelligence, his cunning, and his scrupulous unscrupulousness. I also think that by and large he'd live by the code of not peaching. Sp, what was he going to do, say "I'm a rat"? We'll have to wait on that one, but your general comment on the type of thinking is consistent with my observations in that area.

Brener's book: I don't know him but have understood he is bright, competent and determined. What you suspect is consistent with something Louis Ivon told me about it, that he suspected Richard Townley had done it. Rick was back in N.O. for the time that coincides with the probably time of composition.

I don't know why you don't have TV, but for years I refused to. I know the general problems of reception there. I also know some things are on TV that are not on radio or in print, some of which we catch. Should you ever decide to get one, from a recent experience this advice: We have a rather good "family" set because we also live in mts and a fringe area, the closest station more than 40 miles away. We have a large mast, two very good aerials, etc, and when it was working, a device for rotating. We were given one of the earlier portables with separate battery-pack, intended for use at beaches, in the car, etc. I have a temporary rack for using it at the foot of our bed for the rare times we want to look at something abed, like the rare good old movie, news, appearances on late talk shows, etc. I have two of the cheapest aerials, rabbit ears for VHF and a bow tie for UHF and we get as good a signal on most VHF stations and a better one and more stations on UHF on that portable! I think it is in the extra r.f. end of the set, necessary for real portability. And, moving a set a small distance can be critical and make a vast difference. I have learned that on UHF height is not as significant as theory says.

Agree on Nixon and crisis. He is in real trouble and he knows it, and he has Agnew, no exaggeration to consider him Nixon's Nixon, waiting for a snap at the jugular. There is a big difference between saying anything to get to be President and then being President and having to cope with real problems and suddenly finding out that being an opportunist ignorant may whose success comes from copying the successful, lack of scruple and cottoning to the right wrong just doesn't get anything done. He is, I think, a really desperate man. Confession: I had not noticed his use of the proper name of Mainland China, the real China. However, I feel, without knowing, that none of the initiative was his. I do not know of a single original thing he has ever done, or a single imaginative one.... I don't think Laos was to beach the military, which is possible. I think from the first he has been preparing at the very least to remain in S.E. Asia after leaving VN. Read his early stuff, esp when he went on that trip that took him to Thailand. He mortgaged himself to every two-bit fascist stooge, nothing any sensible pro ever does. And needlessly. He boxed himself in.

Schurman is without doubt right, my sole question being degree. And the teaching of the lesson could be the CIA ploy. Back to Dulles, who was a success because he was always wrong about everything.

However, I do not believe the leak of the Pent Papers was an agency job. They are sophisticated enough for it, but I think it directed thinking and action where they really do not want it. I think the three parts of the CIA-Military-Industrial complex, as I retitled it in draft COUP, requires all parts to be sound, like mind in body. Unless they are stupid, more so than I think.

Ping-pong diplomacy: I think there was no question of support inside China, but that had the government there had any question they'd have done it anyway if they considered time right. I think they timed it with Nixon's problems, figuring he needed straws for grasping, and our negotiations with USSR sweetened for them. Plus we have this big VN problem. The mood of this country has long been for major change, so Nixon, save with his best backers, was bound to be supported. The problem for him is that he is approved by those with no reason to support him and disapproved by those who have. And are undermined by their support by his agreement.

Kissinger secrecy exceptional, agreed. Secret even from Spiro, who doesn't like. He suddenly thinks he has big britches. What I haven't yet figured is how approaches were handled outside channels in this leakproof way, of which modern government permits few. Agreed on the spurce and extent of his problem, and he is now pretty much in the position JFK was beginning end 62 and more last half 63. He threatens the unthinking dedicated wrong. And they can do to him what you indicate. However, I think that at this point the money as opposed to the industrial interest have enough heft with the press for it to be resisted, perhaps exposed, one of the reasons I think CIA leaking PPs not likely. Not lemmings.

Be patient on reaction. He has yet to reach agreement with China and get it accepted. They are not about to give up at the conference table what we could not get by war, even if they could. They will not surrender Taiwan will not agree to our presence on the mainland anywhere, will not agree to naval presence but might pretend it does not exist, so what does Nixon have except unsuccessful negotiations? He is the kind of character who could parlay that into electoral value and recapture some of his disappearing support that way.

Der Spiegel and Kissinger: makes sense. His public records confirms your friend.... Did you catch Cavett's wonderful line on this, I wonder whose Kissinger now? when he was away from DC? Regardless of what kind of feline he is, he is out of his depth once he gets where the President's weight can't help push him. He can do nothing but capitulate to Chinese, and can you picture this? Or anyone else negotiating? And most of the world is close to revolt against us and our policies. Your following opinion of the Chinese mind is quite credible on the record I know, and you are the Chatteries who was dere. Or were you there when this was a famous, stupid radio weekly gag that gagged everybody into stitches? They are also independent and determined, as Mao's refusal to cotton to the Stalinists of both countries shows, and have the capability of fighting for their beliefs against incredible odds.... I don't know what I was thinking of about Howard, that is, do not recall what he said, but the initiative at the ping-pong table is obvious, and that is enough for me. Whether they continued it diplomatically is not as significant, for that more opened all others, and Nixon could hardly have condemned it publicly, or to have refused to go further afterwards, the step he took being the obvious and necessary, the alternative being their exposure of his unwillingness to talk. And, did they not extend an invitation to him? I think he also recalls how much good Khrushchev's trip here did Ike.

I'm answering as I read, and you come to price, which I addressed above. We agree. Your point on the announcement: I think Nixon is much more deperate than shows, and what could he have done, let the awful reds announce it first? And take the play away from him. They were courteous to permit him this victory, and do they have any reason to like Demos better? You see, this all advances peace in the east, their major objective, whichever party is in power. I think this answers your next par, why they bother. As long as we have uninformed uniformed zanies all over that part of the world, it can go into flames at any moment. I'd be shocking you on this point in TIGER. Their's is not domestic problems, except for expenditures they have to make they'd prefer to direct into domestic needs. Again you carry further what I said on liquidation of adventure, and again we are agreed. The real problem here is how to prevent utter chaos and perhaps revolution because despite all the lies, it is a war economy and there has never been any real planning for change from it. Worse, Nixon has always been the improviser, never having the brains to be more.

"Partial isolation" Remember, I said we always repeat the same mistakes. This is what unfried the people of the USSR behind Stalin. And it also requires resourcefulness and dedication for survival, so we always help our "enemies" and never learn.

I think they see little choice between a Nixon or an HHH or LBJ or McG, for all ours have essentially the same problems and limited choices. They may, indeed, anticipate the same very serious developments here I do, which means that they deal with whoever is going to be hurt in their own self-interest. As I read I see we again are agreed, your description, "another hairy barbarian".

I digress for a moment to note what to me is one of the more impressive signs of the popular support of their people, the basic changes they have been able to bring about in such things as sexual activity. That means the people must be in solid accord with official thinking to the point of real sacrifice and positive determination. I know of no parallel in history, government's or man's.

I think your analysis, what Nixon needs for 1972, etc., too narrow. It is correct, but it is true of everyone who can be the candidate of any party except those much to the right ~~and~~ of any Nixon (meaning whichever one of the real ones many characters he is in at any one time—you ought to read a speech on intellectual freedom he made during the Ike years at Franklin-Marshall College in Pa., and try to imagine this is any one of the many other real Richard Nixons. My own opinion of the Chinese position is that they may ~~be~~ decide and probably will to agree to what they can agree to and just ignore what they can't agree to, believing, I think correctly, that any American President needs of them whatever he can get. There is nothing real, short of total disarmament that the USSR will not now agree to, that any president can get from the USSR. Our greatest blunder was not to take Khrushchev's offer on this....Of your what follows, I agree with the military part. That is Nixon's real worry, real problem, aside from the first real, lone, unassisted nut. All of whom are on the side he has had supporting him. Isolation: agreed, again.... I'd never before heard of the wise Sun Tze...And one factor you have not considered is the coming very real and quite insoluble problem in the eastern Mediterranean. Both sides have made that insoluble, us and the USSR and the Arab propaganda. Israel has no choice, as Sun Tze reminds me, for she can't survive the loss of a single battle. What outrages every major power is that a nation less populous than metropolitan Philadelphia is practicing what they have always practiced and is so disdainful of their opposition that she doesn't even both to claim the gander's sauce....This is a problem for every major country except China, and for all small ones not near China. What you tell me of Chinese thinking and attitudes is very helpful to my understanding. What little contact I have had with Chinese is not enough to tell me these things, though I have profited a bit by reading. And I am the one who resurrected Evans Fordyce Carlson from oblivion (and had the mobile Gung Ho. stolen from my work!)... The one thing you have not addressed is no less exceptional: the ability to conceive the impossible and the capacity to bring it off. Like the great March. Yet they also produced the Chiang of 1927, what was also the Chiang of the kidnapping, and the Chiang who broke ~~at~~ that word. And bravery. I was doing news, a one-, an staff just before they took all. What went entirely unnoted was the number of entire armies that deserted as soon as we moved them, trained and armed, from Formosa. From the lowest private to the top general, all, and with our stuff.

Frey: I notice immediately, and I always felt somebody was out to get Haggerty because he was fair in presiding and because he decided the way he did on two vital issues, the Z film and the question of Dallas evidence (where I happen to have disagreed with him as a matter of law after the trial got started)....RB-47: I wonder more and more about that source and his dependability and whether he could have authored a certain message!

Think I'll read the clips next, so I can be up to date in anything happens. It will not be possible to begin writing today anyway, and getting the letters all done is the same on a Saturday to DC, the imp. ones, as ~~is~~ on Friday. Thanks, Best,

