

5 September 1971

Dear Harold:

I hope here to clean up some odds and ends, unanswered questions and so on, from your letters dating back a month or more. That this much has accumulated is an excellent indication of how my work shift is affecting both of us. We've done it before, but we were younger and more resilient, and the makeshift devices we used then to cope with the incredible inconveniences and frustrations of living this way no longer work. It is affecting both of us about equally, slows us both up in many subtle ways and is beginning to take its toll on the way we feel. The point is, we shall continue to do our best not to neglect your questions, but the answers -- where we can provide them -- will take longer.

Your Aug. 3 -- whereabouts of Walter Szxid Sheridan and what he is doing. No clue. We're alert to this and will let you know anything that turns up.

Your Aug. 4 -- about any reading of the affidavits. Never had time to study them, really, but see no reason to disagree with your conclusion that something considerably bigger than JG is involved -- possibly a concerted move to discredit the whole Democratic Party apparatus in the South.

Your Aug. 9, last page -- your point that the whole Cold War anti-Communist stance of this country traces back to Churchill's speech at Fulton, Mo., where he lifted the "Iron Curtain" phrase bodily from Dr. Paul Josef Goebbels and set the whole American press off chasing Communists. As you say, this is the overt origin, and like you we'd like to know who swung that particular deal. However I felt this was standard British ruling class operating procedure at the time, and that is, to maneuver the United States into a mood so it would assume the main burden of countering Stalin in Europe and relieve Britain of the burden. In this connection, George Kennan's coining of the phrase "Cold War" was scarcely less influential, but I cannot recall whether it came before or after Churchill's speech. What I am reasonably certain of is that Churchill was preceded by a speech by our then Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, made at Stuttgart in which he said much the same thing about the danger of Russia without resorting to Goebbels for his argument.

Your Aug. 15 -- Bernard Kalb's interview with Fairbank on China. Yes, this is something we missed because we didn't have television, and we should like to have seen it. John is an old and valued friend, generally very sound on his subject. Some day, no doubt, we shall decide that the price we pay in not catching such things is less than we'd have to pay by watching for them.

Aug 16 -- On this day, a Monday, the Los Angeles Times has a long roundup by Dave Smith on the Sirhan Case. At one point you asked if we could supply a copy; then we both think we remember you sent along a note to someone else saying this other person had supplied one. In any event, we finally got hold of a copy and made another copy for you in case you still need it. Please say whether you do. If so, we have one for you. If not, we can offer it to Hal in case he missed it.

Your Aug 19 to us and Aug 21 to Hal regarding an article in Aurora translation and appearing in Sputnik. We haven't seen it. ~~If we can, we'd be interested.~~ *Kalb says he has and will provide*

We suspect this may be a tentative Soviet reaction to Nixon's gambit toward China, which as you know has stirred all sorts of rather paranoid reactions in Russia. The Soviet New Times carried an article the other day arguing that China is basically expansionist and aggressive and bent upon empire. It's gone that far. I suspect the original article appeared in an obscure journal like Aurora simply because it was a trial balloon and could always be disclaimed if the reaction was too unfavorable. Translating it and planting it in Sputnik appears a deliberate warning to Nixon that the Russians know a few things too and might not hesitate to publish them if he leans too far toward China.

Your Aug. 26 -- We do have an extra mike with on-off switch that is usable with your Sony recorder. When we have time we'll pack it and send it along. Try it and see how it works. If it's no better than the built-in mike, send it back. If not, you're welcome.*

Your built in mike, by the way is what Sony calls an Electret Condenser mike, suggesting it may not be too much different from the condenser mike (with the single penlight power cell) we told you of, which the local dealer has. When we have an opportunity I'll try to find out whether this separate condenser mike is any better than the one you have built into your set.

*Or, perhaps your electronics friend could take the plug from our extra mike and connect it to your Concord mike. Your Aug. 31, to someone named Wayne, including a clipping from an unspecified newspaper, datelined Atlanta, and assembled from news dispatches. We have not yet had time to check our own files for anything comparable with this. Certainly we remember nothing of the ~~wrsk~~ sort from that time. However we shall make a careful check of our files and then return your clipping, as requested. In this connection, the AP here keeps only its own originating files, nothing from anywhere else unless it is directly relevant to something we're working on. So no hope there.

This is a very unsatisfactory way to deal with your most interesting letters, enclosures and clippings, but it is the best we can do under present circumstances. There are many things about which I'd ordinarily have more to say, but the fact is that both of us are in a sense stupefied by the violent wrenchings about our schedule takes us through. In order simply to live, we have to undergo each weekend the equivalent in hours of a jet trip to London or Tokyo, and back. A sensible answer would be to keep the same schedule and not make such drastic changes, but some are necessary in order to get to banks and stores. Any social life is out of the question.

One final thought -- reverting to the reference to your Aug 9 on page one about the origin of the Cold War. In my mind this is associated with the advent of Byrnes, who replaced Stettinius, who had replaced Hull. Getting rid of Stettinius was roughly coincidental with Truman's firing of Henry Wallace, who symbolized cooperation with Russia in foreign policy and the more radical innovations of the New Deal. It was during Stettinius' tenure that Dulles was wheeled into to State Department in a wheelchair, suffering from gout, as the GOP's consultant on foreign policy. I therefore suspect that this marked the beginning of a change in policy, away from cooperation with Russia and toward one of hostility, to Russia. The Southerner Byrnes may have been Truman's sop to the Democrats while letting

himself be steered toward such a policy of hostility, especially after he found Stalin such a hard old nut at Potsdam. In any case, Dulles already had his foot in the door, and it seems reasonable he already was plugging a harder line toward Russia for various reasons considered desirable by the interests he represented, and which the British may have been eager to exploit. It is certain that Truman already was becoming baffled by the Chinese problem, and he only made it worse by agreeing at Potsdam to Stalin's demand that the Chinese sign a treaty with Russia which gave back, to Russia all the rights they had held in Manchuria in Czarist days! Perhaps ~~Remember~~ Roosevelt had agreed to the same thing at Yalta, I can't be sure at this late date, but the point is that things were cooking which Truman little understood and was prepared to deal with intelligently. J. Parnell Thomas was raising hell with the Un-American Activities Committee, and you may remember Alfred Kohlberg was functioning -- and had been since early in the war -- as a one-man China lobby who appeared determined to prevent any permanent, reasonable relations either with Russia or the Communists who already showed every sign of winning out in China.

Sincerely,

jdw