

15 February 1973

Dear Harold:

Some preliminary and/or tentative answers, at least, to some things you have brought up through your 75.

We'll pass the long George Hardner piece on press subpoenas and pending bills to provide immunity, since we had more extensive files on this than we expect ever to need. Thanks.

Your 5Feb note on the Asia News Service's reports on KPFA: You appear to have gained the impression that Troscear thought Kissinger promoted the resumption of the bombing and continuation of the war. What he said was that the North Vietnamese said he repeatedly had threatened them with this (Flora Lewis of the NYTimes reports this too) but I doubt if Troscear thinks Kissinger either believed this would work or favored it. My personal guess is that he probably told them several times what he thought Nixon would do if they didn't cage in, but that doesn't mean he approved of it personally. His apparent relations with Le Duc Tho were fairly convincing after it was all over, and if genuine mean he done his duty for the GL by telling him, but I feel Kissinger must have had a fair idea of what the world reaction would be and how it would swing things in favor of ~~xxxxxx~~ North Vietnam. ~~The~~ certainly showed every indication of feeling it was a certainty, and he was right. How right is indicated by the nature of the settlement, which contained only one small concession to American face by the provision for recognizing the existence of the demilitarized zone. This was implicit, already, in the October agreement which contained an American commitment to the Geneva Agreements of 1954 which set up the DMZ in the first place. All the other changes from the October agreement are in North Vietnam's favor, which indicates how anxious our GL really was for a settlement, now that he had all his military supplies moved into South Vietnam and had let the military have their day with the Christmas bombing spree.

I wish I could help you on your note of 5Feb about Williams and his handling of your case. About all I can say is that I don't have a good impression of Belli, not only from his handling of the Ruby case but from a couple of other minor things which lead me to believe he does jobs now and then which would automatically align him against you. Both added up to maneuvers to support the official myths. I further doubt whether he would welcome a chance to take on Williams, as almost any attorney probably wouldn't. If letting the statute run out on a client is unethical, and if this can be proven, would not one approach be through the Bar Association? And can he prove that you administratively closed the case? I can't think of any lawyer out here who would be likely to take on Williams in Williams' own bailiwick, and can only suggest that only a lawyer with some sympathy and knowledge of local courts and conditions could give you advice that would be worth anything.

On a related matter, your note of 12Feb regarding the Joint Foundation and Stephanie Mills, I'm trying ~~ng~~ to get the address of either or both for you. This obviously is an unusual foundation and yours is an unusual case. I think the obvious thing to do when you can is to write them a letter, explain your ideas is not more than a page, and ask them candidly how you can apply for help, what more they need to know and so on. I'll let you know the address when I can.

Best,



jdw