

JUL 26 1971

7/24/71

Dear Js,

Urlet 21 w. clips, another pkg Gervais clips here. Brokenup day, with Lil backsliding a bit in otherwise smooth recovery. Grocery shopping a bit too much for her, workmen here by surprise to make a repair, so ideal time for corres. worst for writing.

Thornley: I merely consider him within possibility on threat. My chief interest, please do not spread, is positive identification, to the degree it can be positive, by the only two people who (knew) know who picked up the FPCC handbills. I have been after that "third man" for a long time, have no proof of who he was, and consider Thornley and Russo both possible. Plus other stuff bearing on this. But before he was killed in Hurricane Camille Doug Jones and Myra Silver each, separately, made identical selections from approx. 100 misc. pix., and likewise, with real positiveness, rejected all of LHO, inc. mug shots. And they were contemporaneous. Thus, there is nothing of KT I must not at least consider, hence thanks for the tape that has not yet arrived. It will await audition, but it is vry good to have.

Don't spend time you do not have on Yockey. If it gets really urgent, I can get enough. I fear you are spending more time on this than you have, so I don't want it spent is what seems likely to be the least-promising ways. But that stuff, if you ever see it, would be worth collecting. Makings fine novel with good doctrine.

Cook: sickening. The mag I referred to is unidentified. Carl Stern gave it to me when I was in to see them. (Conf: NBC investigating L.A. situation, having f.u'ed it when I backgrounded bureau chief almost six months ago. While Stern was copying what I was letting him have, he duped that for me, and I didn't notice until I got it home that it has no identification. The writing is rubbish, uncredited repetition of my material, incompletely, with inappropriate credit to Bud. Cook is sick on this subject. When McWilliams assigned WHITEWASH to him for review, he switched to his crappy stuff Ramparts wouldn't take. Having just reviewed F-U for Sat Rev, he rereads in this journal, omitting all ref. to source, but not forgetting a chapter title he liked and using that as subhead: This Is Your F.B.I. Now it happens I took a bit of poetic license there. That was not the title of the show. It was the tagline of the radio predecessor. The CTIA nuts are out to reread all of this work to which they have contributed nothing but trouble and impaired credibility to make a record of their having done all of what has been. If you've seen The Nation 7/19, you should be able to detect enough, and that is not all. It is not worth the time to read, having nothing in it, but if you want, I'll dig it out and send. Stern has not yet responded to my inquiry re: source, and when I saw him several days ago, I was leaving as he was charging in 34 minutes late for a taping, so natch, I didn't ask.

Rereading that old Hoffa/Partin/Sheridan?Gervais stuff at this juncture is interesting. I'd forgotten the old accusations of bribery vs JG, but if he got 10% of what has now been alleged, he should have no \$\$\$ problems. And his move to the grand-jury, to get all to put up evidence, is hardly the gesture of a man taking a payoff as now alleged as of that time. Interesting that MCC backed down on accusation vs present mayor, Landrieu, then counsel TAC, now charged. Forget Chandler's attractive (and for what I have heard, emasculating) French wife had the shoplift charge. Chandler is carrying a JG torch that will preclude possibility objectivity, in the traditional, not propoganda, sense. When I last saw (and interviewed) him, he was digging into the unsolved N.O. murders to pin them on J.G.! As to his competence as an investigative reporter, not spoonfed, LHO had sought him out and even after the fact he had no story. All LHO had told him was of the paramilitary activity north lakeshore, and of Carlos Bringuier's involvement. Now, how good a reporter is Chandler? It was easy, once the simple LHO code is understood, to figure he is the "Crawford", which he confirmed, on tape, switch in his own hand, after getting his wife's okay. He did ask her! Bradley file 2 suits? Two different years? I'm sorry for the San D. people, who will have to defend themselves individually. I can give them an airtight defense in court, but when they have steadfastly failed to repay my expenses when they asked me to come out and speak, and I doubled their sizie in one trip, and haven't even paid for the books they bought, I'm not about to until squared, and then expenses out prepaid. I have had

experience too many times. The <sup>total</sup> cost thus far, aside from time, is about \$3,000 unrepaired. Bradley made me a promise when I helped him that he would not file vs them and Penn.

Haven't read Casey in Times (Dan&Edgar&John) yet. Looks interesting.

China: our (crossed) views are close. Think Kissinger is in little danger save from nuts because it is done and if he wanted to he could make no change. Dirty Tricky can be. On historic nature, impossibility backout, agreed, too. But the right will have to figure a way around it if it leads to something significant, and that I regard as not too likely. I think they'll take a stalemate compromise with superficial pleasantries between China and U.S. There is absolutely no chance China will make major concession, and little Nixon will. They can work out face-saving deals, as on us moving fleet and them doing nothing in its absence, and they are not in Southeast Asia, so they don't have to get out. I think the importance is that it happened, not that it will lead to significant changes immediately. But it is a necessary first step in any detente, any domestic changes, and here the minimum that can work is past Nixon's concept of his backers' acceptance, so the problems remain. The great danger I fear I can see if not that the negotiations will lead to nothing, for that is what we can expect to be arranged by our side, where history shows its inevitability, as Korea, vs USSR, etc. That we have talked, that we will talk more in itself is significant and marks change on our side, major change. However, with de-escalation, with lowered military and areospace expenditures, unemployment, which I suspect is much more serious than official admitted, will get much worse. There will be even more domestic deterioration, much more need for repressive domestic policies. Nixon is capable enough, Agnew more so.

My hunch is that China's <sup>ing</sup> timing for the initial approach has not as much to do with who is or was President as the total situation. With greatest frustrate SEAsia yet, increasing domestic problems at home, real chance of single-term presidency, it is the situation, not the man, I think. Whatever caused, the timing was perfect. And when the pingponging included an invitation, the only problem was how to arrange to accept it. With the play Nixon had made for Roumania, I suppose that was the way.

As our policy-makers will see it, this is also an increased breach between China and USSR from which we can profit. Doubt it much. Theirs are ideological problems that will disappear if there is ever an attack on either. Note the mutual-aid treaty has not been abrogated by either and neither ever suggests the possibility. Were we to attack China, I have no doubt USSR would respond immediately. I also think it is the existence of this treaty that has restrained out hothots.

Workmen finished, I don't have to keep an eye out, so back to work.

Thanks, best

