

JAN 9 1972

1/8/72

Dear both,

That today could not follow a planned schedule in a sense makes it a good day (cold but sunny, too). I slept later than usual, took my brisk walk, did a bit of editing, decided that with the mail always unpredictable on Saturdays, it would be a good time to gather and cut some of the fallen wood, and for a slightly tiring hour was a ~~machatero~~. By the time I skimmed the mail it is near lunchtime, so not enough time to turn the lazy muses on.

Lil was busy with chores, the weekend being the only time she now has for housewifing. I read her your letter to both, and we enjoyed it together. I could tell from her face how much she liked it. (I also noted that she noted the difference between 2 1/2 and 4 and think I detected the faint whirring of mental gears.) It was kind of you to take so much time. We ebeve enjoyed - particularly enjoyed- that strong recollection of so romantic a honeymoon. In time I suspect Jimmy, who seems all boy and real cute, will have something of his own, into which young Je may grow.

Your explanation of the interference from Fluorescent lights makes sense. Some years ago I was a radio amateur and have recollections of such matters. But I'd just assumed that with mass-produced conductors, shielding would be complete. I have also decided that your apparent belief is correct, that the built-in mike is at least as sensitive as any other. It is better than the good tie-clip one I had attached to one of the cables you provided, at least as good as the old Sony mike ^{when used} on this machine, at least with respect to sensitivity, and until that happy day when I can afford the special little mike made for the TC-40, over which I drooled in Dallas, I think I'll forget about any external mike. Until I get to interviewing again I'll have no need for any external mike anyway. I was surprised at the compactness of that special little one. It requires a battery and has a built-in pre-amp.

Lil is just emerging for a long siege of feeling unusually lousy. Last night she ate normal food (trouble from hiatal hernia triggered, I suspect, but worries) so, what with working, I don't think she has tried on the trousers. Except for expressions of pleasure, she has said nothing. First time we go out I think she'll wear them. They look like a good fit. She held them up immediately, natch. She finds the Chinese clothing comfortable. When we went out for Sunday-after-New Years dinner she wore her older things.

Thanks for the offer on the tapes, but I have no immediate need for any. I remember fearing you might take some of my comments as hints and intended to write you so informing you. I have close to 20, and the two you sent will be preserved for interviews. It will have to be an exceptionally long one they can't hold and none are in immediate prospect. I'm going to try each of the unused cheap ones on taping TV shows and will attempt to return the defectives. I have found another bad one. Slowly the Sonys are getting around (with sensor, that is). The 60s are not in town. In time, I suppose 90s and 120s.

I've just laid out the fruit of Je's great labor and will go over it as I can. I did make a serious mistake in sending you the wrong carbon. It was to a NYC friend I'll now have to speak to by phone. I know the producer of the new Capp show and enough about Capp to anticipate a boobytrapping. He'll probably assume my purposes begin with the destruction of society. I'd asked this young friend to arrange a friendly claque, which always helps. Were it not that this makes possible a trip to NYC that is necessary and beyond my resources, I'd not be doing it for a dead book.

X I'm not looking up what I've forgotten about a younger Kennedy. BUT, if it in any way relates to problems I may face when the mixed whitewash of which I've written incompletely is applied (estimate, within two weeks and a NYTimes story not necessarily a whitewash sooner) please reconsider. I am aware of the problem you state. One problem is finding the proper fulcrum for the application of intellectual judo. To make this backfire. It can.

Thanks for the Ramparts masthead. I know some, but see no prospect. It helps explain their unending financial crises.

Check on the TV tapes. I was aware of your time pressures. I may let you know of the few things I'll be taping in case you should want in the future.

Thanks for list of stories on informants. Some seem new to me. I'll not ask for any because I have no immediate need. I have more than enough for the intro to AO and will want more only if I do I, SPY. If I do, with this I can ask. None seems to be a case I'd need for the intro, my immediate interest. Thanks esp. to the busy Je for the time it took.

RFK and sounding off: I think Krakow was real early. San F was famous last words. Not only a few weeks separation, as you say.

"oguchi: I knew of early firing from radright pressure, but he was referred to as former corner recently, I think on Cavett, who made a nothingness of that show. My opinion of his is high.

Glad to know postage scale set accurately.

Babuns: Je's f'note sounds likely. I have never been able to get the book turned out by the vets of the Bay Pigs. There are two, one by the assn the other by the class that went to Benning.

I missed refusal White House Corres. Assn refusal to support Post. I think UPI did. Agreed on pressures. But what is exceptional is the sharp change in TV news reporting, as I've indicated. This can be done within the cliches, and has been. It continues as of last night. I do hope the Post sweats it out. I suspect its biggest problem will be from the Times, because it can always have what the wires carry.

My first two impressions were yours re Ellsberg and PPapers, but soon I shifted to the belief he is sincere. He could, of course, have been turned on. But intellectually he is no Sirhan. I think the reason the papers come out this way is dual: Times selections and CIA and White House restrictions, that is, they didn't let their inner stuff out. A careful reading of what is in the Bantam version will show the thing that distinguishes the CIA is only its desire for success and its determination to try not to support what even a cretin should have known would fail. There is no brilliance in any of its statements or advice that I've read. It looks better because everything else is so gucky, a restatement of the official predetermination (reminds me of my youth and handling of captured German/Italian secret files, same crap, same hewing to official line in reporting.) Fierceness of prosecution of Ell. & Russo impresses with administration's seriousness. When E faces over 100yrs in jail, I can't think he finked. I once suspected adm. connivance inleak but abandoned that v'y soon, too. It would hurt too much when they are forced to make enough compromise the military is having trouble accepted. Your analysis on non-withdrawal my one. Everyone forgets that our intrusion into SEAsia did not begin in SWN. Go back to Chiang, Thailand, etc. I've always felt Korea was contrived. Ross & Wise on Laos are more than enough, etc. (I was particularly please when I found my contemp. analysis of Gulf Tonkin incident for Howard when he was here. He appears to have found others in the boxes of SEAsia Files I've let him have, going way, way back, when nobody talked about it, not even the brightest kids. I spotted what the books since haven't and latched onto the jugular, even detecting the phoniness of the non-existent second attack. Makes me feel real good.) Anyway, Kissinger is too smart to take on the military, and they are the ones really exposed in the Pent Papers. Some of the ignored stuff on the CIA is pretty rough on it. In State, only Ball has any decency. Both "undys, phttt. The anti-JFK stuff is arranged by omissions, as from the papers. Natrually it was siezed upon by the whores. (Sheehan, by the way, has not responded to my letter.)...I think the resumption of bombing means more than I indicated or you took from it. I agree with your formulation, but think it goes farthur. What you say would be true of any large

2

bombing. This is larger than necessary for that. It can have many intents, ranging from the special US corruption of Keynes to another hope for successful intimidation. However, it also has been counterproductive from the electronic reporting, with pilots and prisoners' wives joining in the denunciation, and I mean pilots in it, on active duty there. It may have had the purpose of encouraging Chinese rejection of the visit, thus giving Nixon the best of two bad worlds -and less opposition from the rightright. And military. And nuts. I think the only real campaign issue he has yet shown signs of having is Democratic crookedness, something they have been working on from the first warming of Mitchell's seat. The most encouraging thing he has is both kinds of Demo. bankruptcy. He is genuinely unpopular for a president. He exudes no warmth to anyone (but Bebe?), seems to have no real friends of any kind.

What was leaked to Anderson -and it had to have come from high up - more than supports your comment on the India-Pak business. Every major power in some way profited from our goofiness and crudeness. The wierdest part is the State statement that India's recognition of NVN shows they are not "neutral"-when we've had a full embassy in SVN for so long. We are devoted to proving to the rest of the world that we hold them all in contempt and have to be crazier than any has ever considered us.

Process: I have no confidence in its relevance to any of the political assassinations. Bud seems to think otherwise, so I've followed what I could without too great effort. He has looked into it some. I haven't. Ray seems never to have heard of it. I doubt Birhan did. If Manson did, that seems to be unrelated.

New: I now have rap sheets on Charlie and Marie Stein. Both involved in drugs, which makes them more interesting. Ray told me he was certain Charlie was in pills. C seems to have disappeared, as Jerry Cohen told me. Marie is back near N.O., across the river in Algiers- and not talking even for money.

Gerold Frank's book is to get big bookclub play from what I've just heard. I think this will mean an even greater cash loss to Doubleday, which so richly deserves.

Many thanks,