

30 March 1972

Dear Harold:

Odds and loose ends:

I have two notes from you about patch cords, one dated 3/3/72 and earlier undated one received here 15feb72. I don't know what an attenuator is, but assume it to be some sort of filter to reduce a signal carried by a patch cord during the dubbing process. I have run into this blasting process myself, with recorders which have built-in automatic amplifiers like the Sonys. I suspect, but do not know, that this may be caused by a different voltage between the sending and receiving machines. For instance, our Craig ~~uses~~ uses five 1 1/2 volt cells, whereas the Sony uses only four for a total of six volts. We can dub from ~~the~~ one to the other, but not the other way round, and I never can remember which way and have to experiment each time.

As for your problem of fixing up a patchcord between the VON and the Sony, I simply wouldn't dare try to obtain and relay any advice on it from here. For a very good reason, I don't really understand what you are talking about. I remember the old Norelco plug, but don't recall whether it had five or three prongs. I gather both had one extra prong to make sure it always was plugged in correctly. The three prongs meant a simple mike circuit was involved. The five meant a remote on-off switch for the mike was included. The only thing I can suggest is to find a shop somewhere with someone who recognizes the equipment and the problem, and by that I mean both machines with their respective plugs and cords.

To answer another question, the TDK tape does not have the sensor. Accurate has seen ads about Gillette tape but hasn't had any experience with it.

Now to surer ground, where I have some idea what I'm talking about. The Canadian tape you sent was a very good job. We've heard that and the CBS forum, not having got around yet to hearing the Ted White program. Still another came in yesterday and appears to have something by Marshall Green. We'll get to both in time. We've already returned the little tape of your conversation with Jerry Ray. We agree with you. He's not stupid.

Tea: We are pretty ignorant in this sector, and plead guilty to ~~liking~~ liking the same kind the British do -- red Assam or Indian -- and with cream and sugar. We also like Chinese and Japanese tea, and are so ignorant that we don't know the difference between fermented and unfermented. Which is the kind the Russians use, which comes in bricks?

Here we can get quite good Japanese green tea, which is all pretty much alike, and some rather inferior Taiwan tea which may be green but more often is reddish. We have not yet seen the kind of Chinese tea we really like, which is a delicate green tea from central and south china. If you want some of this common Japanese tea or some of what we consider rather inferior Taiwan tea, we'd be glad to get it for you. Earl Grey we've never heard of. Lipton is pretty much our speed, come tea time.

Regarding anyone in China who would like a copy of the Whitewash books, I don't doubt someone would be delighted to see them.



I know that

The only Chinese in Peking whom ~~ixknam~~ I know is Chiao Kwan-hua, vice minister of foreign affairs and who I doubt would remember me since I met him only a couple of times in 1949 in Hongkong. He was the one who came from China to make the opening statement for the People's Republic at the UN, and was back in Peking during the Nixon visit. ~~Whathsh~~ he has returned I don't know.

Felix Greene was there recently, but I don't know where he's staying. Julizan Schuman is there permanently, apparently, and I know him, but don't know how to reach him.

I have no doubt Chou would be interested in seeing the Whitewash series, assuming he has time to read them, which I think is doubtful. The best I can suggest is the next time you are in NY and have the time to drop in at their headquarters (it's now in some former motor hotel\* which they bought for \$4 million) and inquire as to how to get them to him. In writing to him you could refer to his interest expressed in the Excelsior article by the Mexican correspondent. It's an interesting idea, and I believe Chou and his office would be glad to know the obverse of the official story, ~~whikthey~~ they are incapable of believing. Next to Chiao Kwan-hua in the foreign affairs hierarchy ~~ixzHuanxHnaz~~ is Huang Hua (pronounced whahng whah) who was ambassador in Ottawa before the Chinese came to the UN and who is in effect the ambassador<sup>at</sup> the UN when Chiao isn't there. If you could get in touch with him I'm sure he could tell you very quickly who'd be interested. He was a student at Yenching during the time I was there and I was aware of him, but never met him. He was Ed Snow's translator when Ed first went to Yenan.

■ In copies of letters to Jack Anderson you express interest in a text of a JEH release on the ITT memo. Dated 25mar72. I haven't seen a text from him moved on the wires or reprinted in any paper for many years. If by any chance one should show up in the NYTimes when Jenifer gets to that issue, we'll certainly make you a copy.

Several letters to various people from you about Burke Marshall. He always has interested us since the GSA-family contract was announced, and for a long time we had him doped out to be the likeliest candidate for the agent in the Kennedy camp. Not so sure now. He seems more like the typical rich man's son with the peculiar arrogance and stupidities of the rich aristocracy. There must be other factors, of course, but this seems thus far to be the more dominant one. In another reference you asked someone if he were the son of a vp of Standard Oil. I looked up both in an old Who's Who and he isn't. Possibly a relative, since both families live in New Jersey towns, but his father has a different name from that of the Esso veep.

The last thing I have set aside to deal with is Karnow's review of Terrill's book, which we're very glad to have. It sounds excellent, much in keeping with what I recall of his manner and approach on TV, which was good and sound if not too incisive. On one minor point I would differ~~m~~ from him (or Karnow, as it may be his reading of Terrill) and that is where he says the Chinese toyed with the idea of inviting one or more leading Democratic figures, presumably along with Nixon, but in the end chose to vote the straight Republican ticket because the GOPs are more hostile to the Soviet Union than demos like Harriman.

\* Lincoln Square Motor Inn, <sup>15's</sup> West 66th Street, New York; opposite the Juilliard School.




This no doubt was part of the equation -- the Chinese rarely do anything for just one single reason -- but in one of Ed Snow's articles in Life last July or April he attributes to Mao a statement that if the Chinese want to deal with America they know they MUST deal with Nixon, the implication being that having spent a career preventing anyone else from dealing with the Chinese, Nixon is the man in charge and will be the one with whom they have to deal. He also attributed to Mao some sort of statement along the lines of why shouldn't we talk with Nixon? We talked with Chiang Kai-shek, didn't we?

I'm particularly conscious of this business of the necessity of dealing with Nixon because I missed it at first reading, Ed slipped over it so skilfully by emphasizing the point that Nixon was, after all, the man in charge. Then when Nixon made his blockbuster announcement that he was going to Peking, we both sat down and very painfully figured out that the real reason the Chinese were going to receive him was that they knew his career and realized that nobody could prevent anyone else from approaching Peking, as he had in the past, but that he could do so at least to the end of his first administration, and if reelected, up until 1976. If the Chinese had decided they were ready to reenter the world scene, we reasoned that they felt this would be too long to wait, and that if they had made such a decision they would follow it up with real action. None of this was too easy to conclude because of our indignation at Nixon's gall. We then realized that the Chinese certainly knew what they were doing and felt better. I then happened to go back and re-read Ed's articles, and there it was. He had told us so months before.

A word about an entirely different matter: As you may have noticed, an all-white jury last week returned a verdict of innocent in the case of the two surviving Soledad Brothers, who with George Jackson <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ accused of murdering a white guard at Soledad Prison three days after another white guard had shot three black prisoners in a yard brawl. The word had just reached the prison that the first guard had been exonerated by a grand jury. The state had no case except four former cons who testified reluctantly, and the defense argued effectively they had been bought off with better treatment or promises of parole. The next day Angela Davis came to trial in San Jose, and again the state thus far has a very thin case against her, purely circumstantial, and I'd almost bet she will be acquitted. In view of earlier acquittals of Bobby Seale and others in the East, it begins to look like the establishment policy of tying up the leaders in long litigation is beginning to run into the law of diminishing returns. The prosecution made a serious mistake with Angela, pitching its main case against her on the theory that she was consumed with physical passion for George Jackson, whom she was determined to get out of San Quentin with the other two Soledad Brothers because she was in love with him. Putting the case on the level of a dime-store tune love romance in the case of a serious and dedicated revolutionary like Angela, will, I devoutly hope, bounce vigorously against the racist ~~paranoid~~ jerks who apparently are so ignorant and narrow-minded they can't even imagine, much less understand, what is involved.

Thanks again for all the good tapes, clippings and always interesting correspondence.

  
idw