

MAY 17 1972

5/14/72 Mary McGrory's 3/16.72 story on Mitchell's "open door" policy is great, but her tongue is too far back in her cheek. I can confirm that his door, or at least that of his assistant through which his can be see, was open when I was there. But the baffling part is finding the open door of value when the office(s) is(are) empty. Well, there was that single magazine, carefully opened to Mitchell's first "victory" and barely able to remain on that end table which held too large a lamp for it. I doubt he is anti-intellectual. I think he is not selective. He is just anti-especially people... Maybe he found dissident people welcome, if they ever could find him in, but he was not happy with letters, even when there was the legal obligation to answer promptly. Or appeals, which he delayed long enough for the courts to get involved. The once and future part is the guts of it. What (he) has been is that which (he) shall be. H

5/14/72 UPI story on theft Ruby safe. It seems incredible that the contents would not have been examined at some point. If there was anything in that safe, it is not in Henry Wade's files, which I've gone over. The only Ruby financial records he has are those from the trunk of the car, large Amerex bought check, represented by stubs. But if the contents were never examined (can it be that the sainted JEH didn't see to it?), then the theft becomes fascinating, for it is clear that the safe can't be sold except privately, and who would be that kind of collector, one who could not boast of his acquisition? Fascinating.

5/14/72 Je's marking of the Ross/Sun-Times "War Assessment" piece, dim but visible, at all points coincides with my own tendency to emphasize. Remembering that Ross was co-author with Wise of two exposures of the CIA, with an excellent selection on SEAsia in the first, concludes with Nixon's second option, before it happened, "ordering terror bombing of North Vietnam." His second graph could explain the incredible that has become the norm, Nixon's political needs, and thus the need for the terror so there would be no continuing offensive at election time, with use still getting whopped then. The third and the third from the last, without specific statement of it, say that our intelligence remains entirely undependable, as does analysis of it. We did not even know, for all the new, super-sophisticated gear, how much they had stashed away where.

5/14/72 Looking at the Times wire story by Barsch that appeared two months ago, 3/13 (and might have made later Times editions), is it not possible to estimate a different beginning to the current anti-Saigon offensive? First this massive attack by it and then Nixon's quitting of the "peace" conferences only, despite other representation, because the victorious side would not surrender at the table what we could not get in the field. Papers more and more tend to accumulate more elaborate morgues and to use them less on policy stories. (It may interest you to know that the Post-Dispatch librarian showed me a full page of the times, cleaner than the newsprint original, about actual size, on good paper, reproduced by a new microfilm process costing but 10¢ for the full page). If I have not kept abreast of recent reporting, I'd be willing to be it excludes the fact that it likely began as a counter-offensive rather than as an initiative, although it would seem clear that an offensive had been prepared before this SVN futility. I'd be interested if any kind of Hersh I-Dol-You-So reporting appeared subsequently, point out where the origins of the current mess lie. H

MAY 17 1972

MAY 17 1972

MAY 17 1972