

8/13/71

Dear Lou,

Because I am staying as busy as I said, it wasn't until after 8:30 tonight that I had a chance to look at what my wife clips for me from the papers I no longer have time to read. Were this not the case, I'd have know of the enclosed clipping I'd like you to return. Read it carefully and you will begin to understand part of what I was trying to tell you of the overall objectives of the present administration and Mitchel et al. Whether you or anyone else agrees with this part of my analysis or not, I think you can see the relevance to the point I was trying to make when I said that in using Jim they had picked as prominent a defendant as they could possibly get who they could expect to have an unfriendly press.

I believe this is a major step in an Americanized effort to make this an American counterpart of Hitler's Germany. No gas chambers, things like that. But an updated fascism they think they can make acceptable.

They've worked out a new trick to help their (bad) boys, like the States' Attorney in Chicago, who was bound to be indicated by any decent grand jury. They arranged a leak in advance to give him the only possible defense, being denied a fair trial by publicity. They'll pull it, too, unless the mans by which they did the trick can be found and exposed. But who prosecutes the prosecutor when both are on the same side and one id the potential defendant?

The point I was trying to make on Alford is credibility if they use him as a witness. Remember, I spent a long, long and disgusting Sunday with him the day before the jury-selection began, and I know something about his "principles", as he then made them clear. Not quite like I read in his statement, either. So, what I was addressing is a possible defense move. And if you want to know how seriously I took this, how clearly I remember it, then you should remember that I did not once go into the courtroom for the jury selection, left and have never returned. And I predicted the loss and why. I knew. Alford and Oser had spelled it out, and not in terms if high principle but in what, considering all circumstances, I'll call utilitarianism.

Best regards,