

Epstein - Panthers - DJ

Two interesting coincidences this morning on Epstein's New Yorker article on the Black Panthers: an apologetic editorial in the Washington Post praising him and his careful research and an unintended slip by John Mitchell rather clearly indicating the possibility that Epstein had been fed this stuff by Justice.

Mitchell had taped what CBS used as a threepinstalment series on the a.m. TV news. The third was this morning. The ~~xxx~~ taping was four days ago, the day before the first airing.

Now the issue of the New Yorker is dated 2/13. The Washington Post carried a fairly long story reporting it on that day. However, after appearance of the news stories, presumably not in the Post alone, after appearance of the magazine, when Mitchell was asked a question about Ralph Abernathy and others saying that there was a police campaign against blacks, Mitchell's reply, as I wrote it down as soon as it was aired, was:

This current study that is being ~~xxx~~ made by somebody who's ~~making~~ doing a magazine article is well worth looking at."

Several questions suggest themselves immediately, assuming Mitchell is not an idiot but an articulate man who says what he means.

This length of time after publication is not "thus current study that is being made." This would indicate that Mitchell's knowledge is of an earlier date, in turn suggesting departmental involvement in the preparation.

So long after publication is not reflected in "who's doing a magazine piece". It was, by then, long since done.

It thus seems that Mitchell was aware of what Epstein was doing but hadn't seen it, else he'd have known it was out, and would not have said "current study that is being made" or "is doing a magazine piece" so long after it is done.

His opinion that it "is well worth looking at", combined with the foregoing, can be taken as indication of Mitchell's knowledge from inside the department of the nature and content of the ~~article~~.

If Epstein did all that work by himself -while teaching - did all that research indicating by the reporting of the New Yorker piece, it would be a departure from his past, which is not conspicuous for diligent, independent research and digging.