

later 2/21/71

Dear Paul,

I've had a phone call from a young friend in New York about other matters. He also mentioned a NY Post story on the taping of a Frost show in which Epstein and Garry appeared, with Frost siding with Epstein. It seems, from this young man's version of the Post story, that again the issue was restricted to the false one of numbers, not to the central questions of whether or not there is repressive action against blacks or dissidents or to whether or not, if there is repression, it is of federal support or inspiration.

If I am not mistaken, Garry is in the middle of a rather trying and months-long jury selection in the Seale case in New Haven, hence I'd suggest he did not and could not prepare for this appearance and by its very nature, had to have been at a tactical disadvantage by being on the defensive.

However, one thing this young friend reported sticks in my mind and bears heavily, my way, on things I had earlier written. Garry asked Epstein if he had interviewed the former San Francisco federal attorney, the black one I mentioned, named Poole. This followed an exchange in which Garry had cited what Poole said on leaving that office (I'm not now certain if Nixon fired him or he quit). Epstein said, as he does in this article, that all such statements flow from Garry's error, which is false.

However, need I make a bigger point of Epstein, doing this enormous research pretended as original, with all those lengthy citations of what happened all over California, and especially under Poole's jurisdiction, and not attempting to interview him? Could anything bear more on Epstein's one-sided purposes? Would you have interviewed all those in California Epstein presents as interviewed in his own impartial investigation (restructuring himself to the implication, never the statement), without interviewed the local federal attorney who had sounded off on precisely this subject, whichever way he sounded off? Now remember, this is not a case where there had to be a whirlwind trip of a day or two. His California citations are a large part of his piece. So, whether or not he was there, how in terms of honesty of intent could one accept his failure to quote Poole, whether from the records made available or in personal investigation?

The fact that Poole was totally ignored strongly suggests that he was not in what was presented to Epstein, for Epstein doesn't even argue against whatever he said. My recollection of what Poole said is not that it had to do with numbers but that it had to do with federal policy.

I don't know when the Frost show will be aired.

And aside from whether or not Frost was partisan, he has on his show has a not unfamiliar attitude on political assassinations. For example, they aired a number of people on several, saying there was no conspiracy, and refused any opportunity to present the other side. They scheduled Kaiser, who did a rather careful and deeply disturbing book on the RFK assassination (and I will show you what I have obtained since then that I am certain will disturb you about the trial), and then cancelled him. It is something like the paper that is overup and then selects on a political basis. Only, they are never overup. They select and they change their minds about a subject or a person or an approach or what a book says.

Sincerely,