

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 threeinstalment 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 ~~made~~ 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.

Dear Mr. Austin, Epstein is one of the laziest, get-me-ahead bastards ever, conspicuous for not doing his own work. For example, the only thing scholarly in his first books is the notes, and he couldn't do them, Sylvia Meagher did. He used a cheap formula of interviewing those with personal interests, put it in soft language, saying at the same time the most scurrilous things about people, and because he had a copout formula that assumed Oswald's guilt, he gave the Eastern intellectual finks their out and they hailed him a scholar and made him rich. His New Orleans book didn't begin to make the case that can be against Garrison, shows other signs of second-handedness (as it needless and libellous error about me), and can't be the result of the very brief time he was there: something like two days. There is a long lead mia culpa editorial in the Wash Post this a.m. If it was not already set for this to be blwon into a bad book, that provides enough advance puffery for it to swing such a deal. And the context, of course, is that it is simply not true that the goods good police ever in any way abuse the bad, bad, bad, blacks. BW