

7/16/71

Dear Lou,

On the assumption that the timing of what was released by whom may have legal significance, I have copies of what was put on the wire by both AP and UPI. I have the DJ release 6/30, "immediate release". I've not been able to go over today's mail, which includes this UPI material and another batch of the N.O. and other stories sent by a friend, so I do not know what they disclose.

I have asked the opinions of several trusted and mature reporter friends. They agree that there may well be more involved than Jim's explanation, getting him. Not that it is not a factor, but that it is part of more. It is about this that I write in haste.

Of all the prominent people against whom charges might be brought, few ~~xxx~~ can be anticipated to have the press as solidly opposed to them as Jim. Thus, if objectives over and above getting Jim are involved, aside from getting at least at him, he is an ideal selection from the government's point of view.

With Jim having been sick as long as he has been, I think it possible that what he might otherwise have noted may have escaped his attention. This includes an organized effort by Justice to rewrite basic law, basic Constitutional protections, by seeking judicial rewriting of the law and Constitution.

There is one means by which this can be seen pretty clearly. That is in examination of Mitchell's public statements. Yesterday's, in the London American Bar Association meeting, is a fine example, one of too many. I do think that aside from other values, such as understanding, having this thoroughly researched, as a law student can do, may be helpful in defense, in court. My clippings are incomplete, no more than a guide, and they do not include some of the better sources, like the New York Times. I think that were a law student to ask for copies of all of Mitchell's speeches for a study he is making, the press office of the Department would gladly provide the texts.

Another is a more subtle political context, part of an unreported "Southern strategy". I believe I have made reference before to the rather large number of trips Agnew has made to New Orleans alone, more than the yearning for his Greek pal could explain. His speeches are many, consistent, and close to fascist, some printed in book form (by your local liberal, Hodding Carter, I believe). What else he has been doing while there, with whom he has been meeting, and his other activities in the south might also be explored, as by a political science major. I think this will yield an added understanding, a different perspective of the same picture.

When vengeance is a clear motive, we are inclined to look no further. I think Jim should. The broader objectives I suggest are entirely consistent with the purposes served by all the political assassinations. I think Jim will understand what I am suggesting readily if you can find a time when he is not feeling too ill and is not too busy to think about it for a few moments.

Of the things that still perplex me about this, perhaps, when you have time, you may be able to provide the answer. From what I have read of the affidavits, it seems pretty clear that Jim was dragged in belatedly, so belatedly that they committed what I regard as a serious legal error, perhaps in itself exculpatory. This was done in such haste that even Pershing showed it when he went to Jim's home, staying only about 10 minutes. There had to be night-long work to have the affidavits ready for first thing the following morning, with the result of Pershing's last-minute operation included in the entire thing. Why this great rush? Why, for example, not hold off for a day and not have all this nighttime work and the rush that can always lead to error? When you can find time, I'd like to know what you can tell me, about this and anything else. Sincerely,