

7/11/71

Dear Jim,

I'll probably see you tomorrow with this. As I wrote Bud, I'll be in then. I did not make my inquiry clear or you(pl) did not understand it. My inquiry re Chappaquidick is limited to this: in that story, if there is a character (say a sheriff) who could be described in ellipsis as a constable, who is he, what is the essence of his testimony, if any, and is he from the country in which Hynannis is?

The Duncan was obvious in the sense you suggest, perhaps too obvious for something as sophisticated as this. But even in this Shakespearian sense (not the only one we've explored with fantastic consequences), there are multiple possibilities. It can be an allusion to MLK, not just JFK.

Your Ogden Nash suggestion is a very good one. We have done much checking with magister, and its archaic meanings are rēah, including in a Chap. sense, one of the again multiple. It is being checked through the volumes of Oxford, has been through other unabridged, as have many of the words. We have the same problem with Lec in Irving's bedroom, and the possibilities that could make sense out of it that have occurred are simply inaccurate. However, one of the things I do not know is whether there were other lees or real people named Inving. The added thing may be that Lec was in an Irving bedroom the night before he was blamed with the assassination. Which can mean immediately before framing or immediately before assassination.

On N.O.: I expect official copies of the affidavit. If you-all would like to copy, I'll lend it. There are 113 pages. Perhaps you'll be satisfied with the newspaper version, which I presume you are getting. If so, you can always borrow my copy for making your own. I have not been sent copies of the news stories, and these would interest me, the stories as distinguished from the verbatim affidavits, of which I have only parts II and III from the S-I and the contractions from the T-P of 7/3 and 7/4 to date. Others may be in the mail but not yet here. Because I think there is much more than here shows and at some time would welcome a discussion of it with you(all), I do want to know everything and keep up with everything. Thus, the news stories do interest me and I'd appreciate copies of them as soon as possible. They can say what the affidavits do not. One of the things that to me seems conspicuous is that DJ had gone pretty far to make it impossible to a) bring this case to trial or b) get a conviction if they do. I would right now bet that under any fair interpretation, they have made the selection of an impartial jury impossible. A subtlety would be to force the case out of N.O., where it would be impossible to convict Jim with an assigned confession witnessed by all the disciples. And with the Pope as notary. Other possibilities. Another of my reasons for wanting to know all, to try and open out. I think, also, that the ABA's standards designate releasing this stuff 100% wrong and entirely unnecessary and 100% prejudicial. As far as I've had a chance to read them.

You misinterpret the local law. The machines are there legal. The payoff on them is not. But there are questions along this line, like why pay him off on what is outside his parish, why pay his flunky more, or even anything, if he is in the bag? I've always had questions about Soule and the vice squad, particularly another and Frey because of his role in the Hagerty thing. Gervais I can figure only in life at stake or enough to keep him in jail permanently. Even the unfriendlyes in the press agree on the latter. I haven't seen and would like the NYTimes story on reaction. In fact, all I have is their first story by Reed and one saying JG was making his own charges.

On the text of the black joke, I have loaned my last copy out and have no copying paper. I am not making general distribution, have raised with only those who may be able to address particular aspects. Keep it quiet, very quiet, and above all away from your nuts. And, at least temporarily, out of your files. I am willing to discuss with you, Bob, Bud, Bill