

3/3/71

Dear Sylvia,

I pay you the dubious complement of telling you that lately my correspondence has been when my mind isn't fit for anything else. I've just returned from a remarkably productive trip to Tennessee, with all but a single witness on tape and not one not first-class in terms of credibility or content of information. I wish I could tell you all of it. And I had a marvelous, unanticipated fight with the assistant district attorneys to whom ~~it~~ I'd been sent by the clerk of the court. Orwell has lived there since Crump took the power he hasn't yet surrendered, dead as he has been since 1954. The refused to let me see the public evidence or duplicates of those exhibits that are pictures, on the doublegoodspeakducktalk basis that the dead judge's pre-conviction prohibition against publicity is still in effect! Wow! Looking at evidence is "publicity"? So I asked them about the DA going all around the state, including in particular to all bar meetings, talking about the case scheduled for hearing last Friday (and showing pictures of King, much as a meatcutter, discussing non-existent evidence and showing slides of the autopsy, saying, "please don't anyone take pictures because I oughtn't be doing this". They denied it. I asked them to make a wager on the spot and said I'd play it back in an hour (I could have done it easily in 20 minutes, my tape and recorder being but three blocks away). So they argued, and then they shifted to claiming this was the DA's personal property! I asked if that came from being the heir or the prosecutor. These people make the WC look saintly.

In any event, this is the most overwhelming thing yet, and everybody was wonderful. Not a single black consider's Ray guilty, and none had a harsh word for him. They have had too much experience with justice. And the press is more tightly controlled there than anywhere I've been. Both papers are Scripps-Howard, each owns the full electronic panoply, with one TV station alone having 8 ~~exist~~ satellites to smother everything.

To give you a sample: Saturday morning I told a cabbie I was looking for another who I named. I was gone from the hotel all day. When I returned I was told that someone who identified himself only as a "witness" had been calling me all day. While on his job, of course, he couldn't leave a number. I worked until late that night. Early the next morning I got a call from the cabbie. I asked him how soon I could see him. He said as soon as the elevator could take him up! In Crumpland, no less.

Our problem is not getting Ray acquitted. That we can do a dozen times over. It is getting him into court, especially with what I now have on all elements of government. My incomplete work is so complete I can show the FBI on the Ray trail two weeks before it was acknowledged, where the shots came from, witnesses to the killing (not produced), five at least police or firemen, proof of the whereabouts of the accused, of the official withholding of evidence, of perjury and its subornation, the whole schmeer.

As usual, your comment on Epstein is marvellously put and so perceptive. My friend at the Post was coming up to discuss it with me Sunday but he was told today he is to be hospitalized and now can't for a while. ...You misunderstood me on Paul. He didn't go for Epstein, not to my recollection. I must have misled you somehow, but I now have no recollection of what I said. While we agree on his melody, we do disagree on him. Only time will tell....Glad to know of the Second Epstein. Corrected to reporter, and of your role....Sorry I forgot to send PW review. Enclosed....You may recall my telling you that I knew Shaw and Cobb perjured themselves, other than as JG charged. I had a pretty fair case. Today I got a statement from the second supporting witness. I can't tell you why, but I can tell you that he did. And it is on his alibi. Cobb is the same guy who provided the handwriting expert, the one who also served CIA/FBI Maheu and I think CIA Rosselli recently in the Maheu suit against Howard Hughes. Best regards,

1 March 1971

Dear Harold,

Thank you for the recent envelope of various correspondence you sent me. I was hoping that it would include a copy of the Publishers Weekly review of your book FRAME-UP but it is understandable that you forgot it with all the many matters on your mind.

As you requested, I am returning herewith the copy of your letter to Hech on Epstein and the Black Panthers. Or, more accurately, your letters to Hoch, totalling some 12 pages. I agree with virtually everything you have said about the article, which I regard as the dirtiest and most obscene snow-job yet written by Epstein, one which demonstrates his steady progression from the merely super-cautious liberal eager to make his mark on the liberal-intellectual scene by attacking the Establishment without giving serious offense...to the opportunist who dishonestly made a deserved expose of Garrison the occasion for an implicit vindication of the WR...to the now outright whore for the J. Edgar Heevers and John Mitchells and their moral accomplice in what is indisputably tantamount to racist/fascist genocide, in which the "numbers" as such are irrelevant and immaterial.

I can only infer, from your letters, that Hech swallowed this foul and nauseating brew and found it good...which does not surprise me. He is, after all, Epstein's soul-brother, as his malen paper revealed. I am only surprised that you continue to think that there is something there to salvage. I have been wrong about many people, so I cannot reproach you for persisting to have hope for Hech, even when he betrays his own inner rot by his readiness to buy the Epstein filth. I fear that sooner or later you will come to realize that Hech is incapable of redeeming himself, because he is basically the very same where as Epstein.

By the way, there were two Ed Epsteins at Cernell, one who was very flamboyant and travelled to Africa and is probably the same as the one who was trying to raise money to go to Alaska.

Another correction: On the second page of your long letter to Hech, where you give a most generous characterization of my work (for which I thank you), you credit me undeservedly for the notes in INQUEST. I did not "do" those notes, I merely checked them against the 26 volumes for accuracy, and I indexed the book.

About the court papers in CA 2569-70---I am grateful for your offer but for the moment do not put me on the forwarding lists.

I caught Mitchell's interview and I fully agree with your interpretation of the anachronism--that the material was spoon-fed to Epstein by the DJ. I am also returning herewith your letter to Deris Browa, as I do not have an address for "GRS" (Schoener, I presume).

I am really looking forward to receiving your book on or about 3/24/71. I've sent an order and check. Send me the PW review if you get a chance.

All the very best,

*Sylvia*