

3/8/74

Dear Barry,

Sorry neither you nor Maureen were in when I phoned with the suggestions/information that seem to have led to MacKenzie's story on precedents with federal grand-jury reports. What appeared lacked the kickers - the Nixonisti/Mitchellisti political objectives and the fact that these precedents were set by those now protesting.

On the Chicago/Fathers one you might be interested in knowing that among the objectives was hiding the fact that the initial cause of that assault was an FBI informer named O'Neal.

You may recall that long after Hanrahan's Jaworski story did not appear I suggested to you that assuming the kind of blatant whitewash there was in Texas was too unsophisticated.

I hope the absence of Post editorial comment on these new indictments betokens at least uncertainty and what I'd prefer to believe, dissatisfaction.

I am more than dissatisfied and should it interest you, I do have a few chapters and a few verses. In fact, I wrote my analysis of the indictments before the Post came the next morning (re 3/1/74 indictments) and another thereafter, before seeing the full text. I could add but I see no need to subtract.

Today's partial text and stories is multiplication.

All the arithmetic is very bad.

Now that the weather and the gas situation have improved, I do hope you can find time when you are off to come up so we can have a lieisurely chat.

Before Paul saw James Ray I told you, him or both that there is what I think is a good follow-up. I did tell him this again after the story appeared.

For the moment this must be confidential, but only until the few limitations and the necessary explanations can be made.

After the minitrial the Department of Justice, not the state, offered Ray a deal the nature of which precludes the possibility they believe him to have been guilty. I have all the details, and not from counsel.

Ray turned it down, giving high principle, omerta without using the word, as his reason.

It was not his reason. He could not do what they wanted of him in return for turning him loose in England.

And he would not accept England in any event. This part must remain confidential because my source is the only possible one, Ray himself.

England is comprehensible because the extradition treaty was violated. Admitting this provided an out. The Vesco case, by the way, may be precedent on violation of it.

There is to be a pretrial conference in chambers in ^Ashville 3/15. I will not be there. This is despite the fact that the state is going to the ^Supreme Court on cert. We will be moving that this not be in chambers. I suspect the judge wants it private. And will refuse.

Sincerely,