

9/8/73

Dear Maureen,

Neither Barry nor you were in when I phoned yesterday, after speaking to a reporter who had conferred with me prior to being sent to New Orleans. His paper believed the stories about the threats on Nixon there. It is pro-Nixon. They did no story because he found that what I told him before he went there was the case, there never was any serious basis for any of the allegations with regard to Gaudet or the black militants. I did not know what Barry considers relevant to The Watergate, so I thought I'd tell him what I'd been told. Because you were neither in, I discussed it with Claiborne, who was on this story for the Post after I spoke to Chapman.

I would now add to what I initially suggested the possibility if not the probability that federal security agencies were involved in the planning of a public-relations caper. The alternative is that some Nixonian has made a study of the investigation of the JFK assassinations. The parallels are too many and too close to assume all are accidental.

From this I would go a bit farther and suggest haste in the improvisation of the ploy. Otherwise I don't think there would have been as much use of incidents of the past.

This is belief, not fact. I neither have nor will seek factual basis for the belief. There are always threats, some of them may be intended, but in Louisiana the norm is far out for us. I have specific knowledge of other cases where the reality is incredible.

In speaking to Claiborne, I did give him a basis for my being more suspicious than he is.

This morning's story on the Colson-Hunt 7/1/71 conversation interests me much. I have seen only what the earliest edition of the Post and the AP B wire carried. If it is not too much trouble, I'd appreciate a copy of the transcript and the covering memo. My interest is more Hunt than Colson.

I am trying to find as much time as possible for understanding Hunt prior to his testimony. After that I may try to interview him. I haven't decided if I'll try. It is possible he'll refuse. If I do make the effort, it will probably be through his new lawyer, about whom I know nothing. If you (plural) know anything about him and any possible, even remote connections, I'd like to know. Bittman's firm, for example, had represented CIA. Incidentally, the Post story on Bittman leaving the case did not report what I understand, that Cox asked it and because of a possible conflict of interest. If you know the nature of the possible conflict, I'd like to know on the chance it coincides with other information I may have.

Please excuse the typos. Someone who has stopped off is going into town. If he mails this it will save two days.

Sincerely,