

LF- NBC's Carl Stein had a piece tonight on the charge by Democrats' counsel in the WG case that the prosecution would allege that the defendants were engaged in blackmail on their own and not in political espionage. The prosecution did not deny it. I guess we can expect almost anything from now on in. Cooking this kind of thing up is pretty raw, with the evidence already in. For one thing, it would seem to require a couple of fraud charges and I think others that, naturally, neither the administration nor the Creeps nor the RNC, will ~~not~~ consider filing. The prosecutor said he would go into the financing a little. I rather suspect very little, for only \$1,700 is alleged to have changed hands, according to the indictment, which everybody forgets. However, I have a special point in writing on such incomplete information, for I don't want to forget. Why does not some Chicago reporter take this in-court statement at face value. It is in effect, confirmed by the prosecution. Why not then ask the Chicago custodian of that \$10,000 if ~~they were~~ ^{it is} being withheld because ~~that~~ ^{it is} ~~was~~ the yield of criminal endeavor. I would not say blackmail to begin with, but leave it to him to address a broader question. Blackmail can be specified later. He'll say not to this, naturally, whether or not he does to the broader question. I don't think the reasons I've seen in the papers make sense except if there is a suspicion of foul play. What I'm really driving at is that this may be a roundabout way of asking if your officials have reason to suspect the \$10,000 is Creep-ing capitalism. I wish I thought your man would push on this money. If there was any reason to believe that either Hunt had not declared all income, there has been plenty of time to resolve the question or decide what I'd believe to be the case anyway, that it is not possible to prove. There is, of course, still another possibility, that Hunt knocked down on the CIA. Bear in mind what has not been mentioned anywhere, if the official story is serious, then it can't relate to WG money Hunt latched onto in calendar 1972. He has two months and ten days in which to declare that. There remains also the possibility that Hunt is not her ~~his~~ heir or administrator, and that also would be interesting. My own hunch is that whatever the reason is, the real reason in holding all back is to hide it until after the trial. Or, that it reflects upon Hunt. HW 1/5/73