

Watergate: Indictment, Sirica, Coverage, CA appeal HW 1/19/73

I can only hope that Judge Bazelon learned something about government policy in such matters by sitting on my appeal in the spectro suit!

The Post does not go into the exact words exchanged in the CA hearing yesterday. The New York Times uses UPI copy. It quotes Bazelon in exactly the sense I have criticized both judge and prosecution, when the prosecutor said he wanted to allege blackmail as the motive, Bazelon asked, "Why didn't you indict them for it?" This is obvious, as it is with all the things not in the indictment into which Sirica said with some vigor and considerable press that he wanted "exposed".

But if any newspaper or wire service raised any questions about exceeding the indictment or what in this case can't possibly be the motive or consulted any quotable authorities, I am unaware of it.

Moreover, in earlier accounts, the attempt at blackmail was attributed to Hunt alone, and he is out of the case. Silbert did not have to acquiesce (only that?) in the plea-copping. Nor did the judge. What relevance in the case against McCord and Liddy can there be against over Hunt's moonlighting in blackmail, if he did?

The UPI quoting of Silbert has him giving blackmail as the only motive, when this can't possibly be the case. Or, whatever his past and politics, he is lying to protect the administration, Nixon and the Creeps. ("What else would a wiretapped be interested in?")