

Alch's testimony of 5/23/73

On hearing and seeing it I formed certain impressions that were troubling so, tonight, I took part of it in again as it was repeated on Public TV. My suspicions and apprehensions are strengthened.

If Alch's exact words are stripped of their characterizations, descriptions, interpretations and other diversions, they almost without exception support what McCord testified to and often where they do not it is because Alch said other than McCord did.

Alch blew the "national security" whistle where McCord did not. And how interesting it is that before Alch repped McCord, McCord had a call from Chile

Alch confirmed McCord, that Bittman asked about McCord's acceptance of executive clemency, which is precisely what McCord said.

Alch contradicted himself on the CIA defense.

Caulfield and Ulasevich actually confirmed McCord in such detail that it amounts to work-for-word. Where McCord said they told him the offer was from the President, Caulfield said that while he didn't say the President, he was certain this was the case and that the offer had to be from the President.

U. said he was certain there was a tap on McCord's phone, if only by McCord. It is clear he and C expected another tap and they also so specified. These are pros. They have a basis for an opinion.

As I noted in this evening's letter to Herb Brubaker, Alch deliverately misstated what McCord had said about tampering with McCord's CIA records and then, vehemently, denied what McCord didn't say.

It was a long, verbose piece of lawyers' acting. Whether the committee is conned by it, how they react to it tomorrow, will tell much about what it will do of what it is possible to do. They can take Alch apart if they have the wit and guts.

Were it not for the tragedy of it, it would be funny to consider that the one defense Alch said would work didn't, wasn't even accepted. Yet he had refused to attempt the credible defense McCord had asked, exactly the same thing said by the two dicks, both of whom admitted doing what they knew was wrong, each giving a reason that amounts to and in the case of Caulfield was stated as to help the President.

Alch's testimony leaves no doubt that McCord did not at a late date make up a fear of what could happen, violence, etc., and today's Jack Anderson column, with sources other than (and anti-)McCord gives chapter and verse, quoting McCord's source's memos. Anderson says the DJ was aparnoid on this and McCord was backgrounded by DJ. Sp, he faithfully repeated what he had been told and his reaction to it is predictable, ~~z~~ exactly what he said it is.

There was a very considerable amount that Alch went into that was not necessary to his alleged self-defense purpose, most of this was designedly prejudicial, and on the chance the record will be used, I think it is good that he was entirely uninterrupted. All those lawyers had to know much was irrelevant.

The question I now have is who does Alch now represent, did he have another client than McCord before- why did he overdo it so much. I think his excesses are out-of-character. He is too good a lawyer for some of the stuff he pulled, even if he gets away with it now. I think he is pretty uptight. I don't know why. It is not because McCord defamed him. There was defamation, but it was of others, not Alch, unless there was testimony I do not recall. The allegation of pressure is really nothing, because whatever the trust, other lawyers are used to this and attribute it to the client's lack of understanding and the lawyer's determination to follow the course best suited to the client's needs.

HW 5/23/73