

Dear Js, after an early start and about 4,000 words, a brisk walk and a refreshing dip there was Colson. As I said I would, I taped it. Unless you do not and want it I will not keep this tape. Those hardnosed reporters (who are not amoral and unscrupulous) were no match for him. They hardly touched him and never succeeded in stopping his fillibustering or getting him to be responsive. There is only one way to confront a Colson and none of these had the kidney for it. There are risks. But this again shows the way I have used in the past is generally the only one that can succeed. That way was to firmly and explicitly pull him up short, say exactly what he was doing and demand that he stop it and confront the reality, not corrupt a TV appearance into cheap propaganda. There was another basic error, in the common approach. It assumed him to be a relatively honest, responsible and responsive man. The questions are predicated on this. They should have begun by throwing him off with questions he would not likely have anticipated and in areas of his own tenderness, like Hunt and his record. Anyway, they didn't and they delivered a large body of sympathetic opinion to Colson as they gave GL's following comfort and support...After the other shows earlier this week I felt that Colson would clam. Despite his coup on this one, I think he will because the risks are now greater and he has accomplished more than a reasonable man could have hoped to. He again fingered Ehrlichman and Haldeman while again pretending not to. It is possible to believe that his protestation of deathless devotion to the GL may really be designed to let GL and Ehr and Haldeman know that if he is touched, they'll bleed. And in seeming to defend GL and to have no interest in self-defense (his line was that mean didn't incriminate him), he gets across the notion that he was in no way involved. By now Hunt should have ended this in secret, as I believe he will in public. Or, Colson's major interest is Colson. He served it as well today as even he could have hoped to. He served it much better than these reporters should have permitted. But then one can't exclaim "bullshit" on TV, can one? And one can't even seem to be impolite when there is no other way of stopping the unresponsive, articulate fillibusterer. HW 7/1/73