NYTimes 1/15/73, Hersh second article HW 1/29/73

Unless there is deliberate intent to mislead, the opening seems to eliminate Hunt as the source of the report the Miami defendants would be adequately taken care of. Other accounts have Hunt doing the caring and that with great stinginess, given the money around.

My views on the reasons for Rothblatt's refusal to be part of a guilty plea are in no way changed, not reduced and actually strengthened, as I see it, by courtroom developments, including what amounts to no defense at all today, with a TV news account having McC's mouthpiece running through seven witnesses in about an hour. This would include any cross, so there was no cross or nothing to cross.

Hersh should know better than to say a plea changes makes "little legal sense" because the sentence would be virtually the same either way. The difference is that with a plea copped, there is no reversal and these mouths stay thosed. The extent of sentence is not the issue. There is a legal difference in the possibility of reversal, and there is basis, as had by then been amply indicated.

That Hunt would cop a plea because of emotional stress is not credible. This and other accounts, attributed openly to Bittman is without sense. He swaps the possibility of freedom for a few uncomfortable days less uuncomfortable? He is better for his kids in jail right away rather than maybe not at all or at least much later?

There must be a typo in Hersh's close, that with only two defendants there would not be less aired. It has to be the opposite. So is his conclusions that it was not clear whether Silbert would call the witnesses who had been announced for with the separation of Hunt, before it was announced, he had already cut down by the essence of the case, the part around Segretti.

This is a unique case in which even the "good" reporting rabges from not good to very bad. The real story has not been told, even where it has been gone into, as with who Hunt is, how the White House was involved.

I'll await reporting of today's ke sham before commenting at length, but two things shrick for comment I do not expect: Sirica's saying that this jury could get what the prosecution did not offer; and Silbert's last-minute exculpation of so many. Klein-dienst's comment on his being a enocrat now has point. Like JBConnally!