

After last night's evening TV news established that the staff summary of Hunt's interviews had been given to the major media, my doubts about the committee were increased. There was no need for this p.r. stunt if the committee had serious interests only. I decided to see what the Post carried this a.m. and then make a note of my own estimate, in advance, as a means of testing my own understanding. Pincus's editorial article today is the first I recall casting any doubt on the committee's real purposes. If Pincus falls far short of the actuality and makes factual errors and if he thinks or seems to say they are mere bumbler, he did criticize. He appears unaware of the fact that some of the questions he says need answer are answered in the committee's record but are downplayed in the hearings.

What I believe is predicated on the hope if not belief that Hunt is still in contact with reality, that his primary desire is self-justification and self-protection, that he is galled with a desire for vengeance, that his fascist beliefs are as they were, and that he hopes to survive by continuing to live as a minimum.

He will exculpate Nixon to the degree he can. He will not disclose their earlier connections (here I am less certain and much will depend on the committee's interest), he will really go for Colson (regarding him as a doublecrosser who put his selfish interest against the course of honor), He will talk fairly freely about the known jobs, with an effort to justify them. He may talk about others that certainly were pulled and of which he was part. He may well seek to use this forum to go after compypms like the Kennedys and that administration. His anti-CIA focus will be against the "liberals" in it and changes in policy as he thinks he sees them. He will not tell all that was in his White House stuff and he will not indicate the significance of some of it. He will portray himself as against the WG but loyal, doing his duty. He will be loyal to his Cubanos and his past. He may seek to guff "iffy and perhaps some CREEPs. He will claim that the blackmail was not that but was defense and humanitarianism oriented, government obligation, and that most of it went to lawyers and those kinds of costs. He will say he took the rap out of loyalty/patriotism, from principle, and that he was leaned on to do this and use his influence on the Cubans to ditto. I think this also sets the tone I expect.

What is more important is what he will be asked and how. I believe the committee despite all that has happened will continue its whitewashing, particularly of Nixon but not of his aides like Colson. Here a question of simple competence will enter. That they have able lawyers does not mean these men have allowed themselves to contemplate what really happened.