

OCT 1 1973

Dear Jim,

This has been a broken-up day. I had to miss the pm. of the hearings from a little over a half-hour after they started until a little more than an hour before they ended. If I'm not to fall asleep looking at the reruns, I should try to take a nap because I began writing about 4:30 a.m. With some other things that came by mail, I've had a mind divided between the hearings and something on the Ray case.

If you noticed - and Cesar did not - have you any evaluation of Hunt's attitude toward the CIA as he reflected one today? I formed several impressions on that. I also believe he is lying, that some of it transcends what can reasonably be attributed to his crazy views.

At the end of the morning session, Gangbuster (aka Baker) charged in and into the CIA part. He backed off, not Hunt. Hunt blurted out that he is satisfied it has always been in domestic intelligence and there is a law against it (two separate occasions of I think at least three). This, by the way, is not within the committee's purview, so I expect nothing of the executive sessions because I think Weicher and the Dems will back off when they think it through. However, there could have been developments I didn't catch.

In addition to his state of mind about the CIA, if you caught what I think I did, his state of mind per se would interest me. He may well have been tired, but I am satisfied that where he seemed to be confused, it was because of the nature of the answer he knew he should give and didn't want to.

When Baker joins Gurney in pretending that Baldwin could have been a double-agent, the prospects are for something really nutty, if he means it. He is no nut, so if he pulls a nutty thing, I am right in my view about what he has been up to and that it took me a little time to tumble to, his role as GOP/Nixonian protector in all of this. That is the only way he can run and have any support. He is doing it, cleverly. As a lawyer he has to know of several things that disprove entirely. McCord article sets some forth without intending. The stuff that nobody wanted. Great evidence. For ten cents plain in a phone booth it would have been all over. Not that it should not have been once he started talking to the FBI. (Hunt's lying on the arrest was to sooth his own ego.) Baldwin could have identified or led to Liddy and Hunt-and didn't. No double agent would have missed this.

Thompson, understandably, is in on the deal with Baker, from his questions.

I also got the impression that Hunt is still "loyal" not only as a matter of belief but because he expects something yet or has a deal.

The questioning was terrible, the leads he threw out were ignored. He was, for the most part, cool and collected. But infrequently they hit a chord but the legal ears were not tuned in. So, they didn't follow up.

It was easy to figure Morton Jackson as a former CIA. But why did Hunt go to Mexico with him, and with this in the papers, why did they not ask? And if Jackson gave him the names of law firms from which to choose, a CIA one was a natural. Weicher has something in mind wondering what Pittman did for all that moola. I've long been wondering, but felt he might be bagmaning. ...Times for today is being saved for me. HW 9/25/73