

Times L

Dear Jim,

12/6/74

DEC 6 1974

Frates' calling of Colson as a defense witness for Ehrlichman ought not be considered an act of stupidity or of desparation because Colson and Ehrlichman hated each other. He could have had in mind reasons that serve Colson's interest while at the same time being adverse to that of other defendants, about whom Ehrlichman cares naught.

I haven't gone out for the Post yet but I believe it not likely that the reporters would find new in the questioning that Frates may have considered important in his cause.

So, if there is any difference between the Times' and the Post's coverage I'd appreciate a copy of the Times'

My own view is and has been that Colson dumped his blame on almost everything on Ehrlichman. This does not exculpate Ehrlichman. But Ehrlichman may see it otherwise.

I have no reason not to believe that except for when he did jobs like the Fil^leding one Hunt was working for Colson, not for Ehrlichman.

The motives of these people can be quite complex. However, there is no way such moves won't benefit the prosecution. *HW*