

Dear Jim,

9/26/73

A few things are beginning to clarify a bit in my thinking. I'll not take time for explanations now, but there are some unnoted things in Hunt's testimony we should discuss.

I was absolutely right in what I thought I detected insofar as I can determine without a full transcript. As you know, I have heard nothing on this.

One of the things not adequately covered in the papers is Hunt's prepared statement. Would you please phone Sachs' office, say you are a lawyer interested in the case, that you feel more attention should have been paid to what he said voluntarily, and you would appreciate a copy? I wrote, got no answer, so I'd rather not write immediately....One of the possibilities is that they elected to have no press copies. I don't know. I do know the Times' verbatim doesn't even refer to it.

*Desiring  
for the  
100 con  
nection*

If I am by no means certain that I know the answer about the conflict of interest question that prompted Cox to ask Bittman to retire from the case (the Post edited the reason out, by the way), I think I am onto something. The interest I have had from the first in Bittman and Hogan & Hartson in Agency cases is justified, if you can learn any more. I'd also be interested in Bud, Bill or others know anything about Sachs and how he came to be Bittman's replacement.

*Help to  
Colson,  
against  
Hunt's  
interest*

You will recall there was a time when I sent Bud the message if he wanted some sparks to fly, I had flint and steel? Well, it is now a bit less primitive. I was then confident unreported criminality was involved and provable. To what I then believed, I now have quite a separate criminal charge that I think is not questionable factually and I am fairly confident is also beyond legal question.

*Beatty  
newspaper  
Jan 3  
in Hunt's  
employment  
4/10/73*

I'll be working on this out of context, while my mind is really taken up with other and complicated matters. However, I have marked up what I have in mind for when you are here again, and the markings will bring it all back, I'm sure, should I not remember.

*Edited  
with Hunt  
on CIA &  
domestic  
intelligence*

Because there is no word from Bud, who hasn't even returned the call, I assume he is doing nothing about seeing if he can get a refox of the Hunt transcript. So, with this stuff, as I understand it, all being run through the computer at the library, would you ask Elke if he could take time to retrieve certain and not very many pages?

I have those the New York Times printed yesterday and today. Look some doing to get yesterday's, but I have it and have just begin to read it. The Post used no paragraphs Q and A's. So, I'll not be asking for what is in the Times, unless the time comes when you think I should, if it has what I'm certain it does.

If you got these Times, yesterday's, 9/25, the Q and A ends at the very beginning of Baker's first questioning, with him asking Hunt what support the CIA provided, before Hunt named names (two as I remember, neither new).

One matter nobody seemed interested in clearing up is that \$30,000 for income replacement for him and wife in the October accounting. Asked, he said he had no knowledge of it. Now he accounted for her estate, which shows nothing like this. So, what happened to that \$30,000?

Times Q and A 9/26 ends with Hunt's answer to Inoye on Segretti, that he and Liddy were to monitor and help him, if the later edition carried more.

Later, I've finished what the Post & Times used, sometimes skimming where I was sure of my recollection. Hunt lied, sometimes not cleverly, twice getting caught. Why should he lie in his circumstances? If it was from ego, it is a weak ego that can be fortified by such very weak lies. Plus a couple of big lies, I'm sure. ...I find this much less an attack on Colson than touted, not an attack at all and probably a downplay of what he could have said. I also have reason to believe he did Colson a big favor, so another area of wonder...I do not think he was confused when Sachs said he was and when he pretended to be, either. He showed no signs of uncertainty and many more signs of being fully alert and comprehending fully than I'd expected. He may be very unhappy, but his mind has not slipped. And they all threw cream puff. I wonder why? HW 9/26/73