

Harold Weisberg  
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701  
2/5/74

Dear Mr. Hunt,

Those of us who are not lawyers are sometimes right in what we want lawyer to do. Of course, we also err. Today's reporting of your yesterday's appeal deals with that about which I wrote Mr. Sachs some months ago. He replied that he had shown you my letter.

You may not need precedent to argue official perjury and the destruction of evidence. However, if you do, I can provide both, both involving the Department of Justice, plus the subornation of perjury plus the deception of the court (particularly Sirica) and the failure of the Department of Justice to respond when charges were addressed to it. Aside from this, assorted dubious tricks.

There is also precedent in Sirica's departing from the role of a judge in a civil suit I filed. It is not exceptional for him to be a partisan rather than a judge. Your arguments along this line are obvious. My contemporaneous notes express surprise that the press made no comment on the role in which he cast himself. I then noted it should be grounds for reversal.

As I think I told you through Mr. Sachs, I am writing on these matters.

It is probably only coincidence that your letter and Bob Woodward's review of Tad Szulc's propoganda appear in the same issue of the Post, Sunday's.

Szulc strikes me as a journalistic Sirica. So you can understand my belief and its origins, I explain.

My first questions came from his earliest Watergate reporting. They compelled interest because they were less than completely honest. This is also true of his later accounts of these stories and their imputed significance. By the time I read his Sunday Times piece it was apparent that he served a master other than the Times. At least an interest, one hardly hidden. So, I obtained a copy of his Bay of Pigs book and from my knowledge of that matter it was again apparent that he had a dedication to other than journalistic honesty. This turned out to be true of his book on the Dominican affair as even more it is of his book supposedly on you.

I have a xerox of what I have reason to believe are the galleys of your Give Us This Day that he obtained. The annotations can settle the question if it means anything to you. I then thought it unlikely that Arlington House had thrown away subsidiary rights. I therefore assumed the publisher did not supply the proofs. Alternatives are fairly obvious. The most obvious possibility appears to have fed him for the Times piece, too.

So, for my writing I have an interest in Szulc. Were I in your position, aside from having known him in the past I would have made it my business to learn more about him. If you have and if you feel you can let me know, I would appreciate it. If you feel this would not be against your interest but would prefer disassociation, I will respect that. If there is anything you want kept in confidence, please make it clear so I can preserve confidence. This can be important because the time will come when I will seek an interview with him. He may not agree, but I will ask.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. My opinion of Woodward's "review" should be obvious.