

Sirica- He ain't neither all that bad.

Rugaber's 2/3/73 story discloses what I do not recall in other reporting, that all the evidence before the grand jury was not under oath and, if I read it correctly, that of Maurice Stans wasn't. Here is something worthy of loud outcry, editorial included, but it is buried in the middle of the jump. And not reported at all elsewhere. It is bad enough that the right questions weren't ask, but "testimony" not under oath? T'ain't testimony. None of this alters the impropriety of some of his conduct. He is a judge, no more. He is not the prosecutor (in this casethere is none!). What he has done is expose the government not the White House. I didn't realize he is 69. Guess he won't join Burger at al. Nor does this mean that if he decided to ask questions, he asked all the necessary and obvious ones that it might be expected he'd know from his own experience. I can only wonder what else might be buried in those transcripts. Or if Ervin gets his investigation, he'll have the ~~start~~ ~~start~~ with the understanding and will have the guts. He makes good noises, but he also can stop short and has. Perhaps Sirica's sounding off can help there. But I never dreamed there would be so raw a thing as "absentee" grand-jury "testimony". When it is from Stans, I guess that says enough about who was in charge. HW 2/5/73

FEB 8 1973 73

Larry-later 2/6/73 The Chitrib Siddon story and the AP and H UPI wire copy, all 2/2, all contained details on WG I'd not seen reported elsewhere. Thanks. If the prosecutor thought the judge was serious, it took lots of brass or lots of pressure not to call the witnesses the judge asked be called. With a serious judge it could have meant risking exposure of the careful covering-up and the gross inadequacy of the grand-jury "investigation", as reflected in the gross inadequacy of the indictment. A law student could have done a much better job of handling the grand jury, if there was serious intent. I'm still not persuaded that this judge was entirely on the up-and-up, and one clue to this in in what you've sent, that he went out of his way to say he was not criticizing the prosecutor-the man who mishandled the grand jury and the indictments. Thanks HW 2/6/73

Superficially, what Gunning says (ltr to NYTimes 1/25) is the way it is. However, the judge bestows the sentence not the prosecutor (who can recommend and may). One of the signs we may have is the sentences, and of those who coped pleas and those who didn't compared. If the judge really means what he has been saying, the sentences with be severe. We'll then have to wait and see if there is a pardon, which would then raise more questions about the judge, who would be covered, with harsh ~~sentences~~ sentences and fast pardons, and still not look like he is part of the deal. With all the Cubans known violators of federal law, Neutrality Act at the very least, the pre-sentencing investigation will also have to be some kind of deal...Nobody has yet asked why McC wasn't charged separately with violation Communications Act. Sirica has to know of this, too. Didn't peep, tho. HW 2/7/73

our 2/5 WG:Hunt/Buckley. Your description of how he came thru is so typical of the "intellectuals" of the radiright (Agnewing). They are all more than certain they alone hold the real truth, they alone understand. I think he has more than delusions of grandeur about himself: a bit of paranoia with it. If the "New Frontier" hadn't backed out (on the word JFK never gave, that is) he'd have pulled it off. See is his book doesn't say this. He was right on WG, recommending against, but not saying to whom, note), right on Bay Pigs (all New Frontier fault). Everybody is always doing him in. Did you see Braden'd column on him? Post didn't carry, which is hard to understand...TV has shown us your weather. Some rain for those hills. It has come to us and I hope, passed. We had flood warnings, but we're so situated and they can't flood us and we can't slide like you in. Glad you didn't!...If no Marboro outlet there, don't bother looking for copies F-U. Marboro has only remainders of which I know and I know of no case of subcontracting other than to Giant, D.C. Cesar finally got recommendation NYU lawyer, wrote me about it, (leaving out the address!) I'd like to read Hunt's civil-suit deposition and will try. HW 2/7/73

FEB 8 1973 73

Your 2/5 actually 7
git here a.m. 2/7.
Note on Evans-Nova
1/29 asks was f'not
included in Post
version. Yes. Holle
ing suit and filing
not the same. Col-
son got his letter
printed and all the
other coverage in
which he appears
wrong. This crumb
crumbles too much
(aka protesteth)
I think he must be
so deeply in he has
to be daring. He is
responsible for Hunt
in W.H. when even th
W.H.dog house should
have been denied. If
no more, this is too
much and I suspect
more. HW 2/7/73