

This is not by any means the end of Buckley's influence upon and connection with Watergate figures, central characters who are dedicated authoritarians and some of whose Watergate-like activities preceeded that single criminal event.

There are others and they trace from the Buckley estate at Sharon, Connecticut right to the office of E. Howard Hunt and from there in other spiderwebbed, authoritarian and Watergate directions.

And to covering up on The Watergate itself.

(Ref to caddy)

B Is for Buckley, Bill and Bull.

Hunt has a spook pal who didn't blab.

He, too, is in Who's Who.

Only what has come to be called and honored as "investigative reporting" is more often the skillful and diligent pursuit of official leaks.

~~He didn't~~ He officially leaked Who's Who and I could not give a relevant part away.

The one reporter whose stories reflect an effort to use this basic source material didn't know how.

He assumed a 1965 address would be current in 1972. It wasn't.

But let us not get too far ahead.

There was this close friend of ^Hunt, former fellow CIA man, who was bashful about it.

Buckley: Bill and Bull

Under unusual circumstances, Howard Hunt added a dimension to Nixon's Bay of Pigs responsibilities and involvements. In a ~~broadcast~~ TV show taped/January 18, 1973 - in San Francisco before an audience of young women from wealthy Republican families a few days after Hunt dropped his defense and entered pleas of guilty to six Watergate break-in counts only - he declared:

"Now this commitment was made by the Eisenhower Administration in which President Nixon served as vice president, and I believe he chaired the National Security Council." *(The vice president is one of few permanent members of the council)*
This is to say that the Bay of Pigs was part of Nixon's official duties and keeping close tabs on everything and everyone related to it was his and Cushman's official responsibilities.

Hunt's purpose was not to say that Nixon was closely tied to anti-Castro Cubans or involved in the Bay of Pigs by more than sympathy, both of which are true. He did not then, earlier or since criticize Nixon. It was his prelude to an attack on all Kennedys, in this case the martyred President, to blame him for the failure of the Bay of Pigs. Hunt's hatred of all Kennedys is as sincere as Nixon's. Faking evidence to justify it later turned out to be one of his official functions as Nixon's spook in residence.

Everything about that TV show was out of the ordinary, including its lack of honesty, forthrightness and of acknowledgement of long-time connection with Hunt.

Hunt was much sought after by all the media. He had kept himself inaccessible. He had added to the natural ~~mystery about himself~~ public and journalistic interest by making even more of a mystery about himself. When he was caught by TV cameramen leaving a lawyer's office where he had been deposed he sought to hide his face with his straw hat and hands, for all the world as though pictures of him did not exist. This merely assured pursuit and more photographing. It also added to the exceptional interest all TV shows had in his appearance. But he avoided all until ~~he~~ ^{aired - telecast} this particular one that was broadcast on the Public Broadcasting ~~network~~ Service network January 21.

Compared to the major-media shows available, Hunt elected minor exposure.

Hunt had the best of reasons: he assured himself against unfriendly questioning.

There was nothing on the show as taped and telecast - there was a change after taping- or in the transcript to indicate this reason.

More than this and more than was edited out was missing.

The show was William F. Buckley's ~~First~~ "Firing Line."

This is the same Buckley who as doyen of the political right, whose most ~~many~~ witty and intellectual spokesman he is, has so often accused what to him is the "liberal" media of lack of honesty and of imposing on popular trust.

This is the same Buckley who said absolutely nothing about their long and close friendship, their common past or their present exceptional relationship in introducing ~~the~~ Hunt.

Had Hunt not slipped and referred to him once as "Bill" (transcript, p. 12), there would not have been reason even to suspect that they were other than strangers thrown together by circumstances.

The truth is that they had been the closest of friends for several decades. So close that Buckley is the godfather of Hunt's three oldest children.

Buckley is the executor of the estate of Hunt's wife, who died in an airplane crash in Chicago a month and a half earlier, on December 8, while she was on an exotic mission for Nixon. There are reasons for doubting the propriety of his filling this court-approved role and for some of what happened in the accountings of her estate. Hunt was caught ~~in a hole~~ trying to pull off a fake accounting. ~~and caught~~

Buckley also was a CIA agent under Hunt back in 1951-2, in Mexico *insert 2A*

For this holy man of the erudite right, founder and editor of the National Review, ^{very} its most attractive and literate journal; sponsor of Young Americans for Freedom, the "youth" group of the right; and a policy-level Nixon official in official propaganda, on the board of the United States Information Agency; for this man who looks and acts like and presents himself as the epitome of personal honesty and integrity, omitting these facts in presenting ~~the~~ Hunt to his large and for it expanded audience is quite a collection of oversights.

Buckley was not without training. In World War II, after Officers' Candidate School, he was sent to the counter-intelligence section ~~of~~ at Ft. Sam Houston, Texas the day the war ended. (Parade 11/8/70)

Some of this has received no public attention, none of it received much attention and the minor space it occupied was not on the initiative of either man.

This show came at a time of Hunt's need for decent public relations. It assured him a freindly reception and the certainty of nothing embarrassing. There came another time when Hunt felt he had the same needs and Buckley aired him again, again exclusively. This was on May 12, 1974. The first show followed immediately upon Hunt's plea of guilt, which was part of the obstructing of justice by the Nixon administration and the White House in particular. The second followed immediately upon disclosures of the contents of some of Nixon's tapes. They were interpreted as proving that earlier allegations, that Hunt blackmailed Nixon, were true. Embarrassed, Hunt again needed an opportunity to say that blackmail is not blackmail. Nobody but Buckley could be expected to sit still for that line, especially when Watergate and its tragedies made Hunt a rich man. So Buckley cancelled a scheduled show and again aired Hunt to defend Hunt.

It was a drab and otherwise purposedless show.

If one might expect no less of fellow spooks of the past and such close fræends, for spooks and friends do stick together and help each other, one might expect more of a man who postures as Buckley does and of any TV show aired on public facilities and at public cost. (The transcripts the show sells carry this acknowledgement, "...transmitted through the facilities of the Public Broadcasting Service...made possible through a grant from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.")

On the second Buckley propaganda effort at taxpayer expense for Hunt he did acknowledge their longtime friendship. He did not acknowledge serving under Hunt Personally in CIA. Nor did he acknowledge that he had taken over the Hunt legal defense.

Or that this - shall one call it a friendly gesture when Hunt was already loaded?- was also followed by further and considerable increases in Hunt's wealth.

Even that this, too, led to another past CIA connection.

If anybody ever had a friend when he needed one, Hunt had a real friend in Buckley.

This is why it was not general knowledge that Nixon hired himself a would-be assassin if not a real one when he placed Hunt in the White House as master of spying.

This and the refusal of the press to report it when with friends I pieced the

irrefutable proof together and offered it to several major elements of the media, including one of the reporters most honored for his Watergate reporting.

What is even more surprising is that nobody anywhere in the media thought it at all strange when ^Hunt's mouth was moving on the screen and no words were coming from the speaker.

Extra Space

Perhaps I was more suspicious. ~~the other~~ Buckley's path and mine crossed several times ~~and I suspect that~~ ^Hunt's and mine did when he was in CIA. Whether or not he was involved in what happened to me, it was hurtful, the kind of experience I would never forget and didn't and an experience that led me to some of the more sensational suppressions of The Watergate. They are worthy of separate attention.

Buckley was born both bright and wealthy. If his beliefs are independent, they are also those to which he was born. When he ~~was~~ became director of the ~~existence of~~ foundation established by the late Alfred Kohlberg, who made his millions from the old China and headed the China Lobby of the McCarthy era, it was a natural development. His views and Kohlberg's coincided, so much so that Buckley criticized Nixon's detente with the new China.

Check this section

August
It was apparently in pursuit of these views that Buckley announced on ~~October~~ 31, 1966, that the Kohlberg foundation was sponsoring a new and unofficial investigation of the JFK assassination. (NYT 9/1/66)

I had published the first book analyzing and refuting the Warren Report, White-wash: The Report on the Warren Report. ^{Publisher} ~~the subject~~ ^{the subject} ~~opposition to~~ ~~its publishing~~ was so great I had to bring the book out as what I believe to be the first "underground" book. The book is neither right nor left. But Buckley and others could have taken the criticism of the Warren Commission as an indication of bias on my part, particularly because ~~in the~~ the second page of the Introduction raises the question of conspiracy and the fourth is critical of the way the Commission treated wealthy members of the Dallas John Birch Society.

^HBuckley's representative, Oscar Collier, known to me as a literary agent and as the former president of a publishing house, phoned in Buckley's name to ask me to be this new investigation's chief investigator. He identified the rest of the projected staff and I accepted.

Apparently Buckley got a report on Whitewash because his investigation dropped dead. Whitewash proves with what the Commission ignored that the accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was really anti-Communist. So, while in his announcement Buckley had hinted darkly at conspiracies, one not of the left did not appeal to him.

He and I had a short personal encounter in New York City the night of December 5 of that year. ~~Giorgia~~ The late Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, my Italian publisher, and I had been taken to a literary reception for a motorcycling, leather-jacketed poet by Ruggiero Orlando, correspondent of Italian radio and TV and of the magazine L'Europeo. Buckley was more or less holding court on the side of the salon opposite the poet. When Orlando introduced us Buckley's manner and words were insulting, "OH, I haven't read your book." In spontaneous anger I replied, "That's obvious or you wouldn't have made some of the stupid mistakes you have!"

To this the man of devastating repartee merely turned and walked away.

So, I can hardly claim to be immune to prejudice against the man. Nor do my experiences tell me that his dedication is to truth. I find it to ^{be} what is consistent with what he wants to believe and says, regardless of fact.

So, when it was announced that Hunt would make his first public appearance on the Buckley show and would fly across the country to do it when all the major networks would have grabbed him at home, I compared Buckley's Who's Who biography with Hunt's career. Sure enough, there is a void in Buckley's that coincides with the first two of Hunt's years as a CIA agent in Mexico. And part of Buckley's education had been at the ^University of Mexico. ^{CIA} This suspicion paid off because that is where and when Hunt was Buckley's/superior.

Suspicious of both men, I taped the show and heard and saw Hunt as he spoke.

The tape discloses that ~~he said~~ half-way through the show he said, "I have a list here of four recommendations that I made well before I joined the project," meaning the Bay of Pigs. ~~He identified~~ But when he got to ticking them off, in words there was no first recommendation; It was whited out.

Buckley was suppressing something. In context this could not be a profanity.

Buckley's people are not very smart. They didn't edit the studio tape, the one

they sell. It has the ~~words~~ suppressed words. But this mistake was not made with the transcript, which sells much more widely than the tapes that cost 20 times as much and are less easily consulted.

Buckley corrupted the transcript to suppress.

No blackout is indicated in the transcript.

Where Hunt said, "I have a list here of four recommendations" the transcript reads, "I have a list here of recommendations." In the transcript the entire first recommendation, the one highest in Hunt's list of Bay of Pigs priorities, is out. The next three are ~~represented~~ represented as his calling each the first, second and third.

Buckley has him making three recommendations only.

Heavy stuff, especially for a Buckley.

Hunt's first recommendation was "that Castro be assassinated!"

Castro was a head of state, recognized by most of the world, by all the major powers except the United States.

Buckley knew of this Hunt-Nixon connection of the past obviously, and of the harm it could do Nixon to have a would-be or actual assassin on his personal staff as well as the public-relations harm to Hunt, who awaited sentencing.

Principle was no obstacle when ~~expediently~~ suppression served a political purpose for a political ally, Nixon, and a friend, Hunt.

But Hunt was bull-headed.

He has his four recommendation in Give Us This Day (p.38), word for word the same, beginning with "Assassinate Castro."

When Hunt knew he could make this kind of recommendation - and when he wasn't booted out of CIA forever for making it - it is obvious that assassination and the CIA also are not strangers. (When I was in OSS in World War II I saw a handbook on how to assassinate without leaving traces and how to use commonly-available objects. One I remember is an ordinary lead-pencil.)

In fact, his proposal was given serious official consideration and there are abundant reports of the effort being made. Some have been published, one involving Howard Hughes' wealth and his honcho, former FBI agent Robert Maheu. A Bay of Pigs veteran who is also a

former CIA agent in trouble with the Agency gave me an account of one that failed only by accident. Hunt says it was never rejected and for months he "was told it was 'in the hands of a special group.'" (p. 38)

Buckley's integrity may not have been ^{good} high but his judgement was.

Nixon had publicly claimed the Bay of Pigs as his baby. He was on the National Security Council. He was the White House action officer on the project. And the project's political chief had recommended the assassination of the head of state of another land. These things Buckley had to know. He probably knew much more, including the fact that Nixon's military aide and adviser on national-security affairs, the man who kept up with everything on the project where he couldn't, had been an office-mate of Hunt's in CIA at a time when another head of state was overthrown. ^{Cushman} ~~was~~ was Nixon's personal friend and personal selection as the CIA's second-in-command. If he was not himself part of the Guatemalan adventure, it is improbable that he was unaware of Hunt's role in it, identically the role he had in the Bay of Pigs.

To put this another way, it would seem impossible that Nixon didn't know of Hunt's recommendation that Castro be assassinated.

Yet ^{he} added Hunt to his personal staff and in the capacity of a spy against other Americans, those Nixon didn't like.

Despite a change in policy under JFK, ~~there was no report that~~ Hunt was reportedly in charge of another CIA plot to assassinate Castro, assigned to it the year after JFK's assassination.

During Watergate reporting of official leaks, Newsweek is one of many publications reporting a Hunt/White House plot against the president of Panama:

"...low-level White House officials at one ~~time~~ time considered assassinating Panama's head of government. [John] Dean's story is that the Administration suspected high Panamanian Government officials of being involved in the flow of heroin from Latin America into the ~~United States~~ U.S. and were also concerned about strong man Omar Torrijos's uncooperative attitude toward renegotiating the Panama Canal treaty. Thus, in Dean's telling, some officials found a Torrijos hit ~~deal~~ doubly attractive. The contract, he said, went to Hunt, later a ringleader in the Watergate break-in. Hunt, according to Dean, had his team in Mexico before the mission was aborted. Hunt's lawyer could not be reached for comment."

I saw no denial -ever, anywhere anywhere.

This and similar stories received little attention. So did the lack of denial. The media is uptight on this kind of story. When it was apparent that the media would not report Hunt's suppressed disclosure on the Buckley show or Buckley's suppression, I gave the story to Ian McDonald, then a Washington correspondent of The Times of London, one of the world's most respected papers. It used the story on the front page. Not one United States ~~news~~ news service or paper or broadcaster picked it up, common as the practise of re-reporting is.

If the refusal of the media to report a proven and sensational story when it is clearly front-page copy and otherwise significant may seem odd, it should be noted that this suppression was consistent with a long-standing policy under which certain kinds of sensitive stories dealing with foreign affairs were ignored. Nobody gives the orders. It just happens.

But when it was of interest to the CIA for ~~this story about Hunt~~ ^{stories about Hunt and assassinations} to be used, they appeared, ~~wasn't and~~ under suspect circumstances. Angled, conjectural and not all accurate.

Buckley was a true friend to his old friend Hunt in old friend Hunt's time of need.

Whether or not Nixon also ^{is} was an old friend, Buckley was a true friend to him because this suppression and the total suppression that followed it and ^{is} was, in fact, attributable to it at a crucial time in Nixon's counterattack/defense. ^{these} Had two things that were true and lied about been known at the outset, all The Watergate and all it did to the country might have been different than the agony that followed. These two things are Hunt's current employment as Nixon's special consultant in these squalid affairs -- he actually planned ^{spy operation} the whole ~~thing~~ according to his own later sworn testimony before the Watergate committee and his plan for the ^United States to cause the assassination of another head of state.

In his personal ~~writing~~ writing the eloquent, syndicated Buckley was openly and stoutly Nixon's defender. Examination of a few of these earlier writings indicate the impartiality and independence of this particular show as well as Buckley's personally. And that of some of the papers carrying his column.

His column that appeared in various papers on September 20 and 21, 1972 begins "Suddenly Mr. Bernard Barker surfaced, and that in itself is perplexing. He gave an interview to The New York Times, but sic disclosed very little." True but less than Buckley

could - and a sincerely honest reporter/columnist would - have said. There followed a braggart's boast, that ~~Barker~~ "he would never talk, period...nobody would succeed in making him talk about ~~ex~~ the super-secret mission in the Watergate/Building ..."
Office
This is followed by the charge that the Democratic Party ~~xxxx~~ "is making charges all over the place (, read "falsely") and has filed extravagant civil suits..." (The Republicans settled out of court with all but one of those filing these civil suits in February, 1974, for more than three-quarters of a million dollars, which in a different sense might be called "extravagant" .) Barker was looking for money- Castro's! And there is "no man to whom ~~the~~ ^{his} country should be more grateful than Howard "unt."

Not even Nixon, one takes it.

What follows was deleted in the San Francisco Examiner of September 21~~x~~. [†]This is Buckley, speaking for himself, not quoting Barker, and as printed in the city in which his Hunt show was taped: "I concur. I have known the gentleman for 21 years and am the godfather of three of his children. "unt is not a trifler - yet his involvement in the venture, if it went beyond mere coincidence, tends to magnify the significance of the case."

Buckley then credits conservative columnist James Jackson Kilpatrick with "a version ...not implausible..." Here again the Examiner used its blue pencil:

"...contemporary Cuba...the Castro government, foreseeing its economic ~~excommunication~~ excommunication from the Soviet Union, decided...to make a deal" with McGovern/the democrats under which "based on the tactical need of the McGovern people for money with which to wage the ^{presidential} campaign and the strategic need of Cuba for more economic help."

Were this not enough a "prominent Republican" reported "the fact that the deal would be secretly consummated at the Watergate, perhaps on the very day of June 17.?"

Thereafter, and the only reason the crooks were caught, is "the Republicans were betrayed."

This is seriously present. ^hNo spoof.

On October 23-24 Buckley went after the Democrats who "proceed on the assumption that the whole of the White House is guilty." Immediately following, except in the same Examiner, "They ~~are~~ have nicely suspended, during the crucial interval

between now and the election the presumptions they guard so zealously in other situations." This, he actually says, is that skyjackers are presumed to be innocent, which is terrible when those caught in the criminal political acts are not!

The Examiner includes that it "is the most audacious act of proposed highwaymanry of the century" to hold Nixon responsible. "The American people will not turn to massochism in order to avenge the privacy of Larry O'Brien."

On the massochism he was wrong.

In any event, Buckley is not detached, not unimaginative, and, except from his nationwide TV audience, did not keep his long friendship with Hunt secret.

Then came the TV taping.

The Washington Post of January 18, 1973, carried a short story ~~concerning~~ headed "Hunt will appear on Television Show." It concludes, "In a telephone interview yesterday Buckley said, 'Howard and I have been friends since 1951 when we were both living in Mexico. Howard was working for CIA [not Buckley, who was, under Hunt]... Howard's children and my sister's children have gone to the same school for several years together.'" [This sister, Mrs. L. Brent Bozell, was active in a campaign to overturn the Supreme Court's legalizing of abortion. Buckley's brother-in-law edits an ultra-conservative ~~mag~~ Catholic magazine, Triumph.]... as a matter of fact, I've been made sole trustee to the "Hunt Children" after Mrs. Dorothy Hunt was killed in that Chicago plane crash.

Nothing deterred Buckley. May 1, 1973, "If Nixon were impeached, the punishment would be visited primarily on the state." (Surprising how this notion [?]graged Nixonians. The innocent pay for the crime, not the guilty.)

As late as the next January, after all the public hearings of the Watergate committee, he was attributing a political motivation to Nixon's "enemies" who were trying to "formulate a [sic] high crime or misdemeanor of which he can be judged guilty."

This was after his disenchantment with Nixon over the detentes with the Soviet Union and China.

Back to that TV show. Buckley had as a guest with Hunt one Mario Lazo, former Cuban lawyer who ^oconcept of the law emerged as 'crime is not criminal if it suits my

desires." He described himself as having served both the CIA and the FBI when he was still in Cuba, via the diplomatic pouch of a "neutral" nation. His views are so extreme, he is so sincere about the irrational, it may be better to quote the understanding of a conservative reviewer, Carolyn Anspacher in The San Francisco Chronicle. Her story was headed "Watergate 7 Lauded," no exaggeration.

"Castro, Lazo declared, is on his last legs and his only hope of survival is to gain U.S. recognition and with it desperately needed supplies. ...a lot of Communist [meaning Castro's] money was going into McGovern's campaign. ... the group conducted an honorable, patriotic operation to get that information." That is, the non-existent information about the non-fact.*

A reading of the transcript makes this seem reasonable. The ^{actual} words the paper paraphrased are on page 10: "However, here is ~~Gates~~ Castro, in November, knowing he was through, that he has to die, and his one chance of surviving is to get recognition and help from the United States. He can't get that from the Republicans [note-after detente with the USSR and China, to be followed by American corporations providing transportation to the Castro government with Nixon's ~~approve~~ sanction]. His one chance is to get it from the Democrats, from McGovern, Ted. Kennedy, Fulbright."

Lazo got so insane that he turned even Buckley around, beginning with a string of five consecutive "no's": "No. no. no. no. no. What makes you accept the allegation that in fact there was Communist money in the Democratic operation?" (p.12) When Lazo sought to explain as "fact" "Because, as I say, Castro's regime is drawing to an end and he knows that the only way--" Too much for Buckley, who weakened to but three "no's" when Lazo again interrupted to say of Castro, "...he knows that the only way ^{that} he can survive is to have McGovern as President of the United States."

"That makes it plausible," the deep thinker of the intellectual right, Buckley, agreed.

It may appear, especially in retrospect, that this was the raving of the incurably insane. It is the head-spinning reality. Lazo merely was exuberant. This is the straight line from the Buckley September column already quoted.

The ravings on this show did not end with exposure. They are the precise line

taken by the Cubans caught in common crime for Nixon's political benefit, it is precisely that Barker (H 1H357ff) and Hunt (9H3662ff) swore to before the Senate Watergate committee. Millions saw and heard it live all around the world.

To assume this craziness is a facile invention to explain a monstrous crime is to be unjust to these revanchists. Craziness that it is, it is their true belief. They are genuine, sincere in belief that day is night.

What is more troubling is that this fiction is dignified by the Buckley and becomes the sworn testimony, the defense, the explanation, the diversion from Nixon. These ~~books~~ did not dream up the crimes. They were merely its imposed upon Nixonian instruments.

And without exception drew heavier jail sentences than those who imposed upon them, those who in their intensity of belief and deep sincerity served.

The fact repeatedly sworn to by a number of witnesses is that the whole thing democratic break-in was approved by Nixon's Attorney General, John Mitchell, the others, disclosed and undisclosed to now, by his assistant for domestic affairs and for the spooking branch of the dirty work (the political was under Charles Colson), John Ehrlichman.

But providing an explanation and a motive for this caught crime that takes all of the responsibility away from Nixon and makes the Cubans appear to be patriots rather than common burglars with political purposes and then suppressing, in Nixon's interest and in the interest of his chief spy, Hunt, the fact that Hunt wanted to have Castro assassinated with what had to be Nixon's approval and with no indication he ever disapproved is not the end of Buckley's services.

The Watergate, while taking his wife, made Hunt rich. After Buckley moved on, it and apparently Buckley made Hunt much richer.

Frank Sturgis, better known by the name to which he was born, Frank Fiorini, was a long-time informant for Jack Anderson and before his death, Drew Pearson, of the Washington Merry-Go-Round column.

After a compassionate visit from Connecticut's Republican Senator Lowell P. Weicher, Jr., minority member of the Watergate committee, Sturgis-Fiorini wrote his wife, Anderson's September 18, 1973 column concludes with this quotation from that letter:

"Perhaps the most fascinating reference was to the columnist William Buckley. 'I don't know if I told you before ~~the~~ ...but William F. Buckley used to work for ~~the~~ CIA and I don't know if he still does. When he found out that Howard (Hunt) was going to work in the White House he told Howard that ^{it} was good that he would be close to the President but Howard told him that he was there to take orders and not to influence anyone...."

It was known earlier, but when Anderson asked Buckley for confirmation "Buckley frankly admitted he was a 'deep cover agent' for the CIA from July, 1951 to March, 1952 but said that he had not worked for them since. He declined to say what his CIA role was."

The real question is of service, not of pay.

But not with Hunt. With him all is money. ^{Tragedy} has added greatly to what he accumulated over the years, a valuable property in one of the tonier, horsier Washington suburbs, the return from the two-score books and his generous CIA salary plus that \$125 a day from the Mullen public-relations agency. His CIA retirement alone is \$20,000 a year. Insurance from his wife's death was \$260,000. Then there was the undetermined amount he extorted from the White House. If far from all the just under a half million they put out in hush-~~money~~ ^{money}, he did latch onto a considerable proportion. The last reported payment to him was \$75,000.

Things picked up when Buckley took over Hunt's legal defense after he was out of jail on appeal.

In her Washington Post column of December 9, 1973, a year and a day after the ~~fatal~~ crash that took his wife's life, ~~the~~ Maxine Cheshire wrote:

To cut down on legal fees, convicted Watergate burglar E. Howard Hunt has changed lawyers again. Sidney Sachs has been asked to turn everything ~~over~~, including Hunt's motion for appeal, over to the personal attorneys of columnist William F. Buckley, C. Dickerman Williams in New York and William A. Snyder, Jr., in Baltimore. ~~Buckley~~

Then Hunt suddenly struck it big with another book, his confessions, or what he dared say of them ^{or} and what he could bring himself to and what would not magnify his legal problems.

G. Putnam's Sons bought his Road To Watergate for an undisclosed sum described as "a substantial six-figure" sum against the eventual royalties" and had in turn sold the paperback rights "to Popular Library" for another "substantial six-figure" sum", according to Putnam's vice president, Edward Chase (NYTimes 3/16/74)

Crime rarely paid better.

14

As are the revanchist Cubans, buckley is a man of sincere beliefs. If he bent them in political expediency, the thrust of his charges against liberals and others not to his liking and hid this, as he did - part of the fault is that of the press for not putting the available facts together - it was from conviction that it was the right thing to do.

Does anyone doubt that Nixon, too, believed the things he did, had done in his name and were done in his name, did not also believe it was the right thing to do?

Is there one of those detected in any of The Watergate crimes who did not say exactly this? Not one.

Is there one of those conservative and personally-ambitious young who paraded before the Senate Watergate committee who did not say just this, he thought it was right? Most adding^{ed} because they believed the world's most urgent need was Richard Nixon's re-election, and this was justification for anything

Each~~x~~ of the seven burglars and charged with conspiracy in the burglary said this except G. Gordon Liddy, the silent one. But it was said for him by his wife.

All considered this kind of patent dishonesty the true patriotism.

No doubt Buckley, who is long on patriotism, also did.

The confusion here is between the personal interest of a single man, Nixon, and the country and duty to the country.

None of it did the country any good. All of it hurt as nothing else ever had. The country was torn apart by it, the tears stretched constantly by Nixon as it served his interest and his survival.

All these dedicated claimed to be serving truth but all raped her.

Whatever was in Buckley's mind, he served not truth and not the country~~x~~ and not his old friend Hunt alone.

He served Richard Nixon personally.

He served the CIA.

And the strangest part is that they were in conflict, with Nixon trying to get the CIA to take a bum rap ^{for} from him while not daring to charge them with the justified raps.

The Watergate world is a crazy, mixed-up, contradictory world.

And it made for the strangest bedfellows.