

~~write on 7 - page of release~~
+ First name Stavis Boyle, Seuro

11

Senate Spy Inquiry to Look for Hughes Links

3/26/78

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 24—The investigation by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence into the attempt by the Central Intelligence Agency to salvage a Soviet submarine will lead the committee into the relationships between Howard R. Hughes and the Watergate case, former Watergate investigators say privately.

For some two decades Mr. Hughes and the vast complex involving the Hughes Tool Company, Hughes Aircraft and, later, the Summa Corporation have long been a major contractor of equipment for the C.I.A. This relationship fed speculation that the reclusive billionaire may have even more covert contacts with the agency.

But it was not until 1973 and the Senate Watergate investigation that a pattern of evidence suggested that divisions of the Hughes empire might in deed have been linked with the C.I.A. and political machinations of the Nixon Administration, including Watergate.

Several Watergate committee investigators said that the \$350-million C.I.A. contract with Mr. Hughes to salvage the submarine might well be part of an intriguing chronology of events that they encountered during Watergate.

Two Problems for Hughes

In 1968 Mr. Hughes, according to court testimony, appeared to have two major problems with the Government. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice had warned him not to buy any further casinos in Las Vegas.

And, second, the Atomic Energy Commission intended to conduct more nuclear tests in Nevada. Mr. Hughes, according to this testimony, wanted to change the Justice Department's mind and stop the A.E.C. tests.

He ordered a series of secret political contributions that culminated in the payment of \$100,000 to Charles G. Rebozo, the Florida banker and close friend of Richard M. Nixon, for the benefit of the then newly elected President. Mr.

Hughes's intention, according to the testimony of his former aide, Robert A. Maheu, in a trial last year, was to gain influence in the Government.

In late 1969 and early 1970, at the same time Mr. Hughes's \$100,000 was being delivered to Mr. Rebozo, the C.I.A., recent news accounts have disclosed, was looking for a company to recover a Soviet diesel submarine that had gone down some 700 miles off Hawaii.

The C.I.A., these accounts said, awarded a \$350-million contract to Howard Hughes's holding company, the Summa Corporation, to handle the recovery operation.

And, indeed, Global Marine, Inc., a firm controlled by Mr. Hughes, constructed the Glomar Explorer that tried to raise the sub. The construction and planning for this mission appears to have spanned the years between 1970 and 1973.

Other Hughes Links

During this same period other figures were taking their places at the periphery of what became known as the Watergate scandals. Lawrence F. O'Brien, fresh from the Presidential campaign of Hubert H. Humphrey (also a recipient of Mr. Hughes's largesse), joined a public relations concern that had a \$15,000-a-month retainer from the Hughes organization.

Robert Bennett, son of Utah's retired Republican Senator Wallace F. Bennett and Washington representative for Summa Corporation, bought into the Robert F. Mullen Company, an international public relations concern that was operating as a front for the C.I.A.

In August, 1970, E. Howard Hunt, a veteran C.I.A. agent, appeared to retire from the

C.I.A. and joined the Mullen Company.

In December, 1970, Mr. Hughes discharged Mr. Maheu, a former F.B.I. agent who had managed the Hughes Las Vegas interests. Mr. Maheu, testimony would later bring out, had put documents about Hughes political contributions in a safe owned by Herman M. Greenspun, a Las Vegas newspaper publisher.

Mr. Maheu was once alleged to have been involved in a 1960 plot, organized by the C.I.A., to assassinate Cuban Premier Fidel Castro. When asked in court about the allegations, Mr. Maheu declined to discuss them, citing national security considerations.

Material in Safe

Although the details have become blurred by contradictory testimony, in 1971 certain aides to President Nixon were told that Mr. Greenspun's safe contained materials that could be damaging to Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat of Maine. Mr. Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy, then the nucleus of the secret White House unit called the "plumbers," contemplated breaking into the safe. They were allegedly promised the assistance of officials of Summa Corporation. The burglary was not carried out, but Watergate investigators strongly suspected that the target was not memorandums about Senator

Muskie, but the Hughes memos hidden there by Mr. Maheu.

By the spring of 1972 the stage was set for the Watergate burglary. Mr. O'Brien was then chairman of the Democratic party with offices in the Watergate office complex. R. Spencer Oliver Jr., whose father was a Washington lobbyist for the Hughes organization, had an office in the complex as executive director for the Association for State Democratic Chairmen.

Meanwhile, the Soviet submarine project was under way, presumably with the approval of Henry A. Kissinger, who was then Mr. Nixon's adviser for national Security affairs, of the secret 40 Committee and of the President himself.

Mr. Hunt and Mr. Liddy had formed a burglary team of Cuban-Americans and James W. McCord, a former C.I.A. security officer. The team was briefed and made its first entry in May, 1972. The Cuban members later said they were told to look for documents that might link the Democrats with money from Communist-bloc countries.

C.I.A. Concern

But the telephone upon which a tap was placed was R. Spencer Oliver's.

On June 16, 1972, the team re-entered the Democratic National Committee Headquarters to repair the tap and obtain more documents. Five of the

to Watergate

burglars were arrested by the Washington Police early on the morning of June 17.

From the time of the break-in on, the C.I.A. appeared to show concern that the Watergate investigation might uncover its own secrets. It withheld vital evidence from the F.B.I. and in early 1973, Richard Helms, then the Director of Central Intelligence, ordered tape recordings of his calls over six years destroyed. The tapes included top-level conversations with the White House.

As the Watergate prosecutions bore in, several suspects insisted publicly and privately that the investigations could

compromise national security.

At least the Watergate defendants linked the national security concern to Mr. Hughes.

In June, 1974, the Glomar Explorer, reliable sources have said, began its salvage operation in the Pacific. At almost the same time, on June 5, 1974, four burglars entered the Los Angeles office of Summa Corporation and stole papers concerning the secret project.

On July 9, 1974, an official of the Summa Corporation received a call demanding a \$1-million ransom, according to press accounts. This began an involved effort by the F.B.I. to get the materials back. By early 1975 facts about the secret attempt to salvage the submarine had begun to leak out.

of Hunt's mysterious non-disappearance

When

~~When~~ "disappeared" his and Bennett's pasts stood them in good stead.

Hunt did not ~~disappear~~ ^{vanish} when and as Szulc reported, which adds ^{more} interest to Szulc's reporting. *that*

What Szulc did in that masked call to Hunt the day after the break-in, that Sunday that was so essential in the subsequent history of the coverings-up that are obstructions of justice ^{that} and had then ^{just} begun, was tip Hunt off that somebody knew what he and the other six were trying to hide.

There never has been any explanation of the silence of the arrested five or of Hunt's disappearance that lasted only a fortnight. At the time and in retrospect it seems strange that the press showed no interest in the reasons or in investigating what could account for what without ^{analysis} ~~thought~~ seems like plain foolishness.

Those five knew their identities would be ^{discovered - revealed} ~~known~~ soon enough. They were fingerprinted. All knew their fingerprints were in FBI files. It was a question of time only before their full and correct identities would be known. ~~McEora, Baker, Barker and Liddy, who had been~~ The two CREEP employees, James McCord, ~~director of security~~, and G. Gordon Liddy, ~~who was not then arrested and who was counsel to the finance committee and head of the CREEP dirty-works operation,~~ (had been FBI agents. ~~Baker~~ Barker had worked for the FBI (but not as a "special agent") at least in Cuba, as a member of Batista's secret police, *and for CIA*. ~~Sturgis~~ Frank Sturgis/Fiorini had a criminal record. And Eugenio Martinez and Virgilio ~~de~~ Gonzalez, like all but Liddy, had CIA pasts.

Why, nobody asked, with proper and full identification inevitable almost in minutes - and this is exactly what happened - were all silent, not even ^{right} giving their names? Why did all refused the right to call a lawyer?

The answer is traditional in intelligence operations. First of all they provided these precious moments for covers to be built and strings to be pulled. If the whole story had blown up to begin with, Nixon would have been blown up and out of the White House with it. And strings were pulled. ^{latest} Regardless of the omissions in all official explanations and investigations, Hunt and Liddy went to work immediately. Counsel was arranged and at the very ^{latest} least the White House was informed less than two hours after the arrests. ^{mentioned} (Hunt on Bill Buckley's show broadcast May 12, 1974, where it was also

Hunt did say this, and with some contempt, in his second appearance on Bill Buckley's show, broadcast May 12, 1974. If it was not missed by the press, it was ignored.

John Mitchell, who had been Attorney General and was running the campaign, was

informed ^{at} breakfast-time that very morning, via Liddy's call, ^{to him in} ~~back from~~ California, where

^{Back} he was ^{in general} sent orders to ~~to~~ get Richard Kleindienst, then Attorney General, to ~~assist~~ he could. (From that moment on Kleindienst obstructed justice because he did nothing and

because he did nothing about Liddy's involvement when it is Liddy, personally, who sought him out on the Burning Tree Golf golf course and told him. ^{May 16, 1974} Kleindienst ~~later~~ copped a

cream-puff plea when he had committed felonies, pleading guilty to a single misdemeanor. ^(Post)

^{1.5. District Court} ^{George L. Hart actually praised him. Indle/Kleindienst wept. (Post 4/8/74)}
The sentence could have been as little as a month, could have been suspended, ^{was a month suspended, and too. On June 7 'Sentencing'} did not mean mandatory disbarment, and was ^{(Post, 5/17/74,}

The traditional behavior of experienced spooks caught in the act did buy time for

their principals. It did not help them. But this is not because they did not expect it.

They did believe that the pulled strings would unlatch the jail doors. Hunt expressed this

expectation in explaining the traditional workings of intelligence on that second

^{and in his Senate testimony.} Buckley show. Again the press, then contorted with Nixon's transcripts and the questions ^{they}

of his and others' knowledge and involvements, was without interest and did not

report it.

Nor did anyone ask why Hunt alone disappeared. Liddy did not, yet he was supposedly

^{Why did Dean, as he swore on Ehrlichman order, tell Liddy to tell Hunt and Hunt to flee the country?}
in charge of both the overall CREEP spy operation and the break-in itself. ~~Why did Hunt alone disappear?~~ Not one of those in the White House or at CREEP who knew or were involved

went on the lam, and there were many, some later charged and jailed.

Hunt did not expect to spend the rest of his life in hiding. He, too, was buying

time and working on "arrangements." He, too, was giving others precious time. But why

he and not Liddy? Of course ^{some} ~~one of them~~ had to ^{be} ~~stay~~ around and work on deals and be

a communications center, which also entailed some flying. This does not explain why Liddy

^{when others could have only} did that and Hunt for all practical purposes melted.

Actually, he was never really out of touch with home base.

~~The next day the bureau~~

Much later in the day the bureaucracy worked as it is supposed to and the FBI and Secret Service notified Ehrlichman and Butterfield. Helms testified to suffering ~~suffered~~ a characteristic spook failure of memory about when the CIA was informed and about his being told, but it also was that day.

Handwritten scribbles on the right side of the page.

Handwritten scribbles at the bottom right of the page.

Liddy was anything but disassociation for Nixon and the White House. Liddy had been in charge of the White House's similar operation, the Special Investigations Unit, self-nicknamed The Plumbers, before he and that operation were shifted to CREEP.

This is pretty close Nixon/White House connection.

One
The only answer is that Hunt's ~~was~~ ^{connections with Nixon were} even closer, ^{another is} and the other complications of Hunt's activities - CIA.

Despite all the lying about it, which worked, ^{Forgetting their pasts,} Hunt ^{NIXON} was a White House employee at the time of the break-in. He was Nixon's agent when he, personally, planned the details of the CREEP operation for Liddy to present to Mitchell for official approval.

To the ^{end} ~~last minute~~ of Hunt's testimony before the Watergate committee, it and the press kept describing Hunt as a "former" White House employee at the time of the break-in, repeating faithfully and while knowing better what was the first keystone of the Nixon/White House defense, the Clawson caper. In that testimony he ^{also} described how he had done Liddy's planning, but by that time it made no difference.

But not until the end, when it also then made no difference, was he asked, as what appeared to be an afterthought, by Chairman Sam Ervin if he had not been on the White House payroll on June 17, 1972. Hunt testified that he was. The White House actually fired him several days later. The press which reported this also reported that he ~~had~~ ^{was} not ~~then~~ ^{still} been Nixon's spy in residence. ^{If Nixon had to be disassociated from Hunt and the crimes immediately. It was a first}

~~This was an early~~ essential to Nixon's survival, to his ~~own~~ unimpeachment.

So was one of Bennett's great favors, actually saying that Hunt was so busy ~~in~~ with the work of and so essential to the Mullen agency that he could not have had much time for any of this "third-rate burglary," the immediate White House ~~discription~~ ^{characterization} that was designed to disassociate it, ^{helped} ~~and did~~. In this and in other ways Bennett performed admirably as public relations man and as disassociator. To do this he had to cover himself and his business ~~while~~ by giving good information while practising the black art of disassociation. ^{and stumbling.}

He told The Washington Post June 21 that he knew nothing at all about the matter and "I take at face value" his "only comment" from Hunt, "a flat denial that he was ^{near} anywhere, the Watergate Saturday night," the night of the break-in.

He told Doyle and Sarro of the Star on the 22nd. the bit about Hunt's indispensability to the firm, and that the loss of this "closer Look" HEW contract, which "amounted to slightly over \$100,000 a year," was life or death because ^{the} the contract was so sensitive... a matter... loss of it could mean the end of his firm."

When Hunt's ~~salary~~ ^{quarter} salary alone took a fifth of this, ^{when there were rent, other salaries and so many other} when he had expenses, and, this, while ^{still} (not all), was immediately known, the press played it straight, "objectivity" for it and the accompanying lie.

There was the same objectivity with ^{the} this one dealing with ~~Hunt's~~ ^{alone being able to get} Nixon Julie/Eisenhower to do a 30-second TV spot for the ~~HEW~~ contract with HEW - in an election year yet!/?

"We could not ^{have} gotten Julie to do it if Howard hadn't been a White House consultant. We thought it was quite a coup." (Star 6/22/72) "closer Look"

HEW couldn't do it? It wouldn't have been possible with the agency's long history of favors for and activities in Nixon's ^{campaigns? Not because it really was a fine project?} ~~campaigns~~, including the current that while reported ^{None of all Bennett's personal White House friends could have done it? Not his sonator father? Not his} attracted no attention, Bennett's ~~person~~ ^{those} setting up of a hundred fronts for the hiding of Nixon re-election money? The White House wouldn't have grabbed at the exposure of the President's daughter ~~in a genuine public service, promoting good works,~~ in a genuine public service, promoting good works, with ~~his~~ his re-election pending? ^{No questions is "objectivity?"}

Nor did anybody gag on why the President's daughter of all people was selected by the ~~White~~ President's consultant and the agency so long involved in his political life.

"In the public's mind she's a schoolteacher," ^{without cracking up, straight-faced} Bennett ~~actually~~ said. (Star 6/23/72)

Julie, ^{for} who had been able to teach only two days in Jacksonville, Fla, Florida before she broke a foot and had to stop, "was the most prominent teacher we could find." (Star 6/23/72)

When this kind of transparent lying didn't stop the presses in spontaneous protest, ^{spokesmen} Bennett ~~and~~ and the White House/and others leaking behind the scenes could get away with ^{unnecessary} anything. But they dared not take ~~that~~ chances, so they put some truth out with the fiction, ^{what - fiction or truth} always downplayed.

Hunt was hired by Mullen on May 1970 retirement from CIA because ~~because~~ of the "endorsement" of Richard Helms, then Director, Central Intelligence, ^{Helms} Hunt gave him ^{and Bill Buckley as references, the story went}

(There are many proofs of the Bennett-White House intimacy and that he dealt directly with those at the top, not through Hunt, when he did not want to go through Hunt. One is a ~~azHaldeman memo~~ of July 29, 1971, ~~from Hunt~~ memo from Haldeman to Colson, which limns White House special interests and the intrusion of the FBI into political matters. It reads, in part, "According to Bob Bennett, his father remarked that when Pierre Salinger was a candidate for the U.S. Senate, the FBI ran a check on him...I'm broadminded [sic] enough to want to read it. This would be very useful ~~in~~ in complementing the investigation De Motte is pursuing..." Salinger had been press secretary to Democratic Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.) (Part 4/27/73)

During the preceeding days a little more had come out from official sources and from Bennett, who fed the press with skill and care.

On Monday the 19th Hunt's name and numbers ^{phone} in the Cubans' addressbooks was disclosed, which led to Bennett. Hunt was still in Washington, although the press and the FBI managed not to catch up with him. Despite all the talk about his disappearing ^{he wasn't even hiding.} ~~he hadn't.~~

Confronted with the connection and pretending ignorance of it all, Bennett told the press Tuesday the 20th that "he had been unable to reach Hunt since his name became entangled in the mystery of ~~er~~ who tried to bug the Democrats and why." ~~Star~~ ^{DC} As that day's Star's fifth-run story put it, "Today his present employer, a Washington public relations firm that has specialized in work for Republicans, announced that Hunt would be suspended tomorrow morning unless he has shown up."

(The "specialized in work for Republicans" part is a more credible explanation of Bennett's concern for the future of his firm than possible loss of the HEW contract.)

"It is a safe assumption he knows he is in the news stories," Bennett continued before asking, "What the hell is going on?"

He also ~~told the Star~~ ^{said} that Hunt had been scheduled to go to New York on company work, which amounts to another kind of covering Hunt because Bennett knew that in fact Hunt was in New York. Accidentally the Star helped the disassociation out by describing Bennett as Hunt's "present employer," which ~~implies further~~ ^{had left} that Hunt ~~no longer was~~ at the White House.

"Maybe I'm being paranoid," Bennett told the Star, "but I felt I had to act."

He was indeed being something, but it was not paranoid.

What he feared ^{not} admitting he downplayed in explaining how Mullen hired Hunt to begin with:

"I think I'm right in recalling that Mrs Helms and Mr. Mullen knew each other, and Mr. Mullen was looking for a writer about that time...Mr. Hunt has a long background of writing ability. That's what he did for ~~at~~ the CIA."

Novel thought that Hunt's ~~spy~~ political spy trash was what he did for the CIA. Or that this is the kind of "writing ability" required by a public relations agency. Or the reality, that a life-long black-arts operator with a side-line in propaganda novels is the ideal man to handle ~~the~~ an account the purpose of which is to ~~attract the interest of the~~

inform the handicapped of the federal programs that could help them.

And that Hunt had been recommended by the CIA's Director? ~~(Helms justified others)~~
before the Watergate committee. He said that
wise, ~~that the personal office of CIA helped place Hunt.~~ (

did not do test of
~~When Helms address this~~ before the Senate Watergate committee August 2, 1973 (8H3232ff)

~~he gave the impression that the CIA's personnel office helped place Hunt.~~ The import is
similar, *was new to* that Hunt had to be placed with Mullen, that he had had no previous connection.
In effect Only Helms ~~was~~ *ed* disassociating ~~himself~~ *ed* from the record Bennett had made of *Helms'* his personal
connection.

Bennett? *told all.*
The fact is that ~~both~~ neither Mullen nor Helms was truthful.
Bennett

~~Mullen~~ was working on his own disassociation. Having said that if Hunt did not
show up on the 20th he would "suspend" him, on the 21st he announced the suspension.
Thereafter he gradually disappeared from the news, as did mention of his agency's name.

~~Disas~~ Disassociation was everybody's problem because everyone connected with Hunt's
project was connected with the crimes and ~~was~~ *could be* criminally liable *on how they trouble*

Hunt knew it and this was his trump.

Everybody else knew that Hunt knew it and this was their worry.

If Hunt talked they were all done in.

But nobody knew if Hunt would talk, so everybody had to be careful until he was no
longer a question mark.

So, everybody was careful and hedged every statement, not to get caught in a lie if
Hunt did talk and not to offend him to provoke him into talking.

Bennett's
Thus ~~Helms'~~ *prudent* statement beginning with, "I think I'm right..." and the Clawson scheme
of confusing the date of the last check issued to Hunt *was* with the last date of his employment *are*
to make it appear *that Hunt* he was without White House connection while he still had an office there
and in fact was still on the payroll. ~~are designed to disassociate Hunt from Nixon and CIA~~

Then press secretary now promoted to close Nixon confidant Ron Ziegler followed
Clawson with one that is an example of Nixonian cuteness with semantics, a hedged statement
with which he got away:

"I don't know where Mr. ~~Hunt~~ ⁿ has been. He's not been in a consulting role with the

the White House for months." (SFE Exam 6/20/72)

Throwing in the verbiage "consulting role" is the key. This enabled Ziegler to lie while seeming not to lie. Hunt had been in his office the day before this story appeared, ^{White House office} the very day of Clawson's deception. And if Ziegler and Clawson didn't know it is only because they didn't ask ^{or they were lied to,} Hunt left a time bomb (behind) and a warning, as we shall see.

KA
These official lies are the Nixonian practise and with The Watergate the only means of his survival. They are not haphazard. They are practised, with full dress rehearsals before performance. The bunch most ^{informed/}involved ^{sometimes} gets together, including Nixon, and they run through all the questions that can come up and how they can lie their way around them. They try to avoid overt lying but when there is no alternative, they lie. But their preference is for semantics, seeming not to lie while having ~~with~~ the intent and the need. ^{and accomplishing the same result.}

On some occasions these dress rehearsals for seeming not to lie were tape recorded. John Dean delivered one that survived to the Senate committee, which published it in facsimile. (3 H 965, 1200-9)

7A
Without Hunt's disappearance ^{disassociation} ~~none of this~~ ^{im} would have been possible. He knew it and ^{White House} they knew it and he and they were never out of contact, despite what appeared in the media. Hunt's moves were not only knowⁿ, there is substantial reason to believe they were directed. Only because there never was any real investigation can there be any uncertainty. In reality I believe there is none.

These are all tough characters. At that moment they were also desperate.

Somehow Nixon had gotten away with the first and vital ~~step~~ move in disassociating himself, but that meant obstructing justice, a crime for him and all involved in it. The first step is like something from a fable. It is the pretense that the caught crime was not Nixon's because Nixon had nothing at all to do with his personal re-election machine, the one he personally established outside the regular, traditional party machine, the Republican National Committee. CREEP was Nixon's baby but he actually ^{pulling out P} got away with pretending they were strangers. So, with this, that caught crime was pinned on CREEP, not him, and the press and politicians stood still for it, actually helping it along with this ^{facit} ~~facis~~ acceptance.

Once ~~the~~ Nixon got away with ^{indirect} indirect lying about Hunt, when the time came the lie was unequivocal. It was also under oath by his man ^{Fred Malek} in charge of converting the machinery, power and money of government and government contracts ^{to} into ^{machinery for} his re-election, ~~Fred Malek~~ ^{Fred Malek}. The initial leak of the Watergate committee's belief Malek had crossed over into crime did not come until ~~the weekend of~~ ^{beginning} Saturday, June 8, 1974, long after that committee's last hearing and without its ever having ~~held~~ ^{ans} held a public hearing on any aspect of that criminality. So, Malek was protected and Nixon was again. Malek was an important figure in The Watergate crimes but ^{he was rarely mentioned by the press,} remarkably little in the papers, even after Nixon shifted him from personal staff to be assistant director of the Office of Management and Budget, ~~after the re-election.~~

^{May 11,} On ~~July~~ ^{July} 25, 1973,

The House Appropriations committee was hold^{ing} hearings on giving Nixon the traditional \$1.5 ~~mil~~ \$1,500,000 for the presidents' "special projects" fund. (Congress finally backed down after initial rejection and gave it to Nixon again.) ^{Hunt} Hunt was ^{paid} paid from this fund.

Asked during the hearing by Democrat Edward R. ^{Roybal} Roybal (right), "Was Mr. Howard Hunt paid out of this fund for special projects on the day ^{that} of the so-called burglary occurred?" Malek said he'd have to check the records and would file a written statement. In it he began with a lie, went to ~~an~~ avoidance, and was allowed to get away with it:

"Mr. E. Howard Hunt was employed by the White House as a consultant from June 6, 1971 to April 1, 1972. In regard to the alleged burglary, this matter is currently under investigation by the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities [The Watergate Committee] and we would prefer not to get into these matters concerning the ongoing Watergate investigation."

Perhaps "June" is an error by UPI, from whose July 25, 1973 story this is quoted. ~~But~~ April 1, which is close enough ^{to} to Clawson's March 29 and far enough from June ~~of~~ 17, is a lie if not perjury.

But nobody, even at that late date, really cared, so the Congress let Nixon get away with it, ~~part~~ still another part of his unimpeachment.

g

...robbed some of the records (34 935)

no records were created (34 1159) John Dooney who fronted for the cover up, "always assumed" is the crime. By then there had been these dress rehearsals for the cover stories. ~~and~~ The

But the ineptness that characterizes everything these revanchist Cubans do made it impossible to hide Hunt. Szulc's part it in succeeded during the most critical period of the improvising of the cover and the disassociation but Hunt's name and White House connection, as all involved knew was inevitable, did come out on the 19th, two days after the crime. By then there had been these dress rehearsals for the cover stories. ~~and~~ The stories were put out and were accepted. This "objectivity" that is anything but objective because it means publishing lies ^{as unquestioned truth} without calling them lies made acceptance possible. It provided adequate cover for all the silent politicians.

After all the deals were set, behind the scenes these tough characters were cutting each other's throats. That also became their survival needs.

Bennett provides a suitable illustration. ^{which} An illustration can help understand what forces were at work in these critical first days of Hunt's disappearance so he could be disassociated and so he could look out for himself.

In documents Dean produced for his Senate Watergate committee testimony there is a memo from Haldeman to him dated January 18, ~~1972~~ 1971 asking for "an inquiry into the relationship between Larry O'Brien and Howard Hughes." O'Brien then had a public relations firm. He was to become Democratic chairman for the campaign. When he took the Hughes retainer he announced it publicly, so it was no secret. The ~~is~~ pretended secret that was not secret was from Nixon's bosom pal ^{Rebozo}, who attributed it to Maheu. "Bebe further indicated that he felt he could acquire some documentation of given a little time."

^{Rationality} "Documentation" can't refer to the public announcement O'Brien had made.

Dean spoke to Bennett, who "felt confident that if it was necessary to document the retainer with O'Brien he could get the documents."

Ma If this is not ludicrous, it is sinister. In the Nixon White House the two were ^{INDISTINGUISHABLE,} often inseparable.

Haldeman's instructions were, "You should keep in touch with Bob Bennett as well as looking for other sources of information...Once Bennett gets back to you with his final report, you and Chuck Colson should get together and come up with a way to leak the appropriate information....However, we should keep Bob Bennett and Bebe out of it at all costs." (Post 11/1/73)

Whether or not this was the beginning of that wild scheme to ^{burglarize} burglarize Greenspun's safe, it shows the real relationship between Bennett and all Nixon's closest and provides a means of evaluating whatever Bennett says. It also shows Bennett's morals and ethics. It was somehow ~~stain~~ evil, if this White House business of O'Brien and Hughes means no more than is on the surface, ~~is~~ for O'Brien and Hughes to have any relationship, no matter how open and normal. But at the same time it is perfectly proper for Bennett to be laundering Hughes secret contributions to Nixon. ^{to have the same relationship and}

With Hunt ~~out~~ out of the way, not available for interviewing or questioning, he was sanitized by the White House, whose real purpose was cleansing itself.

Hunt's ~~initial~~ initial employment date was shifted from July 6 to August, the apparent reason being to hide the fact that he was rushed onto the payroll, before the FBI ~~comp~~ completed its security check. His job was "to help declassify the Pentagon papers," in the words of one syndicated account. It continues, "Clawson said Hunt later contributed intelligence on drug smuggling in the Far East and evaluated other narcotics information for the White House Domestic Council." (CDN 6/21/72)

The papers were entirely uncritical. Thus this and the Mullen story about Hunt's work for the CIA having been restricted to writing were never compared and questions were never asked about their incompatibility.

It had been too risky for Bennett to try to limit the Mullen-CIA relationship to personal acquaintance between Mullen and Helms, so he had let it drop that years ago Mullen had done a small public relations job ^{for the CIA,} for Radio Free Cuba. "Nobody cared about something of which they had never heard, Radio Free Cuba. But if the newspaper libraries had been checked ^{ed} what I quoted from the papers in Oswald in New Orleans would have been apparent, that Radio Free Cuba was part of the CIA Free Cuba Committee and that funding was a secret half-million dollars a year."

Here again is the importance of Tad Szulc's ploy in suppressing what he learned immediately about Hunt, ~~assuming he had no prior knowledge,~~ his dishonest reporting the day after the break-in at Democratic headquarters.

Another journalistic failure encouraged the White House, Bennett, the CIA and all others

These characters are not only tough and desperate, they are totally unscrupulous.

When it became obvious that it was a question of time only before there was some public exposure of the whole Nixon-Hughes stink, Bennett practised "public relations" again. He gave Anthony Ripley of its Washington bureau an interview The New York Times published April 28, 1973. The Senate investigation was then certain, as was further prosecution.

Ripley's story begins with the flat assertion that the Greenspun burglary was "never carried out." But ~~the Times had printed an account of it several years earlier, which embarrassed nobody.~~ 9A1

~~In this interview Bennett said the whole idea was Hunt's and that he had not suggested it:~~

"Hunt told him he had heard through underground channels that Hank Greenspun, publisher of the Las Vegas Sun, had papers in his safe that would be 'very damaging' to Senator Muskie," Ripley wrote.

~~Ripley put it.~~

"You have to know about Hunt," Bennett told him. "He made things up... led me to believe he had instructions he didn't have..."

Ripley lacked curiosity about why White House instruction to Hunt, real or facnied, should have any meaning to Bennett, who supposedly was not connected with anything.

Now this is diametrically opposite Hunt's quoted sworn testimony given ^{later} ~~after this~~. It does relate to a crime and it was within the purview, indeed, the charge, of the Senate's Watergate committee. Why it didn't put Bennett under oath and then have a court testing of ^{whether of them} ~~whether he or Hunt~~ swore falsely and committed perjury - or having one back down and tell the truth - only that committee can - but won't - explain.

Bennett, knowing this, apparently was unworried. Or worried enough to risk it. Or certain of protection.

Extra space

This was false. On May 23 the Times headline read "Greenspun Says Hughes File Was Sought." And the lead, the opening paragraph, has Greenspun "charging" that "a burglary attempt was made..."

However, Bennett accomplished his purposes. He got the story out that it was all Hunt's silliness/ and that he had not suggested it:

involved in the assorted crimes and with Hunt to risk the danger of being caught in covering up. No reporter ever put the available facts together and pursued them or questioned the right people.

All those immediately identified were connected with CIA and the Bay of Pigs. All were also connected with the Nixon campaign organization. ~~Hunt~~ Hunt was connected with ~~both~~ the Cubans, the White House and with Mullen/Bennett.

No questions? None about Bennett's connections with the White House? "one about whether he or Mullen had any older, more recent, current or any kind of CIA connection?

None. Not even when what Szulc suppressed did come out, that Hunt was the CIA's top political operative on the Bay of Pigs.

Hunt really is not that good a spook. He did not hide himself that well. And he left more scent for trailing bloodhounds than a bitch in heat. The tragedy is that there were no bloodhounds.

This tragedy is compounded by the dishonesty of the FBI's investigation and that of all subsequent investigations. Pat Gray, ~~and~~ then acting head of the FBI and one of the victims of The Watergate, and all the top people in the Department of Justice and the local federal prosecutors all combined to limit the case to the simple burglary. Thus in his confirmation hearings Gray testified that no other leads were followed and no orders were given to the agents to follow any. The opposite is true, They were told to stick to the simple case ^{did not go to court until} that went to court after the election, having been stalled that long by Nixon's administration for Nixon's re-election and survival. Nonetheless, it is certain that the FBI learned an enormous amount, particularly later when it was no longer possible to avoid the other and ~~much~~ more serious Nixonian crime. More so when a succession of Congressional committees showed investigatory interest and when the select committee was appointed by the Senate. Committees and their staffs are unpredictable. One maverick could blow everything.

Still further is this tragedy compounded by the character of the Senate investigation. It could not hold the lid on everything, but it did hide as much as it dared. The actual record is quite the opposite of the ~~dream~~ ^{excitement} of seeing all this incredible stuff on live TV. ^{of it} What came out is little that had not already come out. "etails were added but not

1. was all right, was in same way, but probably not directly involved,

much more.

Inherent in this is a covering of the CIA. Congress always does that. There hadn't been a meeting of the ^{Senate's} misnamed "oversight" committee in years. ~~So, there was, and the CIA and Nixon, naturally, knew~~ ¹ there had not been any "oversight" of the CIA for this long¹ period of time. One published account had it from the resignation of the late Senator Richard B. Russell, which was in the late 60s. ¹ These committees of both houses held secret hearings on the CIA's Watergate involvement before the special Watergate committee, early in 1973. But not until Friday, June 7, 1974 did the ¹ Senate vote to approve giving the special prosecutor the transcripts of these hearings and related materials - and then under classified procedures, meaning continuing secrecy. (Post 6/8/74)

What this really ^{means} says is that all the protections, all the institutions of society failed. In their failure lay Nixon's success in being unimpeached.

So, retracing the ^{Hunt} scent after it has vaporized and when ~~it was~~ the trail has been covered by everyone, beginning with Hunt, Bennett, the CIA, the White House, the FBI and police and later the Congress, cannot be done with assurance of completeness, ^{or with certainty,} But to the degree it can be done it should be because ~~it~~ ^{his} disappearance was vital to the central new crime of obstructing justice involving so many ~~from~~ beginning with Nixon and descending through ^{his} the chain of command that initially ¹ did only as expected or ordered.

Hunt gave one version to the uncourious Watergate committee in public. ¹ ~~It~~ ^{He} opted not to ~~go~~ ^{what} into ~~all~~ he told it in secret. ~~and~~ ^{also} Bennett was questioned about it by Duniey. ¹ ~~It~~ ^{He} wanted none of it and ^{again, in secret.}

The limited retracing now possible ¹ serves to illustrate the deliberate avoidance of any full investigation, particularly by the Watergate committee, ~~and~~ ^{with}

^{and put it in my file and Nixon} It is perhaps best begun not at the beginning, but ~~by~~ a duplication of the initial services to ¹ hiding Hunt performed by Tad Szulc in suppressing what he was told the day after the caught crime. ¹⁹⁷²

Hunt, he wrote July 2, in a story published by the Times ³ July 3, "now being sought by the Federal Bureau of Investigation...was reliably reported today to have fled to Europe and possibly to Spain. ¹ This report came from persons close to Mr. Hunt."

^{Mr.} "Persons close to ¹ Hunt" can be anyone, from Szulc's imagination to officials. Whoever

When there had been it was a meaningless formality because ~~and~~ real oversight of a vast intelligence system that is semi-autonomous can't be anything else, because Congress is obsessed with "national security" and keeps the CIA's nasty secrets and because everything is "national security" to the CIA and its semi-captive, overburdened Congressional supposed watchdogs.

After the scandals were a ^{stench} stench in the national nose.

Szulc was quoting was a ~~late~~ liar with a purpose.

Of the few things not in question about Hunt's hegira one is where he was July 3. It was not Spain, not Europe. It was Washington, the city from which Szulc wrote and quoted his anonymous sources.

The only people not deceived by this falsehood are those who really were "close to" Hunt and the FBI and prosecution. The press, whose traditional pursuit of its traditional function here was essential if any of the truth was to come out in time, was the ^{immediate} chief victim of the deception. It would not look for Hunt, especially not in Washington. It would seem to be a fair inference that this was the intent of the deception because officialdom was not deceived.

In this story Szulc managed to cover for the FBI again, saying Hunt "spoke" to its "agents three days after the Watergate raid" but "refused to answer any questions." This also covers the FBI's failure to charge him as an accessory ^{on the 17th} and keep him on tap. It has a long record of doing this with the politically unpopular, jointly with the Department of Justice, which then calls the witness ^{Department's} endlessly before a grand jury. (Trial magazine, 1/72) The/specialists in this were culpable in The Watergate. They were in the Internal Security Division.

So, Szulc, an informed and competent reporter, whether or not he had the deliberate intent, was ^{sheltering} here covering a failure of officialdom, a lack of diligence and a departure from practise that enabled Hunt's flight and all the subsequent obstructions of justice.

Szulc also ^{reported and protected} covered another and a grossly deliberate and incriminating White House lie, ^{obliterating} covering the involvement of the White House in hiding the presence of a "wanted man":

"The White House has not said whether Hunt had access to his office there after he ceased to be a part-time White House consultant."

^{in repeating} Repetition of the official lie, that Hunt had ended White House employment 10 weeks earlier, ^{Szulc made it seem credible that Hunt had left the White House permanently} is not as significant as the hiding of the fact that Hunt had been back to his office more than once, ~~that there is a sign-in procedure and thus a record, and that he had spoken to a number of White House employees and left imperative messages.~~

and physically in fact,

How Szulc alone among ~~all the~~ hundreds of reporters ~~all around the country~~ managed to play these key roles for the Department of Disinformation, (one of Hunt's reported CIA functions and one of his unquestionable ones for Nixon) is as mysterious as it is ~~fact.~~ ^{fact.}

Compared with the best reporting - and all of it was exceptionally accurate - his becomes more conspicuous. Once the Times decided to pay attention to Thw Watergate its work was excellent if incomplete. And the Post's was so exceptionally good and accurate that it deserved the Pulitzer it got. But like the Times, its reporting also was incomplete, largely restricted to a (second agreement) with what some involved official leaked to it.

Conflicts in accounts of where Hunt was and what he did during this disappearance are in themselves important because of the quintessential urgency that he be unavailable. Therefore, the conflicting accounts are presented.

Hunt's Watergate testimony of September 24 and 25, 1973 (9H3662 ff) begins with a prepared statement from which he read as faithfully as the court reporter transcribed the stenographic notes. (I have compared both.) Indirectly, in his prepared statement, he specified that as of the time of the raid he was working for Nixon. However, the point in quoting him directly is to describe his functions as he described them. (p3; 9H3663)

"From the time I began working at the White House until June 17, 1972, the day of the second Watergate entry, I engaged in essentially the same kind of work I had performed for the CIA." (emphasis added.)

The first Watergate entry was on May 27, or after the false White House statements about Hunt's separation from it, the second June 17.

"I was trained in the techniques of ^{physical and} electronic surveillance, photography, document forgery, and surreptitious entry into guarded premises for photography and installation of electronic devices. I participated in and had responsibility for a number of such entries and I had knowledge of many others. To put it unmistakably, I was an intelligence officer - a spy- for the Government of the United States." (p. 2; (h3662).

To put this "unmistakably," Hunt was taking nonchances on any other misrepresentations of his White House or Mullen careers. His most probable motive was to keep the pressure on the deals he had long since made and he was living up to. It was part of his continuing enforcement of these deals.

He followed this immediately with an explanation ~~of~~ and justification of the deals, not leaving that to chance questioning, either:

"When covert operations ~~have~~ by the United States or other nations have been exposed ...not...uncommon... it has been universally the practise for the operation to be dis-avowed and covered up. Usually, this has been done by official intervention with law enforcement authorities. In addition, the employing governments have paid legal ~~fees~~ defense fees. Salaries and family living expenses have been continued. Former CIA Director Helms has testified before this committee in regard to some aspects of this practise."

Hunt's testimony is truthful and without exaggeration. With the CIA it extends to contract ~~rather than~~ ^{as well as} regular, full-time employees. The most convenient illustration, ~~which~~ ^{at the time,} has been well reported, ~~is the~~ ^{is the} ~~paying~~ continuing support of the families of ~~these~~ ^{American} aviators ~~used and~~ lost in the Bay of Pigs. It is done indirectly, ~~but~~ ^{It} is not secret, through the CIA's cover on that operation, the Doubl-Chek corporation. Hunt's claim is legitimate and traditional, with all countries.

When his entire opening statement was less than six pages of ~~is~~ double-spaced, wide-margined typing, it is apparent that his emphasis on these matters he wanted to be certain were in the official record ~~represents~~ ^{reflects} their importance to him. In them aside from his own defense then and in further trials and hearings to come he was ~~making~~ ⁱⁿ end many false cover stories. He was not a writer with CIA but "a spy." His work for the White House was not "consulting" by spying and other dirty tricks. It had not ended before the raids and he made explicit his other ~~criminal acts~~ ^{lawlessness was} were all when he was officially Nixon's agent.

14A He was correct in assuming official lack of interest in large areas of his record. The questioning did not go into ^{and} in fact skipped ^{over} his disappearance ~~as such~~. Counsel Samuel Dash's relevant questioning began with Hunt's last visit to his White House office, in the open daylight of Monday, June 19 (~~9H3691~~) (^{umps} 9H3698) then ~~steps~~ to, "Now, did you hear from Mr. Liddy during this period of time?"

"Toward midday on the 19th I got a telephone call from him at my Mullen Co. office saying that he needed urgently to meet me. We met" on Pennsylvania Avenue and "walked

(In passing, particularly because Hunt is articulate and is a life-long wordsmith, his ~~careful~~ choice of words in, "From the time I began working at the White House" should be noted. Actually, he worked in two offices not "at the White House" but in the Executive Office Building. He never worked at the White House. If this is not dismissed as a careless error, which is even less likely when he prepared it in advance and he and his lawyers went over it ^{carefully} in ~~advance~~, it suggests a distinction between ~~his~~ work for the White House and ~~his~~ work when he was an official White House employee. It is a strong if exceedingly subtle hint that his White House work was not limited to ~~his~~ the time he was officially on its payroll.)

around the block. ...he told me that it was necessary for me to get out of town, that 'they' wanted me to get out of town."

When Dask asked if Liddy identified "they" he dropped it with Hunt's answer, an invitation to pursue it, "Not at that time." This says Liddy did ^{tell Hunt} at another time. In his bobtailing Dask asked, "in fact, you did leave Washington... and did you ultimately go to California?" Hunt agreed.

Instead of asking for explanations Dash testifies for Hunt, "At that time, did you make arrangements to obtain counsel?" Hunt's response is "I obtained local counsel in California, but not Washington counsel."

Nobody seemed interested in asking ^{why} ~~what~~ Hunt went all the way out to California to ^{California} get local counsel only when he would have had no need ^{for} to have local counsel ~~in~~ California had he not gone there to begin with. He could have gone anywhere, could have hidden himself well in or near Washington.

"I was staying at the home of an attorney, an old friend named Morton B. Jackson," Hunt then testified. "Mr. Liddy appeared there unannounced on June 21. I reiterated my request ~~that~~ to him that he or somebody obtain counsel for me in the Washington area. Mr. Liddy gave \$1,000 to me and said, this will help with Jackson."

In what ^{follows} ~~follows~~ Dash asked, ~~if Jackson~~ "did Mr. Jackson refer you to any Washington lawyer?" ~~to which~~ Hunt responded, "In due course, he did." This means not immediately. Jackson ~~re~~ "referred me some time later to two attorneys, neither of whom were known to, I believe, either Mr. Jackson or myself."

This is how Hunt
And ~~thus~~ ~~he~~ engaged ~~William~~ William Bittman, who he first met the night of July 3 in Washington."

Dash, a law professor and former Mr. District Attorney in Philadelphia, was without interest in ^{much} too much. How did Liddy know where Hunt was to "appear out there unannounced?" Why go to California to get a Washington lawyer? Why ask a man who didn't know one ^{for a Washington lawyer} he could recommend? How did Jackson learn about two he also didn't know? Whyd did Liddy go all the way accross the country? All Hunt describes, all he was asked about, could have been done by phone ^{or} and mail, safely. (9H3690) ← 15A

no Liddy did assuage Hunt's concerns about "how counsel fees, living expenses, and so forth, are going to be taken care of" by

Here a series of interrelated facts should be noted. Hunt did not leave Washington for two days. Had he wanted to on his own, he could have. He is well-connected in Washington. He could have obtained a lawyer to his satisfaction during these two days if he believed he would need one - or that one would not be supplied. But he did not leave and he did not engage counsel. This has to mean that he felt no need to leave or for counsel or that counsel would be supplied automatically, the point he included in his opening statement. It also suggests that if he had not been ordered to leave failure to provide counsel made him apprehensive so he left not on the lam but to be unavailable until arrangements that satisfied him were made and he received adequate assurances.

All of this and the reasons should have interested Dash. It didn't. In avoiding it when his professional training and experience should have dictated that he explore it fully and when investigatory curiosity should have prompted diligent questioning Dash avoided the beginnings of the obstructing of justice. It is difficult not to believe that this was a ^{political} ~~legal~~ rather than a legal or investigative decision.

If in leaving Hunt was sending some a message, he testified to prompt response-
in a day ^{from} and across the continent, in person.

are going to be taken care of" by saying "don't worry about that, it's all going to be taken care of just like the company, or the Agency. To me that meant in the traditional CIA or clandestine service fashion." (3694 9H3691)

Dash wanted to cut him off here and did, but Hunt persisted in volunteering more. ^{thru} He asked Liddy, "who is the action officer now?" And he said it is [Robert] Mardian... And I found that encouraging news." Mardian was close to Mitchell and had been Assistant Attorney General in charge of internal security under him. ^{16A} Dash skipped back to Hunt in Washington, ignoring all else about his "disappearance." ^{askung} He avoided even why of all the people he knew Hunt went to Jackson, who could not do what Hunt needed on his own, or even who Jackson is. It is not because Dash didn't know. He could not have conducted even a perfunctory investigation without learning and he ran the committee. The lengthy staff "Witness Summary" prepared for the committee's members ~~gives~~ guidance and information has no breakdown covering Hunt's disappearance and says as little about Jackson as Dash would have let the record ^{show} had Hunt not insisted and volunteered.

Under "Post Break-In" on pages 21-2 there is mention of the visit to Jackson and a foreshortened account of only some of ^{the} less than full ^{account} story Hunt insisted on getting on the record. But no real identification of Jackson. Avoidance must be regarded as deliberate, not only because the investigation required it but because of the ^{"explanation"} unusual account of why Hunt ^{flew 2,500 miles} went to him and how he provided the names of lawyers he did not know.

There are three further references to Jackson in the Hunt testimony, two just casual, in-passing mentions (9H3698; 9H3783.) But that he was not just another friend Senator Howard Baker brought out, (9H3754)†

When he asked, "Did Mr. Jackson have any contact with the CIA?" Hunt told him, "At one time he did." Baker asked, "What was his contact" and Hunt said "He was an undercover agent in Southeast Asia for 2 ^{or} or 3 years."

And there it dropped. Dead.

Established lawyers do not act as plain "undercover agents" in remote areas. [†] It would seem that this had to be part of Jackson's past, probably remote past. And any ^{normal} ordinary contact with any agents from that area, when Hunt was a Latin American and Europe specialist, also would seem to be in his remote past. Maybe not, but it seems logical,

Even though Dash knew from the testimony of many witnesses that Mardian had arranged-
improperly - for FBI reports to be given to Nixon's campaign spies and that he was part ^{Mardian in partial} ~~part~~ ^{command}
of the immediate covering up, he ^{Dash/} again lacked interest and again avoided asking the obvious
questions about this covering up. He knew that prior to the time about which Hunt was
testifying Liddy had ~~seen~~ seen Mardian in utter desperation, paranoically fearful of
what could happen at any minute. Mardian himself had testified to this July 19 and 20, 1973
(6H2345ff). And in his volunteered opening statement he said exactly what Liddy told
Hunt, only in lawyer-like language he preferred to that of the spooks;K

"I would like it in the record that as of the morning of ¹⁹⁷² June 17) I was relieved of
my political responsibilities to the extent possible and charged with the responsibility
of acting as counsel to the committee [CREEP], at least as far as Watergate was concerned."
(6H2347)

"The morning of June 17" is the first possible moment, the moment of the arrests.

Uninterested,

... directly to the Executive
... safe, called Caddy
... before leaving. He
... 1973. He said his safe contained
... and subject
... of the Ellsberg photo
... which Hunt described

... and Mrs. Barker in Miami from
... He then drove to Caddy's
... to call Rafferty,
... for the apprehended

... of his name being
... Lakeland, C. C. He re-
... and called Liddy, who
... to his Executive Office
... and the contents of McCord's
... bugging equipment. He also
... of a personal nature.

... Galvin's secretary, to tell Colson that
... and went to Muller and Co.
... on the corner near the USA
... saying that Hunt should leave
... family in Europe. Forty-five
... but Hunt had
... The newspapers were
... and he spoke to his wife, who said
... she wanted to return from London. He said no, "it will all blow over."

Hunt then called either Liddy or Caddy and said he was leaving for Cal-
ifornia. He then called a friend in California, Morton Jackson, and asked
if Hunt could stay with him for a few days. Hunt left Washington and went
to New York where he worked on Muller and Co. business during the
first of July. From New York he departed for California.

Hunt arrived in California on June 20. Liddy arrived on June 21, came
and gave Hunt \$1,000, and assured Hunt that everything
would be taken care of and a lawyer would be hired to represent him. On
Thursday of that week Hunt went to Florida under an assumed
name to talk to Mrs. Barker and tell her everything would be OK. The
Barker name was surrounded by the press and cameras, so Hunt left,
tried to call but no answer, and flew back to Los Angeles.

Bittman Retained

Hunt stayed in California about ten days, then went to Chicago and stayed with his wife's cousin. A day or two later Mrs. Hunt came to Chicago and stayed overnight, leaving the next day. While in Chicago Hunt called William Bittman, an attorney in Washington whose name had been given to Hunt by Morton Jackson, and asked Bittman whether he would consider representing him in the matter. A meeting was arranged and July 3 Hunt flew to Dulles Airport, met his wife, and they both went to Bittman's home to discuss his legal problems. Bittman was retained and given a \$1,000 retainer by Hunt and Bittman thereupon notified Earl Silbert, the assistant U.S. attorney, of his representation of Hunt

On July 4 Mrs. Hunt informed Hunt of several conversations she had had with Caddy, who had refused to give her a referral for an attorney to represent him, how she went to CRP and demanded to see Paul O'Brien, with whom she had had sharp words and from whom she demanded prompt action on Hunt's behalf.

it was ignored, and it can't be if only because this is the one man in the whole country with whom Hunt hid and consulted. There had to be some reason for Jackson to the exclusion of all others and the distance between Washington and California does not explain/account for it.

This is not the kind of investigation to warrant wearing those "Uncle Sam" T-shirts ^{Smiling} that became the rage after the elderly, respected, ^{eye-brow wobbling, Bible-quoting} constitutional expert who was committee chairman became such a hit on TV. It is the kind of non-investigation that was conducted.

Until this was clear beyond question, Nixon first hid himself from the people and the cameras; then, when he did appear, was nervous, ^{obviously} sweated, and misspoke himself often. He was scared until he received this kind of reassurance about his unimpeachment.

It took months for what Baker was up to to become obvious. He overplayed his hand later and it then became clear that he was playing Nixon's quarterback in a game that began immediately, to blame the break-in on the CIA.

In preparing the members for the public hearing and after extensive secret questioning of Hunt and other witnesses, the staff, under ^{thus lengthy statement, with only} Dash's direction, typed up ¹ (about 600 words to explain all of Hunt's "post break-in" activities and connections. In the penultimate paragraph there ^{is} was a line and part of a line, beginning after the word "Hunt", that was masked by putting a piece of paper over what it was ~~not~~ desired to hide. Whether the hiding was from the official source from which I obtained it or by it to hide from me I do not know. In context the one thing that seems entirely impossible is the committee's hang-up on Nixon's ~~false~~ oft-repeated false pretense of "national security." In a sentence dealing with Hunt's retaining of ^{Bittman} counsel and ^{Bittman's} counsel's contact with the prosecutor, this has to be impossible!

111- facsimile fols., attached. (212)

^{overly-busy} This is a remarkably elliptical presentation for United States Senators to use as the basis of their work in one of history's most important investigations. It hardly prepared them for so historic a task that was so fundamental to any serious inquiry and to any kind of decent society under representative government.

In time, all the ellipsis will become clear.

Caddy is Michael Douglas Caddy. Rafferty is Max Rafferty, another lawyer Caddy phoned.

17B fols

178

Caddy was Hunt's friend, emergency counsel and not a criminal lawyer. O'Brien was counsel to CREED. Why would neither help Hunt get the best criminal lawyer available? Surely not because they wanted ~~so~~^{so} critically-important a figure not to be adequately represented, or because they wanted to run any unnecessary risks for Nixon and the CREEP.

available information

The only reasonable answer is that they knew the ~~arrangements had been made~~^{or would be.} From any ~~accounting~~, they did not know from Hunt's end. If this is the explanation, their knowledge had to come from another source.

He hadn't even told his wife!

This statement and Hunt's testimony where they duplicate makes one wonder about some of what Bennett told reporters about being out of contact with Hunt. It repeats that

Hunt did not hide immediately. He didn't even leave for New York for two days.

He was in his ~~various offices, including~~ White House and Mullen offices, publicly, on Monday the 19th, the day he walked on busy Pennsylvania Avenue quite openly with Liddy.

He may or may not have done any actual work for Mullen in New York on the 20th, but if he also arrived in Los Angeles the same day, it was close to midnight ^{and had done} of he ~~did~~ very little Mullen "work."

Liddy could not have guessed ^{in whose} where of the millions of homes in the United States

^{There} Hunt was, so he had to have had some way ^{to} (not of interest to this committee of knowing) "witness statement" ^{has} Hunt not telling any one, if the staff and ^{to} ash knew, they kept it secret from the Senators.

^{he had to have known the press would be all around it} Whether or not Hunt actually went to Miami ^{to} comfort Mrs. Barker we will never know, but he could have done it easier and safer by phone, and with an alias he might ^{"forget"} not remember ^{This story could} it might be impossible to check out. It does, however, provide an excellent cover for other travel, and there is reason to believe there was another trip and that it should have been of utmost interest ⁱⁿ to any real investigation.

This staff memo was prepared long after the unnamed "wife's cousin" ^{and her husband, Mc Harold Carlstead, were} was a public figure. Not mentioning ^{the name} ^{giving} ^a ~~it~~ and not putting it ~~in~~ context is also not consistent with fully informing the Senators for their historic and difficult task. It is consistent with the intent to suppress, as also will become clear.

Adding ^(all this up) is simple arithmetic. ^{Bennett} Nobody wanted the truth to come out and ~~almost everybody didn't~~. The White House and ~~Mullen~~ and the various investigators didn't. Mullen and the White House lied repeatedly and deceived endlessly about an event that was indispensable to obstructing justice, which resulted in Nixon's unimpeachment. The press and the Congress and the prosecutors and the rest of the executive ~~branch~~ ^{branch} ~~outside the White House~~ was part of covering up for Nixon ~~as~~ failed in its obligations.

The immediate purpose was hiding Howard Hunt. The end product was protecting Nixon at the cost of the rest of the country.

But ~~is~~ is not the full story, nor is it the full story of the still-mysterious Robert Foster Bennett, son of the ultra-conservative Senator who was Nixon's friend and whom himself had to have been well known to Nixon from Nixon's Senate days if not ~~secret~~ otherwise. In blackmailing the White House, Hunt used the right word. It is "Seamy."