

Your marking of the LATimes story in SFChron 9/1/73 on the alteration of the date in the Nixon land-sale documents, which I also had forgotten, has the obvious meaning that the story cites, shifting dubious tax credits back to a year in which it enable GL to ~~gyp~~ a little more.

However, I suggest that it also has another meaning, that this whole business was improvised to defraud the government out of that and perhaps other taxes.

From the reasons given earlier for the sale of the San Clemente land there was no need to delay the deal until so late in the year that GL knew the capital-gains tax rate was going to go up.

Accepting the official story as true, they didn't agree until November 15, and they then decided arbitrarily that they would sign the deal December 15.

But they don't arrange for a survey until 12/28/70?

There never was any such land sale!

Had any agent of a y kind been in on the arrangement, the survey would have been arranged immediately because it is basic to the deal. The property sold must be defined in the contract. The contract can't be drawn until the survey is completed. Prior to this there can be an understanding only.

With an average citizen, this 12/28/70 date added to the request of the surveyor that he alter the records to date the completion of his survey to two weeks before he could have begun it when there was money involved would be considered and charged as conspiracy and fraud and intent to defraud.

The dates of surveys and of the signing of contracts never coincide because the survey must come and be completed first. So, there is no possibility of the innocent explanation, the alteration was just to make a neat package.

Several times I have referred to Nixon's cannibalizing of others and to the fact that this is so basic to his character and career that early in my writing, so the overall story could be credible to the average reader, I had a chapter on this cannibalizing.

Yesterday or the day before I made the some kind of reference to Ehrlichman.

This reminder includes DeMarco.

The question is how long will this long list of victims take the rap? For GL, that is.

I simply can't be believed that each and everyone one of these people did what he did only on his own initiative.

The date on which the land sale was consummated for tax purpose was utterly immaterial to DeMarco, as was whether or not the dates were neat and orderly, as they ordinarily never are and can't be.

He is a lawyer. he knew there was at least the possibility of criminality. Why should he run any risk for no apparent need?

The answer is the same as in every other case. Nixon's interest only was served. And as in every other case, that interest was in crooked money.

In each case it seems to have been a lawyer. This is normal because lawyers handle these kinds of deals. So, there is a long and growing list of lawyers who for no apparent reason and no personal gain engaged in acts that range from the dubious at best to the overtly criminal at worst.

To date I don't know of a single clean deal involving money on which Nixon ever engaged in his entire lifetime. And this is the kind of thing that prosecutors do use in court against ordinary citizens. In my writing I traced this back to his Navy days, when he took money from the corpotation he was supposed to be investigating. (In fact, he was part of college-day crookedness in a break-in of the dean's office.) But to date no public figure and no writer has had the courage to report this.

No fabled emperor ever worse such clothes!