

Reynold 3/25/74 - Wilson felt that Dean
Hess or asked him 3 times when the
last payment was made to Hess's
lawyer - This had to be before
3/21/73 because payment was made
then. And why did Nixon
ask Wilson when Dean was
hounding it with Howard
Thurston told story Wilson told H. J. Ted
That when Nixon at Bay Biscayne,
learned of arrests he threw ashtray
across room.

See "Impacts of Highway IV"
Part 7/25/74
W 3 g 1, W 1, g 2

E. H. Lehmann's secret taping of Mitchell 4/14/73, H. Jack Robbins
Post 7/12/74, #32

As George Lardner, Jr., wrote in The Washington Post of July 12 in ~~his~~ its review of the thousands of pages of its evidence just released by the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment evidence, thousands of documents "show no snippet of information was so trivial that it failed to command top-level attention."

Nothing need in passages except detail of FBI to work already known

KO Wm 5/13 obvious paying p11: 3/13
H Hunt not W/g 1/2
A "all the relevant evidence" p17
MO pt in May 2/10 withheld p17 H/g
2/21 report Leonard E + H to H " "

4/15 - Dean - see exp hwy
KO 9/15/72 (20) "2 w/4 guys" from the copy
C 2/28/73 (20-1) when spoke of any thing
H (23) puts in Hunt

KO 3/13/73 (23) The main thing, of course, is to violate the President - 14
KO know of it/track down
KO 3/21/73 (24) Dean under question about do university etc
H cover up of fresh money (25 with H)
H recommendations Will I can deal
(27) Pay Hunt "damn son" (also see Wm. Paid 4/26
Clemency

KO all "not security" faking
O Plan not to remain
? Hunt must kill "get a bad rep" - 14
KO Cover up - H to R - do some thing of E + H killed

? (3) H was to tell Dean he had a "brown man" only once
? H was to tell Dean he had a "brown man" only once
! GL always told everyone to tell the truth!
! Inside up story on Dean report - 2 copies each, GL copies

4/11 (32) - on fresh money scheme
O 33 E + H full scale who I know of fresh money
O 4/17 Put us on guard w/ E + H committee on "Plan"
O 3/13 FBI agents had idea for collecting info on security
? 3/21 through to New York

Why does he engage in acts based on what
Congress can vote impeachment? Only because
what the prof would show, would guarantee
impeachment. Criminal acts

Official falsification necessarily characterized all statements about the "plumbers" and about the Ellsberg break-in. "Nobody was about to admit burglary was Nixon's White House policy any more than anyone was about to acknowledge that he sought to defame those he didn't like with contrived materials and planted stories. But getting the facts was not easy and learning truth was impossible. The White House made it impossible. Given a rudimentary understanding of what had really happened, it is apparent that the only alternative was full confession. This could mean only resignation so it was impossible.

In their column of December 20, 1973, conservative columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak (~~filed property~~) gave three illustrations of refusal to answer simple questions about this:

"Unable to get in a question during a presidential session with Republican congressmen on Nov. 16, Rep. Charles Whalen of Ohio wrote Mr. Nixon a letter asking specific questions about operations of the notorious White House plumbers. Apart from a routine acknowledgement, Whalen has received no reply

"...At a session between the President and Republican senators Nov. 14, Sen. Charles Mathias of Maryland requested justification of the plumbers. Mr. Nixon promised to send him one, but nothing has been received.

"...On Aug. 15, the President asserted he first learned on March 17, 1973, about the 1971 plumbers' burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office. When we asked from whom Mr. Nixon learned the fact, presidential lawyers and the White House Press Office declined to answer. With the advent of "Operation Candor" we hopefully renewed the query"

but received no reply.

There were many reasons - urgent needs - to cut off at Liddy, as Sean testified. During the official proceedings and earlier, through leaks, many of these came to light. Without doubt, all were immediately known to the White House and its surrogates. The first and foremost problem was to begin disassociation of the White House. Because the first link to it came because of Hunt's incredible carelessness compounded by that of his Cuban honcho Barker, the very first disassociation had to be from Hunt.

This was not easy when Hunt was then a White House employee, a very special White House employee. There was no honest way in which this could be accomplished, so it was done with such deception that it can be called a deliberate lie. That lie was so successful that throughout the Ervin hearings, that Senator and others, when they had occasion to refer to Hunt, called him a "former" White House employee. When the committee delayed until an afterthought during his testimony, it went unnoticed that he swore he was still working for the White House at the time of the break-in.

The first of the more serious of the unending chain of linked crises that the White House had to face was this central fact, that its employee, its special consultant in spookery, was caught in if not apprehended at the scene of the overt crime. It had limited choices. It dared not acknowledge Hunt's connection with Nixon, so it plotted how to lie while minimizing the possible cost of getting caught lying at the very outset of what it had to have expected to be a long siege.