

Crime for Nixon Does Pay

The one characteristic of all Watergate investigations is inadequacy.

Not incompetence because all the official investigators and the media were competent. Baker and his staff, for example. They were competent, they knew what they were doing and what they did served their objective, which was the opposite of investigating.

The inadequacy of reporters' investigations enabled the Bakers to get away with their fake investigations.

Much that could have been investigated with ease wasn't investigated at all.

The strangest of these failures to investigate is the crash of United Airlines Flight 553, a Boeing 737 jet carrying 59 passengers from Washington, ultimate destination Omaha, about a mile and a half from touchdown at Chicago's Midway field.

It was the afternoon of ~~Friday~~^{Friday} ~~December~~^{December} 8, 1972, a nasty day. Ceiling was 500 feet. The jet has just come down through it when it lost power within view of many people and crashed into the homes near 71st Place and Lawndale Avenue. (NYTimes 12/9/72, etc.) Witnesses agreed and investigation established that at an elevation of a little over 300 feet the plane's nose went up, its tail came down and with its powerful engines roaring in impotent futility it settled into a block of homes and burst into flames.

The initial reports (AP 12/9/73; NYTimes 12/9/73) identified two celebrities only among the victims, two popular blacks, ^{GBS'} Michele Clark, ~~anchorwoman~~ first anchorwoman of a major network TV newscast, and Democratic Representative George W. Collins, both of Chicago.

Not until later was the body of Dorothy Wetzell Hunt identified.

That crash, which brought tragedy and the beginning of fulfillment of a life-long ambition to Howard Hunt - he became a rich man by it and blackmail - was surrounded by mysteries that linger.

They need not haunt but they do, in part from official secrecy, in part because the real circumstances were a combination of the unusual, and in very large part because

the crash that took the life of the wife of Nixon's chief spook in residence loaned itself admirably to the commercialization of a Chicagoan with a capacity for self-promotion that was equalled only by his need for it.

Sherman Skolnick started what it was not below Charles Colson to pick up when he planted his stories with Bugger Bast. Colson said it sounded paranoid but he really believed the CIA assassinated Dorothy Hunt. To Skolnick nothing is paranoid because paranoia is the norm of his beliefs. He has become a Chicago character who until then was treated with respect by the Chicago press. With this crash he launched a series of exploits that kept him on the front pages. His inventions ranged from staging his own kidnapping to seeing the impossible, a mystery-man parachuting from the crashing plane from less than 500 feet up, closing the door behind himself and disappearing forever after injecting ~~cyanide~~ cyanide into the pilot and, as Skolnick has it, causing the crash.

The attention his ravings received from coast-to-coast, in the papers and on countless talk shows, forced a ~~new~~ re-investigation of the crash that to all but the Skolnicks established that pilot error was the cause. One of the effects was to help United Airlines because the second investigation concluded it was not negligent, and multimillion-dollar suits had been filed against it. Another effect was to mask the real mysteries, to cloak the hiding of evidence that could have ~~in~~ changed all Watergate developments that early in the scandal.

Nixon is deep in Skolnick's debt.

The actual conditions of that crash are unusual and did provoke suspicion. Everything that should never happen did. The plane was too low and had reduced ^{speed} ~~power~~ too much to tower presence ahead of it follow/instructions to abort the landing because of the ~~landing~~ of a small Aero Commander Veteran pilot Wendell L. Whitehouse private jet. ~~The pilot~~ over-corrected, making the loss of power inevitable. His last words, recorded, were "I'm sorry." Midway lacks modern electronic safety equipment but nearby O'Hare airport, one of the world's busiest, had the 737 on its radar, lost the blip, and thought nothing of it until until asked by phone about 10 minutes later. ^{determination} The conclusion of the pre-Skolnick National Transportation Safety Board's investigation (ChiTrib 9/25/73),

later reaffirmed in greater detail (separate file, many clippings) is that the pilot's "failure to exercise positive flight management during the execution of a nonprecision approach which culminated in a critical deterioration of airspeed into the stall regime where level flight could no longer be maintained" was the cause.

The initial coroner's report gave ^{1st and 2nd quantities of cyanide} as the cause of death of ~~10~~ ⁴⁵ of the ~~75~~ victims. There was also much smoke inhalation. It and the cyanide came from the burning of foam rubber that is used in the plane despite the certainty that on burning it generates cyanide. (Post 1/19/73)

The official cause of Dorothy Hunt's death is "Extensive burns." (Death certificate) So said Coroner's Physician Francis J. Anuszeski (right) in the death certificate he ~~did not sign until~~ signed December 13, which was also the day Mrs. Hunt was buried in St. Gabriel's cemetery at Potomac, Maryland, where she had lived. But it was not until November 21 of the next year that Coroner Andrew J. Toman put his signature on the death certificate. Or at least so the certificate copied for me November 26, 1973, says. Official registration of the death was not until November 24, 1973. The delay of almost a year provokes curiosity.

Two days before the funeral and three days after the crash Hunt, who had been hiding from the press, gave the New York Times an exclusive interview. By then the \$10,000 of "investment" money in cash had been found in his wife's purse. He poor-mouthed because he had been unemployed for six months, hiding the fact that Nixon had been paying him fantastic sums and that he also received \$20,000 a year in retirement pay. Hunt would not describe the "investment" nor would he say why it was to be in cash, in \$100 bills like all that CREEP money. But Harold J. Carlstead, husband of Mrs. Hunt's cousin Phyllis, a well-to-do certified public accountant, said "it might appear strange" only "without knowledge of the facts."

"If you were going to take \$10,000 to Chicago you wouldn't take it in cash, would you," he said. I wouldn't either, but everyone does things a little differently."

The courts thought it was strange enough to refuse to give the money to Hunt, who had flown to Chicago. (NYTimes 12/12/72)

If the cash, strange or not, was to be invested- and it was to have been invested by

Certified Public Accountant Carlstead himself - why he and Hunt were so reticent about explaining the investment does seem strange. Not until the following April was an "explanation" made, against by Carlstead. This was after Hunt had entered a guilty plea, after he had received the last blackmail payment known to have been paid him, and after McCord had told judge Sirica of hush-money payments and of perjury and other crimes. By then explanations were needed, because Hunt also was appealing his conviction.

It was, of course, a cover story.

Mrs. Hunt, as the Watergate hearings showed, was paying off the defendants to keep their mouths closed.

Nixon admitted it and did not edit his knowledge of it out of his tapes when he released transcripts.

McCord ~~xxxxxxx~~ was the first to tell this story. His grand jury (NYTimes, Chi Daily News, 4/9/73; testimony was leaked. (Post 4/10/73) He was ~~xxx~~ getting \$3,000 a month from her and each of the Cubans \$1,000, he testified. CREEP counsel Kenneth W. Parkinson, later and in a second account "totally and completely false." CDN 4/27/73) indicted, described the reports as "absolutely false." His partner, ex-CIA man Paul O'Brien, was the middleman on the payoffs and is an unindicted co-conspirator. But the previouslt-cited testimony of Tony Ulasevicz and others, including Hunt. left no doubt.

Mrs. Hunt was the bagwoman.

Carlstead, however, had this fake cover story of the "investment" to which he added phoney specification after McCord's testimony that she was paying the defendants off was published.

Carlstead' story is that he had told Mrs. Hunt by phone that it would cost \$10,000 to buy a Holiday Inn franchise."But by the time she left for Chicago, it had gone up to \$15,000." He also called reports this was a "cover story" to hide secret income as "ridiculous." (UPI in SFExam 4/28/73) ~~xxxxxx~~

Carlstead, who was waiting at the airport, for the plane that never arrived, told the same story to the Chicago Daily News. Philip J. O'Connor's story, naming no source, reports that prior to her death Mrs. Hunt had said her lawyer "urged" the "unts" to invest some money to create 'some ostensible source of income' as a cover for their

5
high standard of income."

Carlstead had started this cover-story operation the moment she died. The Chicago Sun-Times of December 10, 1972, quotes him as saying "she wanted to see him about a personal matter and that the money was related to their discussion." *This soon developed into*

The obvious inference is that "Mrs. Hunt" was laundering payoffs to the Miami Cubans through Chicago where the only people she is known to have ~~known~~ ^{have been intimate with} are the Carlsteads. It didn't come out until the crash, but the FBI had interviewed Carlstead earlier.

He thus becomes the object of some interest. Private, dependable Chicago sources identify him as active in conservative Republican politics, in Bloom Township. His home is at 2245 Evans, in posh Flossmoor, a southern suburb. His CPA business is in the Ashland Building, 21200 Ashland Avenue, Chicago Heights, "he is said to own this building and to have substantial interest" in at least two Holiday Inns."

A lawyer whose locker is close to Carlstead's at the Flossmoor Country Club describes Harold and Phyllis Carlstead as enjoying "excellent reputations" in their community. One of their sons is a junior golf champion.

Eight days after the crash two Chicago papers had stories linking Carlstead to earlier FBI investigations. The Chicago Sun-Times' Scott Jacobs, reported that it was in June, 1972, when both Hunts were visiting the Carlsteads, that "Hunt received a call from an attorney somewhere in the Los Angeles area." Writing from Washington in the Chicago Tribune Jim Squires, repeats that Carlstead could not identify this attorney other than as "some California attorney." ^{Both reporters} ~~Jacobs~~ conjectured the attorney might be Segretti or Kalmbach. Squires added, "Carlstead said ~~that~~ FBI agents visited a relative in California and interrogated her about Carlstead's association with Hunt... "That's why I think they were tapping my phone. They knew all about my telephone calls."

Actually, the FBI merely traced phone bills.

~~(The Squires story contains a development of the "investment" cover story: "I didn't even know she was bringing the money until Mr. Hunt told me when he arrived here after the crash. However, I was planning an investment in the near future and I had talked to Mr. and Mrs. Hunt about it several times in the past...way before the Watergate mess," in August 1971.)~~ *(Chi Trib 12/14/72) Despite this cover,*

91 The FBI had no trouble tracing Hunt because he was careless, ~~about phones~~ not always using pay phones. Besides, from Bennett and others in Washington, there is little doubt the FBI learned of Jackson before the first Carlstead interview (They interviewed him about the \$10,000 before he spoke to Squires.) This means the FBI and thus the entire prosecution knew what we have already seen, that Hunt had gone to see Jackson, who was not the kind of lawyer he needed, and there was then this side trip to Mexico, where the money had been laundered, following which Hunt went to the Carlsteads, where he met his wife for the first time since her return from European vacation. ~~The Bennett story is that it was while Hunt was with the Carlsteads~~ Jackson had to have known where Hunt was going when Hunt left his sanctuary. It appears that he phoned Hunt to give him Bittman's name. Immediately after this call, Hunt returned to Washington, after his wife, and that night met with Bittman for the first time.

This means that to the FBI and to the prosecutors Hunt's non-disappearance was a non-mystery and that the pursuit of the Mexican connection was an obvious need. We know that Jackson was interviewed and was a witness before the grand jury. Other investigations, pretending perplexity over this Hunt "disappearance," did not use Jackson or Carlstead as witnesses. But they should have been ^{if only} because of the highly suspect circumstances that led Hunt to Bittman or all attorneys in Washington, from that firm that had done CIA work and with just the right Chicago connection.

The non-investigating included Mrs. Hunt, who was working for CIA in its Paris office when ~~he~~ she and Howard met and were married. (NYpost 8/15/73) Tad Sculz says he had had an earlier marriage to a Spanish count. ~~It was~~ The Foreign Affair, perhaps the most autobiographical of Hunt's novel, written as "John Baxter," the hero, Michael Prentice, fell in love with the widow of a Spanish count who lost his life fighting with Franco's Blue Legion against the USSR in World War II.

After the scandals became public, Mrs. Hunt was fired from a useless job at the Spanish Embassy. Eleven years of it as a "speech writer." Betty Beale quoted the ambassador (SFChron 8/12/73) as saying "when I gave her my first speech in Spanish she said she was very sorry she couldn't translate. She could only improve English." He added, "That lady

is of no use to me. I really didn't understand why she was hired." He gave her a month's notice.

When the New York Post's John Lang (8/15/73) asked the Embassy about her and reminded them of reports of her CIA past and that of her husband, a spoke spokesman said, "It's strange we didn't know more about her."

This is not because Hunt was unknown in Spain, where he had served CIA.

The Embassy's ~~xxx~~ nervous "explanation" is "sloppy security on our part. She was here so long we probably took her for granted." (NYP Post 8/15/73)

"Strange" it also is that neither the full Watergate committee nor the CIA-chasing Baker subsidiary had any interest in this whole affair of Dorothy Hunt and the \$10,000. One there was the testimony that she handled the paying off of McCord and the Cubans through Nixon's campaign money passed by Kalmbach through Uslaewicz that was it. But as with the Mexican connection, this Chicago connection was ~~ignores~~ ignored.

There were a few news stories, fed by minor mysteries, like her purse also containing neuro-surgeon and a the name of a psychologist/hypnotist who died mysteriously off Saint Lucia when the boat in which he sailed just disappeared without a trace. (Sun-Times 12/10/72) The neurosuregon had no record of her as a patient. The files of the psychologist also hold no record..

One of the bills - one with a number beginning 007 - had a note, "Good luck. FS." These are the initial of Frank Sturgis-Fiorini, who had Hunt's ~~xxxx~~ CIA-supplied "Edward Hamilton" passport when arrested. (Sun-Times 12/12/72)

Hunt's explanation, issued through his literary agent rather than his lawyer, is that she had a painful back injury but didn't consult either man because exercises eased the pain. (Post 10/9/73)

In all these titillating irrelevancies all the relevant was lost. The relevant had to do with the source and destination of the money and with what happened to her estate.

^{in July 1974 had}
The day Hunt's suit against United Airlines was to have been heard, ~~July~~ 1974, the serial numbers of ~~xxxx~~ that mystery money and other hidden information were obtained for me. (The suit was postponed a month.) By the time of this suit, in which Buckley

(Chi.Today 12/4/73)

joined as administrator of the estate, looking out for the interest of the children, everybody had forgotten about the mystery money and about the estate and what investigation showed to be unusual and ~~was~~ also officially ignored transactions.

Perhaps it is immaterial but it is provocative, ~~is~~ ^{that} in these officially unreported and apparently uninvestigated aspects of the mysteries ~~of~~ following Dorothy's Hunt's death there are other facets of Watergate scandals. Two/~~the~~ ^{in particular} reader may want to keep in mind ~~are~~ ^{xxx} that Kalmbach, Nixon's personal attorney and his agent in collecting and dispensing bribe money, was also counsel to United Airlines, which hired Dwight Chapin when Nixon dared not keep Chapin on longer as his appointments secretary. This is the Chapin of the Segretti operations, Segretti's White House connection. And financier Robert Vesco, who employed a Nixon brother and nephew, gave \$200,000 in cash that was put in the CREEP safe from which Watergate money came. Attention was focused on the Mexican laundry. But even after this Vesco money was testified to before the Watergate committee and sworn testimony placed it in that safe for Watergate use, nobody paid any attention to it.

However, if Vesco money was used in any Watergate crime, it involved the Nixon family, which handled it, in that crime.

The Chicago Daily News carried a picture in its editions of Tuesday, December 12 showing Coroner Toman counting the money. The accompanying story reports that "The FBI Monday began an investigation to try to determine the source of the \$10,585 and if the money had a role in the Watergate incident."

The Toman picture was staged. The money was inventoried by others. One gives an account other than the FBI's customary self-portrayal as on top of everything. In his account when the FBI evinced no interest in the Dorothy Hunt property he phoned the FBI and they went ~~uninterested~~ to the corner's office, seeming to be indifferent. Generally in political matters the FBI siezes all the evidence, which gives them control over it.

If the FBI had really wanted "to determine the source" it should have had no trouble. Sixty-three of the 100 \$100 bills were from the New York Federal Reserve Bank, which coincides with Vesco's upper New Jersey address before he fled, first to the Bahamas and

then to Costa Rico.

What makes this more interesting is ~~that distribution of the Federal Reserve~~
16
this is not true of any of the smaller bills Mrs. Hunt carried. Except for the \$1
bills, which show five different areas of origin, none carried the "B" designation of
the New York Federal Reserve.

The New York Federal Reserve Bank keeps no records of bills issued lower in denomination
than \$500. However, there are no banks anywhere where the withdrawal of \$200,000 in
cash would not be remembered if not recorded. The Vesco contribution, in cash and made
April 10, 1972, three days after the law required reporting, was not reported. Edward
Nixon also confirmed that it was in cash. ~~(NY Times)~~ (Post 2/28/73) So did New Jersey
lawyer Harry L. Sears, who headed New Jersey CREEP, who delivered this lode to Stans.

With all the investigations of Vesco it is not possible that he had a bank account
that was not located. Nor is it that if these investigations did not disclose how he
obtained that \$200,000 in cash there would have been no federal interest, particularly
by the Internal Revenue Service, which could have put a tax bite on Vesco if he could
not account for so exceptionally large a chunk of cash.

If there was any secret about the source of this Nixon cash it can be only because
Nixon's government wanted the source to be secret. Nixon did, personally, know that this
\$10,000 was hush-money and that Mrs. Hunt took it to Chicago, as John Dean told him,
to "pass it on to somebody there for a "Cuban committee." (Tape of 3/21/73) Nixon had
correctly told Dean, "The put that under the cover of a Cuban committee." (Tape trans-
script 3/21/73). Hunt's great and good friend Manuel Artime handled the money and the
Cuban committee.

The FBI appeared to be no more interested in anything else connected with Mrs. Hunt.
As a result, the records are no longer complete. Much is not accounted for in the coroner's
files, which never had an explanation of what happened to her luggage. The record sheet
has no listing for it. Nor does it even account for all of her jewelry.

She did have all the money in her purse. Inside she had two red wallets. The
larger wallet held the \$10,000, separated into bundles of 10, and her checkbook, which

had 13 unused checks and showed she and Howard had \$3,254 in their joint Riggs National Bank account. The smaller wallet held ten \$40 bills, two \$20s, 2 \$2 \$10s, a \$5 and a \$2 bill and sixteen \$1s.

Records of the notes, including of the medical men, no longer exist. It is recorded that she was wearing a black coat, of which fragments were recovered, a brown sweater, a brown wig, a white blouse (St. Thomas) and a Sears bra (38B).

One of her rings had four slanted rows of diamonds, three in each row, inscribed inside "Sept 7, 1940". It was 14 carat gold. Another is described as of yellow metal with her initial, DLH, inscribed inside "semper fidelis". A yellow bracelet was adorned with a Uruguayan coin. Of the two remaining bracelets one had four charms, each with the name of one of her four children, Le Lisa, Kevin, David and St. John.

For some reason, there came a time when her file was separated from that of the other crash victims.

No explanation was given for not releasing this money to Hunt after the crash. Nor was there an explanation when it was rlea released January 18, 1973. It did not then go to Hunt immediately. It went instead to Michael B. Nash, a lawyer who had been ~~xxxxxx~~ an Assistant United States Attorney in Chicago when Bittman was. Nash's office is at 105 West Adams Street. He put this money in his escrow account in the Beverly Bank and issued Check No. 151 to Hogan ⁴ and Hatson Hartson, Attorneys. The date on the check is January 24, 1973, the amount \$10,585.36. He mailed it ~~with this letter~~ to Bittman with a covering letter ^{dated} the next day.

The delay of eight days coincided with the ending of the trial in Washington. Two Hogan ⁴ and Hartson partners, neither Bittman, signed the check over to Hunt, who countersigned it. ~~But it was not~~ But it was not ^{ed} deposited ~~it was~~ in the Riggs bank until February 2, after the trial was over. He then failed to account for it as his wife's executor.

In her will of August 3, 1967, Mrs. Hunt designated Howard both executor and sole beneficiary. She used a standard printed form, witnessed by three suburban Maryland women. If Hunt did not survive her, then her estate was to go to her children, and she wanted him replaced as executor by William E. Buckley, Jr., Wallach's Point, Stamford, Connecticut. Old friend of CIA spooking days, Bill Buckley.

Substituting a check for each of learning the source of this cash, except by the FBI. It amounts to an effort to eliminate any possibility of identifying the remainder.

Hunt's first accounting of the estate, notarized and filed March 16, 1973, listed as her sole assets this \$585.36 in cash, \$60 ~~refund~~ from Allegheny Airlines ~~from~~ as "refund airline ticket", \$440 in travellers' checks, and \$170.34 as "Third National Ban & Trust Co. Savings Account." Funeral expenses alone greatly exceeded this. The undertaker's bill was \$2,697.48.

Hunt was a convicted felon and under Maryland law not eligible to serve as ^{an} executor of the estate. Moreover, despite the reputation of prestigious Hogan and Hartson, Montgomery County, Maryland, recorder of deeds Winifred E. Scott was not satisfied with the accounting. She wrote Judge Ralph G. Shure on April 17 itemizing the deficiencies and telling him the \$10,000 was not accounted for: (use facsimile) Two days later the judge wrote Wash, with carbons to Buckley, Hogan & Hartson and The Travellers Indemnity Company. The judge wanted a "satisfactory accounting." (facsimile). Under date of April 24 Wash sent the judge a xerox of the cancelled check. ^{still} The judge was

This got things going again. Dated May 23 Sara-Ann Determan of Hogan & Hartson personally handed Mrs. Scott a Final Accounting described as "amended as agreed upon during a recent conference between Judge Shure" and another Hogan & Hartson partner. not satisfied. On May 3, the day he appointed Buckley as Hunt's successor he wrote Mrs. Scott that he would not "discharge" Hunt or approve his accounting until he was satisfied that inheritance tax had been paid on all the assets. He noted also that in sending the check xerox, Wash listed it as "For Estate of Dorothy L. Hunt." In this second accounting, approved the \$10,000 and the \$585.36 are lumped together with an usual explanation: facsimile.

Thus Hunt still did not account for the mysterious \$10,000 plus her \$585.36. He could lay claim to the money or "others" might. Like CREEP.

To these strange transaction must be added still another. The Annotated Code of Maryland requires the executor of an estate or "personal representative" to be a resident of the state so that legal papers may be served or, if an out-of-state person, the designation of someone who can accept legal papers within the jurisdiction of the State's courts.

Hogan & Hartson made ~~xxxxxxx~~ filed a letter "indicating steps they are taking to have Mr. William R. Buckley named substitute executor." Across the bottom of Mrs.

12

memo of March 9 Judge Shure ~~wrote~~ noted that with Hunt's resignation "we are without a personal representative. Note - Mr. Buckley is a non-resident. The judge underlined "non-resident."

With this as background, Wash's letter of January 25 to his old friend Bittman can be better understood: fascimile.

There remains a mystery about who Junior Bowman of the "small pin" not recorded in Chicago may be, as there may be no more than an innocent explanation having no connection with a former ~~Hunt~~ CIA ^{man} friend whose name is spelled differently but pronounced the same way. Hunt failed to enlist him in The Watergate.

The conclusion may also be innocent, that considerate United Airlines, so generous to Nixon, client of Nixon's lawyer and awarder of a cushy post to Chapin when he became a White House liability, had "recovered other articles belonging to Mrs. Hunt." Not passed through the coroner's investigation, according to this. And ~~it~~ delayed long enough for the first Watergate trial to end before Hogan & Mattson would have to account for anything.

This also requires a postscript. Hunt never did account for all his wife's property, his inheritance. Aside from the \$260,000 in insurance money he got, \$225,000 of which was from a \$7.50 trip policy His wife took out as she departed, there was other personal property worth \$5,034 by his accounting, lost in the crash. Allstate Insurance offered him a \$3,000 settlement but he did not accept and a lawsuit impended early the year after the estate was settled. (Post 1/27/74)

This tragedy was only the beginning of Hunt's wealth/ which rapidly climbed above the initial quarter of a million besides what he had laid aside and the considerable value of his "Which "Witches Island" home which he sold before moving to Florida while his appeal was pending.

His crimes, as genuinely and deeply subversive as those of any private citizen had even been, enriched him in two other ways. His memoirs in this society which so extends itself to reward corruption, suddenly were worth two "substantial six-figure" sums. The first was under a hardback contract with G.P.Putnam's Sons, the second with Popular Library,

for paperback rights. (NYTimes 3/16/74) While Baker was putting together his non-report Hunt was "working night and day" on his memoirs, according to Putnam's vice president Edward Chase. Of Hunt ~~he~~ Chase said, "He's obviously in good fettle, alert and in good shape, not a demoralized man in any way; he looks like any other country gentleman."

Hunt was not the first and not the last of these Nixon felons who became rich from their crimes. The list is long. It include our ~~first~~ first felon Vice President, Spiro Agnew, and Jeb Magruder, who was one of the originators of the operation that ended in The Watergate.

For Nixon's criminals crime does pay.

For Hunt, Nixon personally saw to it that he was paid even more. If two "substantial six-figure" sums means anything, it should be well over a quarter of a million. Our spook villain suddenly cleansed and more famous than any of his many books had made him, had passed the half-way mark on his way to his first million.

That is, without what he got from Nixon, who always uses other people's money.

This may have done it sooner. There is no way of knowing how much Hunt blackmailed out of Nixon or by how much Nixon bribed him to silence.

Hunt did say unless he was paid he would talk. Nixon did say, "Pay him, God damn it." The night those words were recorded on Nixon's tapes, March 21, 1973, Hunt got \$75,000 more. And that was not the first. But there is no full accounting, which is natural enough, considering that this, too, was criminal, and particularly that bribery is one of the two specific crimes the Constitution names as samples of impeachable offenses.

Without Dorothy's loyal and efficient services the payoffs would not have been as easy. With them Hunt also became Nixon's paymaster in bribery. In turn, this gave him something else of value about which not to talk and for not talking he could expect Nixon's appreciation and further financial reward.

Watergate committee

Ulasewicz' Runyonesque testimony portrays Dorothy Hunt as a woman always demanding more and more money for more and more need and with ever increasing imperiousness. He could not persuade her he were merely the bagman, an errand-runner with no influence on policy decisions. He came to look upon each delivery in which he met her with

increasing uneasiness. He evolved a delivery system that avoided her shrill demands; like leaving the envelopes of money in Washington airport phone booths he watched until she snatched the loot. As a matter of fact, Bittman did not eschew the identical system. He too, made pickups of cash in phone ~~booths~~ booths, and accepted nocturnal drops in his mailbox.

Ulasewicz, working for and with Kalmbach, handled about a quarter of a million, some from a multimillion residue ~~of~~ from Nixon's 1968 campaign, some that Kalmbach raised by putting the arm on corporate executives, as he testified before the same committee. He and Ulasewicz confirmed each other.

Then there was a \$350,000 cash fund kept in the White House, ostensibly for "polling." Strachan testified ~~to~~ in the same forum to delivering it in an attache case for CREELP dispensation, confirmed by Dean and Fred LaRue.

Nixon had plenty of the green and he spread it. While there was a roar of Nixonian protest when Dean opening his Watergate committee marathon testimony by saying he had estimated the cost of buying criminal silence by Nixon's criminals would be a ~~half~~ million dollars and that Nixon had replied this would be no problem, the Nixon versions of Nixon's tapes, which he personally edited to diminish their admissions, did confirm Dean. We have seen the matter-of-factness with which Walters and Dean discussed a half-million of CIA money for bribery. Money was no consideration when Nixon's unimpeachment was to be bought. And Hunt more than any other was the one to be bought and the agent who bought the silence of the others. Until her death Dorothy was Hunt's agent.

She accounted for the bread she spread.

What is unusual is the manner of her accounting. Not that it was without receipts, for that would be expected in the clandestine. ~~But~~ She did not account to the source of the bribe money, directly or through Ulasewicz. No, she accounted to Bittman personally. This is anything but the traditional role of a defense counsel, but it may help explain the astounding size of his "fee."

Because the bar runs what amounts to a Mafia brotherhood of self-defense in which, in the name of keeping the bar clean and disciplining itself it protects its members who are fast and loose with money and malpractice until offense becomes intolerable

(In the absence of official explanations - and when lawyers protect each other and what is crooked for ordinary citizens is proper and accepted for lawyers protection is essential to what lawyers do - drawing inferences may not be justified. However, because the inference that the money Dorothy Hunt was carrying could have come from the \$200,000 in Vesco cash, it is worth noting that at the same time Bittman represented Hunt another Hogan & Hartson client, represented by partner Sherwin J. Markham, was this same Robert Vesco. This was testified to in the New York trial of Mitchell and Stans in which they were acquitted. It was reported in the papers of April 9, 1974.)

all the lawyers who ran all the "investigations" saw to it that Bittman was never called upon to testify except in utmost secrecy. Not one word of this leaked out in all the leaking that with The Watergate was as unprecedented as the crimes. So there are no explanations from Bittman. This is typical, of the situation in general and the protection he was afforded. When Special Prosecutor Cox told him he had a conflict of interest in his representation of ¹¹Hunt, the Post's minuscule story on it didn't even include this simple explanation. The same day, ^(8/21/73) in a story just as tiny the New York Times did mention "an" "conflict of interest." And when after the lapse of a discrete interval Bittman gave up his valuable Hogan & Hartson partnership, the notice ^{effective June 30, 1974} (NY Times ^{6/8/74}) was as inconspicuous.

-15A So, we do not know why Dorothy Hunt accounting for the bribe-money she distributed to Bittman instead of someone known to represent CREEP or the White House. We know that she did because one of her accountings survived the end of her ability to testify.

It is her "Memorandum to: Mr. William O. Bittman" of October 2, 1972, "Subject: Accounting of Monies Received." "It is an incomplete accounting that does not include all known Nixon largess. ~~Not a penny went to Lockheed, who was cared for at a high rate than the Cubans.~~ Not a penny went to any lawyer, although the Nixonian explanation and justification is that the money was a defense fund that Ehrlichman, in his Watergate committee testimony equated with the voluntary fund raised in a successful defense of the innocent Angela Davis whose innocence was confirmed by a jury. These were the most costly of lawyers, too. "It is also for a 13-day period only, as the final line shows:

"You have already an accounting of the \$53,000 received on September 19."

Between September 19 and October 2 Mrs. "unt dispensed \$91,000, which is \$3,000 more than she received. Next to the last line explains, "In other words, I received a total of \$89,000 and have paid out \$91,000 (using the final \$3,000 from my own funds)"

She omitted the period.

In most cases her explanations are of "income replacements" None for Liddy. Under her tabulation is ~~the~~ "Income replacement was for a period of 'uly-Nov.)" "ers is included, "Income replacement for Mr. Hunt and Mrs. Hunt." At \$30,000 for five months, the "replaced" income was at a monthly rate of \$6,000, \$72,000 annually. But the maximum

Nixon's

Hunt could have made working five days a week as a \$100 a day consultant is less than half this, \$26,000. Computing at the higher Mullen per diem, Hunt's income to be "replaced is still less than half, \$31,200. Her work, as a much lower rate, was only part-time, in the mornings, as we have seen no real work at all. Not for the Spanish Embassy in any event.

McCord was worth only half as much, \$15,000, or \$3,000 a month.

All the Cubans were not of equal value. Barker received \$6,000, Sturgis \$4,000 and Martinez and Gonzalez each \$3,000. The value of each of the lower-paid Cubans is thus one-tenth that of Hunt or the income one Hunt requires for what Nixon called "compassion" on March 21, 1973 is equivalent to that of 10 Cubans.

They never put up McCord's bail and there is no accounting of Hunt's, but that of the Cubans is. The first item is "5,000 Bail money for Frank Sturgis." Barker, Martinez and Gonzalez are listed in a \$12,000 item, "Bail at \$4,000 each." But then there is this final item where she erased and typed over, "\$10,000 Under ~~table~~ table bail money for Mr. Barker)ker," in which the closing parenthesis and three extra letters are visible, as are other signs of erasure and retyping.

There is no such thing as "Under table bail money" without something criminal.

Or it is an explanation of money having a different purpose.

The extra \$3,000 she said came from her own funds is explained under her tabulation: "In August I gave Mr. Parker a total of \$3,000 for expenses [more erasures ~~visible~~ and extra letters still visible] of travel for himself and others and for telephone expenses, and for interest paid on pawning his wife's jewelry."

What this all means, of course, is that Bittman and that so prestigious firm Hogan & Hartson were involved in making these illicit payments. In plainer English, there were involved in what neither prosecutors nor the bar will do anything about, bribery. How much money went through Bittman's hand and how much stuck to them will never be known. The one time Bittman is known to have testified to this was in secret and leaking was incomplete. He was, however, really uptight for so experienced a former prosecutor in such spectacular prosecutions as those of Jimmy Hoffa and Bobby Baker.

Another of the never-accounted-for items in Dorothy Hunt's purse is not in the

11
sanitized remanant the Chicago coroner's office still has. It was Bittman's unlisted home phone number. Lawyers who are partners in such important firms do not have unlisted numbers just to pass them out to the wives of clients. But Bittman did with Mrs. Hunt. A Chicago cop slipped it to a reporter before all the Hunt evidence was locked and denied to inquisitive reporters. This one dialed Bittman's number. His angry and atypical reaction, more out of the ordinary because his client's wife had just been killed in this tragedy, was "How the hell did you get my unlisted number?" He then hung up, without another word.

Not even a formal expression of sorrow over the tragedy. (Mil-omit this note, which is merely as a source record. Larry Finley)

There are some accountings of how much Nixon money remained with Hogan & Hartson and Bittman. They do not include all the money Bittman is known to have received.

In questioning Robert "ardian July 20, 1973, Watergate committee Senator Montoya described \$157,000 as "grossly excessive for representing one bungler." This committee never could compute the amount. Montoya stopped at the sum they did figure but more is known. The accounting of it is not.

Bittman is one of the 19 unindicted co-conspirators in the list headed by the first President to achieve this distinction. (Post 6/23/74). This was known in official circles not later than March 1, 1974, with the return of the cover-up or obstructing justice indictments. It did not make the papers for another almost three months.

Just before voting impeachment, the House Judiciary Committee questioned Bittman behind closed doors. He spent seven hours in secret questioning on July 9. (Post 7/10/74) Some of the committee's 38 members - and its staff was of more than a hundred, half lawyers - objected to the secrecy which those who prevailed believed was necessary to preserve the legal rights of those mentioned. So, there was wholesale leaking. These leaks included an account of Bittman's testimony.

Imputations of impropriety were not ~~new~~ then new. In firing Gerald Alch, J. Lee Bailey's partner, McCord had spelled his reason out in secret in a letter to the CIA that later figured in his Watergate committee testimony (~~H-335~~)

one of a series of

and still later were used in questioning CIA witnesses. They are reproduced in facsimile in the committee's ninth book. In his January 3, 1973 explanation of having fired Alch two days earlier and informed Judge Sirica in writing the intervening day, McCord ~~said~~ referred to ~~of~~ Bittman's alleged role in blaming the CIA for Nixonian crime, /the issue ~~on~~ which in March, leading to those McCord revolted /~~and made his charges public by means of~~ hectic days in the White House partly captured on partly released partial texts of tape transcripts the more sordid of which are those of March 21 and 22. McCord told the CIA:

"Bittman was shook [over McCord's charges and Judge Sirica's knowledge of them] and has obviously taken the heat on this, because of my violent reaction. He should because he had transmitted to Alch the original idea. We know, of course, who passed the idea to Bittman. We took them up to the brink on this, and I don't believe they will try it again. Breaking it to the press could have gotten some of them disbarred and broken the whole story open."

The "original idea" is "trying to place the blame for the whole operation on the company where it did not belong."

"The company" is the Agency, CIA. (The probable origina of this slang is one of the CIA's corporate fronts that is part of Hunt's past, the Doubl-Chek Corporation through which some Bay of Pigs operations were nanded, including pilots who lost their lives and whose families, in a parallel of this Nixon paying off, thereafter were paid by Doubl-Chek.)

That McCord was right and that the origin of this Nixon defense was Nixon himself was later confirmed in public by Nixon, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Pat Gray and all the top CIA people, Nixon in public statements, the others in Watergate testimony.

This charge puts Bittman in the role of serving Nixon. He did dispense Nixon's money, besides what he latched onto.

One of the central and unreported unities in the list of the 19 undicted co-conspirators is this bribery into silence. Each of the 19 had some connection with ~~the~~ raising or illicit Nixon money, /handling it or receiving it. Former CIA man ~~at~~ Paul O'Brien, was the messenger between Hunt and Bittman and the White House and CREEP. (P, st6/23/74)

and with virtually no time spent in court-room appearances - Hunt did cop a plea - can there have been this much legal research or that much time in skirting around that \$10,000 in settling Dorothy Hunt's estate? On the basis of what is known and what can be extrapolated from it, there is no way of account for 2600 hours requiring more lawyers than most successful firms include.

Dorothy Hunt, Kalmbach, Ulaseqicz and his friend Caulfield who brought Ulaseqicz in and used him to relay offers and promises to McCord, and LaRue, who ~~delivered the money~~ ~~known as \$75,000~~ made the last known nocturnal delivery to Bittman's home mailbox after Nixon ordered the payoff, are all included.

Before the list was leaked some of the charges against Bittman found their way around. Seven overt acts are attributed to him. Most of these "dealt with his receipt of funds that eventually went to the seven original Watergate defendants." (NYTimes 6/8/74)

One possible interpretation of the astronomical size of Bittman's fee is as a cover for other uses of this Nixon money. "He told the Judiciary committee that he had gotten \$156,000 and that Hunt still owed \$50,000 that Bittman would not try to collect. This ~~can't be because~~ ~~he didn't know~~ Hunt couldn't pay it and it is not persuasive.

Nixon's lawyer, James D. St. Clair, had asked the committee to take Bittman's testimony. Bittman was Nixon's defense witness against the charge of paying hush-money. It is to prove this that St. Clair ~~asked~~ used Bittman. St. Clair knew that if Bittman testified that the money he received was for other than legal services rendered Bittman would be in the most serious trouble. "He knew Bittman would not testify to illegal acts and solicit his own conviction and disbarment. (Post 7/10/74)

Bittman's explanation of the \$156,000 "fee" is that 15 Hogan & Hartson lawyers put in a total of 2600 hours in a 14-month period. Not many clients get that much time or so many lawyers. (Post 7/10/74)

19A

The figures are too pat. They come to an even \$60 an hour and account for no expenses at all. They also fall short of the sworn word of a single man, one who entered a guilty plea, admitting obstructing justice. LaRue told the Watergate committee that he alone had conveyed \$210,000 to Bittman.

March 21, 1975,
Whatever Bittman's explanation, Dean told Nixon that the last payment, this \$75,000, was bribery. Nixon's words had been, from the tape transcript, when told Hunt demanded \$120,000, ~~WAS~~ "For Christ's sake, get it!" (Post 7/10/74) The next day Mitchell reported that Hunt was no longer a "problem." *Nixon was told and approved. (Post 6/8/74)*

As it was originally leaked, Hunt's blackmail demand just before gailing was for \$120,000 of which \$50,000 was for that balance due Bittman, the same sum to the penny Bittman said he would not undertake to collect when, if due, it was so collectable from the man who had the cash. But in the version Seymour Hersh had in The New York Times of June 22, 1973, Hunt "demanded a payment of \$72,000 for himself and \$50,000 for attorney fees." By this time there had been printed reports that Hunt had already received \$200,000, before his new demand, and that his threat included writing his own Watergate book unless he did receive more money.

The \$75,000 that went into Bittman's mailbox that night equals the \$72,000 Hunt claimed was due him plus \$3,000 his wife had advanced Barker for Nixon's payoffmasters. If this is the way the figure was reached. Bittman was not paid or received payment in a separate, unreported manner. Hunt testified to paying him \$80,000 from his wife's insurance and to putting this \$75,000 in a safe-deposit box. In addition to the sums delivered clandestinely by Ulsaewicz and \$210,000 from LaRue, Bittman's take is increased by this \$80,000 and is more than \$300,000. Or, way above the fee he said he collected.

The Watergate committee was never able to establish exactly how much Nixon paid Hunt and Bittman, chiefly because it didn't really try. It could have called Bittman as a witness, it could have subpoenaed his records.

Hunt's account of Bittman's take is \$,1000 the night of July 3, 1972; \$25,000 Bittman told him of receiving anonymously and applied to the retainer; \$20,000 Bittman received for Hunt in an envelope, probably in October, "I opened the envelope in his presence and counted out \$20,000 which I turned over to him (this does not say the envelope contained only \$20,000); none of the \$15,000 in another anonymous delivery to Bittman, of which \$12,000 went to Hunt old friend Manuel Artime for the Miami man—all this in cash.

Dash finally said, "I am asking for the total amount of money you paid Mr. Bittman in legal fees." (9H3693. Sidney S. Sachs, who had then replaced Bittman as Hunt's counsel, interposed "What Mr. Bittman was paid." "Yes, or that Mr. Bittman was paid," Dash agreed, thus leaving it even more vague. (9H3694) "\$156,000" Hunt replied.

21

If Hunt meant the total figure of which he knew, this meant that Bittman had received \$110,000 in addition to the \$46,000 for which accounted, raising the \$210,000 from LaRue by \$6,000 to \$256,000. If Hunt was responding to the initial form of the question, before Sachs interjected himself, then the figure would be \$366,000.

Dash asked that a statement of all the "details" be provided. "We will be glad to," Sachs told him. But by the time the transcript was printed it had not been received. A footnote was added to explain the omission.

Senator Ervin tried to elicit from Hunt how much of this cash he could account for, how much Bittman got, how much the Hunts did. (9H3750) Hunt claimed "I don't know how much money Mrs. Hunt received" and got away with it. He admitted receiving personally \$50,000 in February and \$75,000 in March, 1973. Ervin added \$53,500 Mrs. Hunt received the September 19 and the \$88,000 of October 2, 1972 accounting. Hunt claimed to have no knowledge of even his own "income replacement" of \$30,000. Here Ervin gave up.

When Baker asked (9H3755), "Did Br. Bittman tell you how he used that \$156,000, how he disbursed it?" Hunt again was vague, saying it was his "understanding" that all of it "went to his law firm. That they were retained."

Baker didn't even try to carry this line further. "He didn't give up- he just didn't try."

Weicher tried again. (9H3798-3972). He recapitulated a total of \$266,000 to Bittman from LaRue and Ulasewicz, which the committee had tabulated on a large chart in the hearing room. This is \$49,000 more than Hunt accounted for.

Ervin tried to help. (9H3801) His noting that between them the Hunts received \$266,500, the \$125,000 Hunt admitted and \$141,500 traced to Mrs. Hunt. Sachs took the heat off of Hunt again by saying he didn't understand and asking obvious questions - that chart was on display before him and the entire nation on TV- claiming "I don't yet understand" after explanations were made, and even trying to delay it all with the offer already made and never kept, "perhaps it could be straightened out later."

~~It never was~~ The flow of Nixon largess to Hunt and Bittman was never fully explained, and never fully accounted. Nobody knows for sure who got how much money and what he did with it.

It accomplished nothing when Weicher expressed perplexity that Bittman had received not less than \$156,000 for defending Hunt alone, one man, when the total paid the lawyers for the four Miamians was only \$38,000. (9H3802) Sachs again changed the subject with an offer to clarify something Hunt had said about a conversation with Colson.

Ervin did give it all point by noting that after all this money was paid out, "But you did keep silent, Liddy kept silent, Barker kept silent, Sturgis kept silent, Martinez kept silent." Hunt interjected "The four of them" and Ervin added Gonzalez.

"And as a result nothing came out..."

Hunt agreed, "That is true, Senator" (9H3803)

This is the purpose for which all that Nixon money was spent. What remains unknown is the total and the fingers to which the cash stuck as it flowed.

Paul Valentine, having reached a total of "\$449,000 in secret payments" from public sources, consulted tax experts. (Post 7/19/73) This was prior to Hunt's testimony. Their opinion is that it was taxable.

But the tax officials are Nixon's official. They were one of his weapons against his "enemies." If there was a tax agent present at any of this testimony, the record does not show it. If there was any Internal Revenue Service interest in all this taxable money, there has been no sign of it.

With Hunt alone there is public acknowledgement of "income replacement," which, whether it is that or payoff is taxable. And he claimed not to know what his wife received. No government interest in getting the government's fair share share, in enforcing the law?

How much was Hogan & Hartson fee, how much was Bittman fee, how much was payoff he or they handled?

No interest when it was Nixon's money and Nixon was President.

Crime obvious but no interest, no case, no prosecution, and Hunt is in Florida retirement, a rich man because crime for Nixon did pay for him.

Much more than this incomplete accounting begins to show. Another fat addition to his fattening assets came to light the following April. Some good Samaritan gave him another \$100,000 in secret and he again had not the faintest notions about it.

This deal had one of those "companies" so convenient for the CIA involved.

Through all of this, of course, Hunt was poor-mouthing, presenting himself as virtually destitute and his children in need - the same children he kicked out of the house as soon as he was released ^{from jail} pending appeal, ~~and he had a name on a report in~~ (Rolling Stone ~~for~~ 1/31/74)

He had described his blackmail not as blackmail but as the ^{fine} tradition of all intelligence services. On the second show Buckley gave him he said all he received was traditional, two years income replacement. The absolute minimum.

His March 1973 demand for lawyer fees was ^{\$72,000 plus more} after he received the quarter of a million insurance his wife's death gave him. He was not broke and the entire Nixon money-fountain knew it when it gushed that added \$75,000.

Even Nixon then professed compassionate concern - for Hunt alone - and his need for money when Hunt was without this need. Except that no matter how much he has he so urgently wants more.

Coinciding with Nixon's compassion and LaRue's payoff for Nixon Hunt bought ^{\$109,872} and a year later still held a stock portfolio. (LATimes 4/23/74)

He can write tear-jerkers as easily as those spy novels. His opened his statement to the Watergate committee, after collecting the quarter of a million in insurance, after getting that extra \$75,000 over and above all that had been paid earlier, and after buying these stocks, with, "I am isolated from my four children. The funds provided me ^{motherless} and others who participated in the/break-in ^[sic] have long since been exhausted."

So Nixon ordered him paid and LaRue did it the night of March 21, 1973, via Bittman's home mail box, and Hunt went to jail March 23. His demand for this added \$120,000 was made ^{most of} March 16, five days earlier. But he bought/these stocks the day of the night of the \$75,000 payoff - before Bittman's got the money he later gave Hunt. It was another coincidence that his stock purchases and his demands on Nixon just happened at the same time. That, at least, is the explanation of his Buckley-supplied lawyer who replaced the emergency replacement for Bittman when Bittman's own conduct interested the gran jury in him. William Snyder describe^d the coincidence in timing between Hunt's last payoff and his stock purchases

24
as "the damndest piece of bad luck I've ever seen." (LA Times 4/23/74)

If \$109,872 is such damned bad luck for a destitute man, one wonders what good luck could possibly be in Hunt-Buckley circles.

According to Snyder, Hunt ~~was in~~ had been in ~~the~~ jail at Danbury, Connecticut, for four months when Pa Ferris & Co., his horse brokers, notified him by mail of his investment.

"He sure was sore as hell," in Snyder's version, "when he learned about this."

Why was Hunt "sore as hell?"

Because Hunt thought his money was going to be in United States Treasury bills.

But for this he needed a broker?

~~For~~ For Treasury bills he had to give a brokerage house discretionary power to make investments for him?

Ferris' lawyer, Stanley Ragle, ~~held the Los Angeles Times~~ said that without Hunt's permission, which he did not obtain, despite repeated efforts, he could not discuss the details of Hunt's account. He did say that the version provided by Hunt's lawyers is "not a complete statement" of "what happened." It was not this Hunt story that "somebody at Ferris got it in their head that" he "needed a stock portfolio" when he wanted Treasury bills. The day before that envelope with the \$75,000 in cash cropped into Bittman's mailbox, Ferris wrote Hunt. This letter disclosed that he had discussed one of the known stock purchases prior to March 20 with Ferris representative Lulia Walsh.

When news of this new addition to Hunt's wealth that coincided with the time he had told the Senate committee he was so destitute and in deep financial trouble leaked out, Hunt explained through his lawyers that he had bought no stocks anywhere near that time. But regardless of the source of his money, the timing is last threat March 16, stock-broker letter March 20, stock purchases day of March 21, Nixon's agent LaRue dropped the admitted \$75,000 into Bittman's mailbox the night of March 21. And March 23 Hunt went to jail.

This news of Hunt's enrichment from Nixon and his Watergate by an added more than \$100,000 brought from Snyder a further explanation of how it happened that when Hunt was so desperate ~~for~~ for more money for his lawyers he put that \$75,000 in a safe-deposit box, as Hunt had told the Watergate committee he did. Hunt did not pay Bittman for another

month and then with a check drawn against that \$260,000 he got from his wife's death. while acting as Nixon'd bagwoman.

That Hunt put his cash in a safe-deposit box was Prosecutor Silber's idea, Snyder said, after Hunt admitted having all this cash to the grand jury. Hunt's 21-year-old Daughter Kevan transferred the cash, Snyder said. She would not talk about it and Silbert claimed he had no recollection.

These are not denials. Nor are they explanations. Nor is it customary for prosecutors to give financial advice to the experienced men they prosecute for the most serious crimes.

Nor is there any explanation of why Hunt, with his alleged desire to invest in Treasury bills when he puts the small fortune on stocks, had to hide his investment by using the name "Johnson & Co." (Pacifica News, KPFA Berkeley, 4/23/74)

extra space

Hunt was brobed. Bribery is a crime, It is one of the two impeachable crimes specified in the Constitution. The other is treason and then there is the generality, "other high crimes and misdemeanors." Nixon did the bribing. He ordered at least this last \$75,000 paid to Hunt and it was done immediately.

But there wasn't even the initial committee vote on impeaching Nixon for another year and three months after this last known payoff in the bribing of Hunt. (The first can fairly be dated at no later than Liddy's payment to him in California the week after the ~~break-in~~ five were caught inside "democratic headquarters," or two years and a month before the committee vote.) And when the committee did agree to initiate the impeachment process, bribery was not one of the three counts on which it did agree.

This was avoidable and for all that time Nixon could remain unimpeached because Nixon could and did claim innocence. One of the means by which impeachment was so long delayed was his claim taken up by all his vocal partisans that he had committed no indictable offense. They claimed that an impeachable offense is only a crime for which one could be indicted.

Bribery is an indictable offense as well as an impeachable offense. It is a two-way offense, a crime for the gier and a crime for the receiver of the payoff. It is also

a crime in which intent is controlling - is the payoff for a purpose.

This all traces back to Hunt's non-mysterious non-disappearance. He returned after never having been out of contact to play a role in Nixon's defense. His wife and he handled the payoffs to the other defendants, with Nixon's money. Then Hunt decided not to contest his defense - after the wealth started pouring down on him from the White House. He tried to convince all the others to cop pleas with him but his Cubanos alone followed his lead, as Barker - the only one the Senate Watergate committee called as a witness - testified. Liddy remained silent and McCord sprang to the defense two years to the day after the morning he was caught, did of his beloved CIA. McCord, in fact, ~~was charged~~ charge that "The White House tried to bribe me to keep me quiet." He added, "The men involved could not have done it without his [Nixon's] authorization." (National Public Radio 6/17/74)

Kalmbach testified that the almost quarter million he dispensed until the street-wise Ulasewicz warned him "something isn't kosher" was Nixon's money and money he raised for this purpose at Ehrlichman's demand. There is no doubt about the source of that other known \$350,000. It can be traced to a February 1, 1972 memo from Gordon Strachan, his assistant, to Nixon's top honcho Haldeman. It is couched in that cultivated language Nixon brought to the White House. Strachan wrote about "the 690 in accounts," meaning \$690,000 in cash, and that "The 230 in green would be put in a Riggs box," which translated, "green" for "cash" and "safe-deposit box" for "box." Were this not done, Strachan reported, "Kalmbach is willing to retain personal control of the 900 (meaning \$900,000 in cash) and run the very high risk of violating the criminal provisions of the campaign spending legislation." Ostensible, this money was for "polls." But "Stans is opposed to paying for any polls other than through a correct committee; the risk of using green is just too high."

Strachan recommended caution because of criminal law violations and that "only the 230 in green would be held under Kalmbach's personal control."

Haldeman approved this, but in his own handwriting twice changed his mind. First he encircled this "230" and wrote "~~plus~~ +150" and then under his approval changed this to "make it 350 green and hold it for us," his underscoring. (quoted from ~~facsimile~~ copy of Strachan memo.)

Strachan testified to taking this \$350,000 in cash after Hunt started making his demands in an attache case and delivering it to La Rue.

The tracing from the "hite House to those bribed is complete, through both Kalmbach and LaRue, who copped a plea for his part in all of this June 27, 1973 (Post, NYTimes 6/28/73) after an earlier deal with the prosecution. He testified to the Watergate committee July 19. The charge to which he entered a plea of guilty is of obstructing justice. He admitted many crimes as part of a conspiracy.

This tracing includes intent, in answer to Senator Ervin's question, "did you not apprehend that there was danger some of the five burglars...might, in the common parlance, spill the beans?" LaRue replied, "Yes, sir," adding that he, personally, had apid off from this White House fund.

"As I add up these figures, Senator, I come up with a figure of \$242,000" that he personally had handled of that \$350,000, in addition to \$219,000 "that was delivered to them through...Kalmbach and Ulasewicz." (NYTimes 7/20/73, quoting stenographic transcript, Get H citation)

Two of Nixon's closest, Kalmbach and LaRue, personally handled \$461,000 in what was politely called "hush-money" but was actually Nixon's bribing to protect himself. He did it in another crime, illegal use of campaign money, the crime against which the young ~~former~~ lawyer from his own law firm, Strachan, warned against. This is another indictable and another impeachable offense.

But in the two years following the first of the caught crimes none of this was ever put together either in the press or in the investigations.

This inadequacy made two years of Nixon's unimpeachment possible, with all that cost the nation.

It certainly can't be because this information, all of which was readily available, was beyond the reach of all the official investigators. They had this and much more that remains secret.

Nor can it be incompetence. The investigators were competent.

There is no reason to attribute corruption, not at least to all of them.

Fear seems the most probable explanation, fear that the people are children and could not take it, fear when faced with Presidential crime of a magnitude that once would have been considered impossible, fear of the consequences of/impeachment. Nixon's

There was an avoidance of evidence from the very first.

Failure to trace and expose the Dorothy and Howard Hunt paying off is but one of the obvious examples. Lack of interest in the origin of the money Mrs. Hunt was carrying for paying others off through a Chicago cover is but part of this.

Yet that she was the Nixon bagwoman was publicized officially beginning with Ulasewicz' televised Watergate committee testimony.

But there were so many to be bribed. Not just Hunt. Magruder was bribed with a cushy job, others were relocated and protected, but none were rewarded as Hunt was. He was made a very rich man.

Crime does pay, if it is Hunt's, for Nixon.

The Cubans and McCord were given pittances.

Why then was Hunt alone made so rich, paid off so well?

This, too, was Nixon's personal doing.

There were special reasons.

Hunt was different.

He could say what others didn't and couldn't.