

Officials of American Airlines, Gulf and Goodyear also testified that they were pressured to provide lists of individual donors. At American Ship Building, the "bonus" recipients and Chairman Steinbrenner concocted a false story to explain to FBI investigators why they were on such a list, according to Company Secretary Robert Bartlome. However, when it became clear that the group would be summoned to repeat the story before a federal grand jury, Bartlome informed his boss that he and the other seven would not perjure themselves before it. At that, recounted Watergate Committee Counsel Sam Dash, Steinbrenner "laid his head on the desk and said he was ruined, the company might be ruined, and he mentioned something about jumping off a bridge." Steinbrenner has told the committee that he will invoke the Fifth Amendment if called to testify.

Out of Fear. So far, six of the eight companies have been fined for their illegal contributions, and the cases of the other two are pending in federal courts. In addition, executives in most of the corporations judged guilty have been personally fined for their part in the unlawful financing of Nixon's campaign. The businessmen were charged with misdemeanors.

Like Spater, most of the executives claimed that they broke the law not to buy specific favors for their companies but rather out of fear of what might happen if they refused. The process, agreed Atkins, "borders on extortion."

One who firmly took no such position was Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Chairman Russell DeYoung. His company's illegal donation, he testified, "was made solely because we thought the reelection of the President was in the best interest of the country." Republican Senator Lowell Weicker, after getting DeYoung to concede that the company disclosed its contribution only when it was clear that federal investigators were getting close, commented: "I'd say it's a pretty sorry day for Goodyear." Snapped DeYoung: "Not necessarily."

The pitfalls of campaign financing may have tripped yet another 1972 Presidential candidate: Brooklyn's Black Democratic Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm. Though Chisholm spent less (about \$75,000) in her abortive presidential drive than any serious major-party contender, the General Accounting Office charged in September that she maintained inaccurate financial records, accepted three small corporate donations, and failed to report an \$18,000 surplus in her campaign. No action has yet been taken by the Justice Department, but last week, apparently as the result of a leak, Chisholm was forced to answer questions about the allegations. She said that the surplus has long since been spent to pay late-arriving bills and charged that Government investigators are determined to embarrass her because she is "unbought and unbossed."

INVESTIGATIONS

"Nothing Is Inviolable"

The night that Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox was fired, his senior aides stripped all personal pictures from their office walls. They thought that their investigation had ended and that they would soon be evicted. Even after Leon Jaworski was appointed special prosecutor, the pictures stayed down. Last week they were back—an eloquent sign that he has been accepted

DAVID HUME KENNERLY



PROSECUTOR LEON JAWORSKI
A sense of ease.

by the men and women that Cox left behind. Nor has Jaworski been disappointed in the staff he inherited. He declares: "These are people of unusual caliber."

Two weeks into his job, Jaworski last week talked with TIME Correspondent Hays Gorey. Questions and answers:

What documents or tapes are you seeking from the White House?

We will seek everything that Cox asked for—and more. So far, we have not been refused anything. We will get what we asked for. But there have been some problems in locating some of the material. The White House will put in writing a full explanation if there is anything they can't produce.

Do you regard "presidential papers" as inviolable?

Nothing is inviolable. We would respect certain confidential communications. But I have been given an absolute, unquestioned promise that there would be no restrictions.

Who gave you that promise?

General Alexander Haig [White House chief of staff]. I talked with him and made my position clear. He left me to tell the President and came back to say I had the assurances I had insisted upon.

What if the White House claims some of the material must be withheld for reasons of "national security"?

I will make the final decision. I still have top-secret clearance [dating from his service as a prosecutor during Nazi war-crimes trials] and will know exactly what is on the portions of tapes or documents for which the claim is made.

What if material is still withheld?

I'll take it to court.

Would not an independent prosecutor—one appointed by Congress or the courts—be better able to win public confidence?

I would not contest an independent prosecutor if one were established by law, but the important question is what happens in the meantime. There would be a long period of uncertainty—it might be a year before the constitutionality of such a law could be decided in court.

But how can investigation by the Executive Branch of the Executive Branch win public confidence?

It's a question of the public following what we do. Take the staff here. They could have viewed me with the greatest skepticism. Yet there is a sense of ease now, something you would not have if the constitutionality of what they are doing was doubtful.

Could you exonerate anyone without an outcry?

The greatest burden is simply this: Are the facts there to justify an indictment?

What if you find evidence implicating the President? Would you indict him or send the evidence to the House for consideration of impeachment?

Those are the alternatives, and there have been discussions with the staff on which course to take if it comes to that. But we have not made any decision.

The Ex-Lawyers Club

"There certainly are an awful lot of lawyers involved here," John Dean admitted to the Senate Watergate committee. Now it looks as if there are going to be an awful lot of ex-lawyers in the group that Dean was talking about. Last week Dean himself was suspended from practice by a three-judge federal panel. G. Gordon Liddy has already been disbarred in New York State, and the State Bar of California is contemplating action against lawyers from Richard Nixon down. Although he was not connected with Watergate, another well-known lawyer is also facing disbarment. The Maryland State Bar Association last week formally asked the state Court of Appeals to begin proceedings against Spiro Agnew.

For any lawyer, disbarment can mean disaster. Last week convicted Dirty Trickster Donald Segretti started to serve his maximum-six-month sentence in Lompoc Prison Camp 45 miles northwest of Santa Barbara, Calif. Declared Lawyer Segretti plaintively: "Four months in Lompoc is nothing to me compared with being disbarred. What would I do?"