

The Watergate Saga— the Official Version vs. the Reality

by Jim DiEugenio

Watergate was a set-up, a classic ploy as old as espionage itself. In its favor it had simplicity of execution, an irresistible bait and a spy on the inside. It was flawless.

Gerald Bellett, *Age of Secrets*

"Very early on the morning of June 17, 1972 five men were apprehended at the Watergate Hotel, breaking into the Democratic National Committee Headquarters."

The above is the standard opening sentence of nearly every major media retrospective of the Watergate saga. From here the usual commentary then progresses step by step through the construction of a cover-up at the White House, its piercing, the Senate hearings, the special prosecutor trials, the threat of impeachment, and the eventual resignation of Richard Nixon.

This above tale is not just trite but wrong. It is wrong in its fundamentals and it is wrong because it is so fragmentary. It is essentially a cover story, thin but well-disguised. Not as blatant as "A lone gunman shooting from the 6th floor of the Texas School Book Depository fired three shots killing the president today," but still, the overall effect is the same. Another president was removed from office as part of a clandestine operation. As with clandestine operations—as opposed to covert ones—the apparatus is disguised only temporarily, with great help from the media, both witting and unwitting. Only years later, when all the smoke and mirrors

have been dismantled, can the public discern what really happened. Meanwhile the mechanics and controllers have gone on to another project.

Watergate is, or should be, special to those concerned with both the Kennedy assassination and the idea of representative democracy. For it shows the dynamics described above in excelsis. And since many of the people involved in the JFK case reappear during Watergate (see page 16), it is a perfect example of democracy being snatched away not once, but twice in a decade, and by many of the same people. As Mort Sahl has stated, Watergate was the second assassination of a president in ten years.

Sound and Fury

To understand what really happened in those two traumatic years it is important to comprehend this huge fact: the events of the original break-in were never truly examined by either the Ervin Committee or the final Special Prosecutor, Leon Jaworski. In other words, the single event of 1972 that led the country into two years of trauma, was deemed inconsequential by 1974. The media, the Senate Committee, and Jaworski all conspired informally—and at times, formally—to get Nixon out of office. Some of the things the media demanded of him, like releasing his taxes in a non-election year, show how the concept of Watergate was whipped up by an unseen engine of destruction; an engine kept off-stage, felt, not seen, but transcendent. As Howard Baker, the one decent representative on the Ervin Committee said, it was like two giant, enraged animals fighting in the night.

To understand who the other animal was, we have to understand the origin of the group that was caught at the Watergate. To do this, it is necessary to trace the history of the so-called "Plumbers Unit."

The Real Origins of the Plumbers

Nixon and his National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, prided themselves on their handling of foreign policy initiatives. And they both felt that they could only accomplish these in secret. When some of their ideas, an arms agreement with the Soviets, the secret bombing of Cambodia, began to

be printed in newspapers like *The New York Times*, they both felt that leaks in the administration were responsible. They then launched an internal security measure: wiretapping. But they were not satisfied with the efforts of the FBI. So when the Pentagon Papers leaked to the *Times*, and especially *The Washington Post*, the program actually moved inside the White House and was nicknamed "The Plumbers" since its aim was to plug leaks to the media.

It is interesting to note here that, originally, it was Henry Kissinger, not Nixon who was enraged about the Pentagon Papers. But eventually Kissinger transferred his fury to the president who got suitably worked up about the issue. Nixon had always been bitter toward the press, especially since he felt there had been a double standard, one for him and another for the Kennedys. On top of this Nixon had always hated what the *Post* and *Times* stood for: the "Eastern Establishment" or, as he used to say, "those Harvard sons of bitches," who he despised since he thought they despised him. In fact, in her office at the *Post* Kate Graham hung photos of each president from the time her father purchased the paper. Each one except Nixon's. And although Kissinger knew how to flatter the media, to attend their parties and grant them selected access, Nixon did not. Worse, he showed no interest in it. For instance, when Nixon and Kissinger decided on the Cambodian invasion, Kissinger privately denied his complicity to the press and they left him out of the story.

This is important, because when the Plumbers were first organized, there were two units in place. One under Charles Colson, Nixon's political hatchet man, and another under David Young, who reported to Henry Kissinger. (Earlier, Kissinger had ordered some of the FBI wiretaps on the NSC staff. In other words, his own employees.) One of their first assignments was to prepare a psychological profile of Daniel Ellsberg, a former Rand Corporation employee hired by Kissinger to study Nixon's options on the Vietnam war. The FBI had deduced Ellsberg was the one who had leaked the papers to the press.

Fun and Games with Hunt

At this time, and in a strange way, E. Howard Hunt had joined up with the White House unit of the Plumbers (see page 21). In a July 28, 1971 memo to Colson, he suggested that the CIA do a psychological profile of Ellsberg and use it to smear him in the press. At a meeting that included

Hunt, Liddy, and Young, the CIA said they needed more raw data in order to prepare a more damaging profile. So the raid at Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office—Dr. Lewis Fielding—was staged.

It is around this time that two motifs of Hunt, almost ignored by the official investigations, begin to queerly manifest themselves. The 20 year CIA veteran of the Bay of Pigs, Operation MONGOOSE, and JM/WAVE, went back to his roots to recruit the mechanics for this and future operations. Namely, the anti-Castro Cubans he had worked with a decade before, some of whom he had not seen in years. He promised them good pay, expenses, and protection for their help in black bag jobs. Trusting, and not asking many questions, three of these Cubans went along on Labor Day weekend of 1971 to burglarize Fielding's office.

Operational Anomalies?

This is where the second curious motif becomes prevalent. Consider some of the known facts about this break-in. Virgilio Martinez has stated that, from the outset, it was different than other jobs he had done with Hunt. This began with the initial briefing:

The briefing was not like anything I was used to in the Company. Ordinarily, before an operation, you have a briefing and then train for the operation. You try to find a place that looks similar and you train in disguise and with the code you are going to use. You try out the plan many times so that later you have the elasticity to abort the operation if the conditions are not ideal. Eduardo's [Hunt's] briefing was not like this. There wasn't a written plan, not even any mention of what to do if something went wrong.

On top of having no written plans or diagrams, no contingency for a breakdown or discovery, there were other anomalies. Hunt was supposed to monitor Fielding's home to be sure the doctor did not return while the burglary was in progress. But Hunt lost track of Fielding. The glass cutter given to Martinez did not cut glass, so they had to break into the place. Then, with no locksmith, they had to use a crowbar to break into the office. In case of discovery, Hunt had supplied the Cubans with a rope to get out the window. But the rope was so short that if they had used it, they would have broken their necks in the fall. To top it off, when Hunt reported back, there was little of use to the White House.

Yet, to the Cubans surprise, when they all met Hunt back at the hotel that night, Eduardo had a bottle of champagne. The

Cubans were depressed but not Hunt. "Well done," said their mentor. "This is a celebration. You deserve it." Martinez later says that it was all surreal to him. He had done hundreds of jobs for the CIA before and "no one invites you to have champagne and is happy when you fail. . . The whole thing was strange, but Eduardo was happy so we were happy."

One last detail should be added to the Fielding affair. There were two cameras used that night to take photos. One, a Minnox, was given to Hunt and to this day no one knows what happened to the film inside. The Polaroid was given to the White House and there were no shots of Ellsberg's file on it. Yet it was learned later by Jim Hougan that the CIA was very interested in Ellsberg because of his relationship with Frances Fitzgerald, daughter of former covert operations chief Des Fitzgerald. And Hunt was meeting with high CIA officials for "tennis matches" after the Fielding break-in.

James McCord, "Retiree"

James McCord, had been another 20 year veteran of the CIA before he ostensibly retired. This was about four months after Hunt joined the Mullen PR firm. To supplement his CIA pension, McCord went to work as security consultant to the Committee to Reelect the President (CREEP). One of the things he is suspected of doing there is recommending CIA retirees to the White House Secret Service staff responsible for maintaining the taping system there. He did this for his friend Al Wong who was chief of technical services at the White House. Then, something else brought Hunt and McCord together again (amazingly, the pair denied they knew each other in the Agency). H. R. Haldeman, Nixon's Chief of Staff, requested through his aide Gordon Strachan, that some kind of campaign intelligence apparatus be set up. Gordon Liddy, then at CREEP, ended up with the job of coordinating this plan.

The Original Plans

It should be noted here that when Haldeman made his request, neither he nor Ehrlichman ever envisaged the kind of operations that Hunt, McCord, and Liddy performed. And their claims ring true if one looks at their histories. Haldeman was an advertising executive with J. Walter Thompson. Ehrlichman was an able attorney with a respectable Seattle law firm. Neither one had ever shown anything like the intelligence or law enforcement background of

Hunt, Liddy, and McCord.

But it was this request by Haldeman that eventually mushroomed into the Watergate break-in, Nixon's resignation and jail terms for him and Ehrlichman. For Liddy proceeded to map out a whole campaign against the Democrats. Yet, in a continuing mystery, no one knows who commissioned the specific plan to bug the telephone of Larry O'Brien, DNC chairman. Especially since he was prepping to leave for Florida soon and there would be little to tap. But everyone knew O'Brien was a thorn in Nixon's side (see "The Mystery of the Break-In" on page 14).

The DNC break-ins went forward. Hunt fired up the Cubans by telling them there was proof of Castro financing the Democratic party. There were three episodes in late May on consecutive evenings. And then the June 17th one. It is interesting to note that in two earlier ones, McCord's assistant registered in the Howard Johnson's across the street in a room paid for by "McCord Associates." In the second May break-in, McCord in a suit, at midnight, walked in the front door with six of his Cubans. Everyone signing the entrance register. McCord's excuse was that he had some work to do on a different floor for the Federal Reserve Board. Again, the Cubans could not get inside the DNC. McCord spent much of his time talking to a guard.

And what of Hunt on these early forays? After the third, and finally successful May break-in, some photos were taken of the inside of the DNC and there were two phone taps placed. Hunt gave the film to McCord to print. After a few days Liddy asked McCord about the pictures. McCord said that his photographer was on vacation and he could not get them developed. Hunt gave the film to the Cuban operative who was least accustomed to covert operations, Bernard Barker. Barker gave the film to a commercial photo exchange, Rich's Photos in Miami. This, of course, left a trail, since the proprietor reported the odd photos to the FBI. But there is a topper to this *seeming* tangent also. For the photographed documents were held against the background of a shag rug with a long nap. There was no such rug in the DNC. There was no such rug in the rooms at the Watergate rented by the burglars. But there was such a rug in the Howard Johnson's Hotel room rented for accomplice Alfred Baldwin. So as Jim Hougan states, it is likely that either McCord, or perhaps Hunt, altered the photos. For what reason? Only McCord or

continued on page 14

The Mystery Behind the Break-In

One of the most enduring enigmas of the whole Watergate episode is one that most criminal investigations solve immediately: the question of motive. Why did the Plumbers want to break into the Democratic National Committee and plant a bug on the phone of Chairman Larry O'Brien? As H. R. Haldeman writes in *The Ends of Power*, anyone with an ounce of political savvy would know that the DNC was only a shell. It only makes sense to tap the actual candidate's phone, not the chairman of a committee that is millions of dollars in debt. Politically, it even makes more sense to target a campaign manager's phone than a party chairman's.

In fact, many of those involved with Watergate continued to ponder this question while in jail and after they got out. For no one who attended the Liddy-Mitchell meetings in January, when Liddy made his grandiose presentations about surveilling the Democrats, attests to any mention of a DNC break-in or wiretap. To this day, no one has come up with a good motive. With the release of *Age of Secrets* by Gerald Bellett, it is now possible to answer this question with authority. And this answer not only addresses the break-in question but answers a much-ignored but just as important subsidiary mystery.

Haldeman and Fred Thompson both note that while it is provable that the CIA monitored, controlled, and sabotaged the break-in, it is not provable that they actually caused it. A much more demonstrable reason for the break-in was Nixon's obsession with the scars of his past. One of the biggest wounds was the one left by

Howard Hughes.

As Lisa Pease shows elsewhere (see page 9), Nixon placed much of the blame for his 1960 and '62 losses on his monetary association with Hughes. O'Brien had also worked for Hughes. At the time of the break-in, that account had been turned over to Bob Bennett at the Mullen firm. But Nixon thought that O'Brien was still on the Hughes retainer. This fear was fed by John Meier, Hughes aide and a Democrat. In a conversation Donald Nixon had with Meier in late 1971, Don (who was collecting intelligence for his brother at the time) asked Meier if O'Brien was still working for Hughes. Meier said he didn't know but added that he was sure that the Democrats would win the election since they had a lot of information on Nixon and Hughes that had never aired before. Nixon's brother stiffened. Then Meier said that he was

The Real Watergate Story

continued from page 13

Hunt know. But its probably the same reason that the surveillance on the DNC phones was faulty. McCord spent thousands of dollars on electronic surveillance equipment for these break-ins. Yet he left no tape recorder for Baldwin to record the raw data from the taps! Baldwin was supposed to write it down on yellow legal pads. As ex-FBI agent Liddy commented later "It was the most ridiculous fucking electronic surveillance operation I've ever seen."

Which brings us to June 17th. Again, from Eugenio Martinez:

I... told Barker I resented the way they were treating Gonzalez... I said there wasn't adequate operational preparation. There was no floor plan of the building; no one knew the disposition of the elevators, how many guards there were, or even what time the guards checked the building. Gonzalez did not know what kind of door he was supposed to open. There weren't even any contingency plans.

These of course, were all quite legitimate complaints. Even when one is being paid for an illegal assignment, one would want to know if precautions are being taken. A jail term is not a particularly appetizing option. Yet what did Hunt say to these well founded concerns? "You are an operative. Your mission is to do what you are told and not to ask questions." Martinez decided to go along on another "mission". Why? In his own words:

When you are in this kind of business, and you are in the middle of something, it is not easy to stop. Everyone will feel that you might jeopardize the operation. "What to do with this guy now?" I knew it would create a big problem...

So, in spite of the fact that these high-risk break-ins were producing nothing, perhaps because of that reason, Jeb Magruder, Liddy's superior at CREEP, ordered another break-in. This was to fix the tap that McCord said was faulty on Larry O'Brien's phone. Just why O'Brien's tap was faulty opens an interesting issue (see the O'Brien story above.)

The Final Break-In

This brings us to the early morning hours of June 17th. McCord was supposed to tape open the lock on the basement door. When he met some members of the team there, they discovered that the tape had been removed. Since the crew had waited until late at night, it was very likely that a guard had removed it (which was the case). The Cubans wanted to abort the mission. McCord insisted on going ahead and retaped the door. He went off, and at a meeting with Liddy and Hunt across the street, asked them how they wanted to proceed now that there was a danger of being exposed. Liddy decided to go ahead, mainly because McCord wanted to and he was the one most at risk.

So the operation continued. When McCord returned from his conference, Martinez asked him if he had removed the tape from the doors. The tape was no longer

necessary, since the others were now safely inside the DNC's offices. McCord said he had. This was false. And it was this second taping that ensured their capture. For the guard, Frank Wills, could discount one strip of tape—it could be a maintenance man—but not two. Why clean a room twice?

But James McCord was not through with his reign of error. Knowing that he had alerted the guard at least once, if not twice, he now told Barker to turn off his walkie-talkie, their only connection to their lookouts across the street. The second tape was enough for Wills; he called the police. With no radio contact, the burglars were captured red-handed.

And what of Hunt that night? He seemed to have forgotten training school also.

If one is supervising a break-in with obedient underlings, one would expect them to carry nothing on them that would be traceable to their sponsoring agency. In other words, no money, no notes, no wallets, no identification of any kind. After they were stripped you would place those items in a safe place to ensure them from discovery. Someplace like a personal locker or safe or large postal delivery box. Once Hunt collected their belongings he placed them in briefcases in the burglars' hotel rooms at the Watergate. But not before he was sure they all kept their hotel keys on them. And in these belongings of course were Hunt's name and phone number, along with the ill-disguised notation "W.

thinking of turning over "everything that went on with Hughes." Don was mortified. "God. You can't do this to my brother." He then called Nixon and said, "Dick, I've just found out Meier's given all his Hughes information to the Democrats. O'Brien has it . . ."

Haldeman observes that O'Brien had become "a symbol of hate" for Nixon. Nixon felt that now the Hughes connection would drag him down again while O'Brien's own dalliances with Hughes would go unexposed. To Haldeman, Nixon even conveyed that the break-in stemmed from some instruction he'd given to Colson. "I have talked to Chuck [Colson]. . . and I am sure that Chuck may even have talked to Hunt along those lines." Haldeman states that many times after the break-in Nixon would say, "Colson must have done it." In John Dean's first report to Nixon about the

break-in, he said that no one in the White House was apparently involved. Nixon replied, "not even Colson?"

Furthering this chain, Jeb Magruder who actually OK'd Liddy's initial break-ins in May claimed the impetus for the break-in came from Colson. And the way he relayed the message to Liddy, closes the circle. Liddy wrote that Magruder said, "I want to know what O'Brien's got right here!" Magruder then slapped the desk drawer where he stored his defamatory information on the Democrats. Liddy took the gesture to mean Magruder wanted to know what O'Brien had on Nixon.

This motive would also explain the other subsidiary yet significant question. Even though Magruder said that resources were no problem and McCord spent tens of thousands on equipment, the bug on O'Brien's phone never functioned correctly. McCord was sensitive about this point. He

told everyone that he had tapped the phone and showed the FBI where. The problem was he did this eleven months after the break-in, when any discovery would not prove much. Anyway, there is no evidence of this other than McCord's word.

The point is, why was McCord so intent on covering this up? Because if McCord had his own agenda on the break-ins (and he did), and if he was working for the CIA (almost inescapable), then he would realize two things: 1) If the tap worked, the break-ins would be over without the capture inside the DNC. 2) If the tap worked, it endangered an exposure of Hughes' inseparable tie to the CIA and would give Nixon something to hold over them in the face of the break-in capture. In other words, Nixon would have had ammunition to fight back with. McCord's "malfunction" left no opening for Nixon. ♣

House". But even before this, Hunt had paid off the burglars in *sequentially* numbered hundred dollar bills. The money trail would lead from Miami, to Mexico City and back to CREEP. That latter trail would lead to John Mitchell, Nixon's former Attorney General, now managing his campaign. The former would lead to Charles Colson who agreed to take on Howard Hunt at the White House from the Mullen Company, with the blessings of his boss there, Bob Bennett (see page 22). Colson had been a special assistant to President Nixon and with the proximity of these two men, plus some others who decided to tell all they knew (and make up what they did not), Nixon seemed boxed in.

We said earlier that most recapitulations of Watergate begin at this point. We feel that shortchanges the facts and adulterates the truth. And what has been the accepted truth about Watergate? That Nixon agreed to the break-in, installed a cover-up from the top down to protect himself and that in the face of this, some heroes like Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski, Senator Sam Ervin, reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, and their editor Ben Bradlee fought through to the truth. They had help from some institutions like that great newspaper the *Washington Post*, the relentless investigating staff of Ervin's committee, the fair but truth-seeking special prosecutor's office, a sterling Judiciary Committee willing to vote for impeachment, and a simple but honest local judge in D.C. to put the whole bunch of them in

jail. If this is all so, if the system worked so well, then why were all these shenanigans ignored by all these people and all these institutions? Why is it not part of the accepted history taught in schools and colleges? Why do the media, schools, and colleges all ignore these stupefying contradictions in the record? Why was Richard Helms allowed to tell the American public before the press-anointed hero Sam Ervin that the CIA had nothing to do with Watergate? Why was McCord never asked to explain his lie to Martinez or what happened to the photographs before they went to Barker? Why was Hunt not asked to explain what he was doing with a covert security clearance from Helm's top assistant while he was working at the White House? Most of all, why was Hunt's employer—Bob Bennett—not asked why he didn't report the break-in since he knew about it *three days in advance* (see page 22)?

For our leaders to ignore all this is to agree to join in a giant "damage control" operation. The aim appears to have been to deceive the public which cannot be trusted with uncomfortable facts or difficult solutions. For make no mistake about it, the real story of Watergate is anything but simple or palatable. For, like Richard Nixon or not, the man had enemies. This is the president who fired Richard Helms in early 1973. Nixon actually launched an investigation of the *Post* and was aiming to take Kate Graham's TV stations—her biggest money-makers—away from her. Nixon was trying to reorganize the intelligence

community in order to bypass the heads of several agencies. And he was conducting his foreign policy, not through regular State Department or Pentagon channels, but mostly through his National Security Adviser, Henry Kissinger. The same Kissinger who was a product of that Eastern Establishment that Nixon hated, and who was going to the movies with Kate Graham while he was working for Nixon.

So at the same time Nixon appears to be sabotaged from below (Hunt and McCord), he is doing battle at the top with some of the heaviest hitters in the Washington establishment. And once the Watergate story broke, Nixon's blood was in the water. And no matter how many times it threatened to die a natural death, a "bombshell" would strike to keep it afloat. As this process continued it led to defections in the ranks, most notably White House counsel John Dean, who, while negotiating with the press and Justice Department, became, so to speak, the Ruth Paine of Watergate.

But what nobody seemed to notice was that to keep the controversy alive, the "bombshells" became less relevant to the original story and at times quite stretched. For instance, to bolster his credibility John Dean stated that during the cover-up stage of Watergate, he had met with Nixon around 40-45 times. Yet, the White House logs indicated that number was double the real figure. Dean said that he felt Nixon knew about the cover-up from at least September 15, 1972. Yet Richard Moore, an-

continued on page 32

Watergate

continued from page 15

other White House employee, said that after a March 21st meeting with Nixon, Dean told him that this was the first time Nixon had known the details of the cover-up. Dean stated under oath that, after he left Manila, he first heard of the cover-up from Fred Fielding in San Francisco on June 18th. But as the authors of *Silent Coup* show, this is unlikely and Dean seems to have altered the facts to hide how quickly he was involved in the cover-up machinations. Most people ignored the faults in Dean's testimony for two reasons. When the tapes were released everyone concentrated on Nixon's words, not Dean's. Secondly, the partisan Ervin Committee and the media had bought into Dean and now could not reverse the "star treatment" they gave him.

This is not to minimize the role of Richard Nixon. Nixon, predictably, mishandled Watergate every step of the way. The worst was the so-called "Saturday Night Massacre" when he fired then Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, and, when the Attorney General and his assistant refused to carry out this order, they resigned. This created a firestorm and Nixon lost any hope of winning back the confidence of the American people. The invisible forces in Washington had won out. The rest was, as Oliver Stone shows, near-Shakespearean: death coming to a man who had already been dead a long time.

Then Gerald Ford took office. The same man who was part of the cleanup battalion after the JFK murder, did the same with Watergate. In pardoning Nixon and letting Jaworski proceed as he had been doing, he did what he always had. He went with the flow. Which in Washington means the CIA, the Pentagon and its allies in the media. This even though Colson had stated in *Newsweek* that Nixon realized he was a prisoner of the CIA and Pentagon in his own White House. Even though Nixon had

Coming Attractions

- ☛ Analysis of the newly released documents
- ☛ Clay Shaw's domestic contact reports
- ☛ Ruth & Michael Paine under the microscope
- ☛ The formation of the Warren Commission
- ☛ More from Carol Hewett on Ballistics in Dealey Plaza

And in addition, the continuing saga of Harry Connick & the Garrison files, and lots more! Join our efforts to illuminate our present through our past. Subscribe to **PROBE!**

called Haldeman at four in the morning to ask the following questions:

"Do you know anything about the Bennett PR firm, the Mullen Company?"

"Did you ever employ them at the White House?"

"Were they ever retained by us for any purpose?"

"Did you know they were a CIA front?"

"Did you know that Helms ordered Bennett to hire Howard Hunt?"

"Did you know that Hunt was on the payroll at the Bennett firm at the same time that he was on the White House payroll?"

By the time of this call—the summer of '73—with John Dean mesmerizing America, Nixon was near the truth. But he realized that with his credibility ebbing and the Post-led media which was being fed stories by Bennett (see page 23), in one of their periodic feeding frenzies, he had no chance to fight back. After he left, Ford intoned over his second national trauma that our long nightmare was over. Dr. Feelgood was at it again. Unfortunately, the nightmare was not over. Neither was it beginning. It was just continuing. ☛

Hughes

continued from page 11

convince the media Hughes was still alive. If the voice at the other end was Hughes, he had a remarkably spotty memory, going on in great detail on some questions, and unable to sufficiently answer others, all bearing on significant aspects of his life. In the course of this interview, Hughes (or whoever) made derogatory comments about Robert Maheu. Maheu promptly sued, hiring, among others, Charles Appel (see sidebar on page 7).

Hughes' death brought forth many alleged wills, but none of them ever held up in any court. Without a will, Hughes empire passed completely into the control of the CIA. All holdings belonged either to HMI or Summa by then. Insiders claim the Hughes companies made up the CIA's biggest proprietary in history.

Hughes officially died in a plane (a poetic touch for the ex-pilot). His body was full of needles that had broken off during his years of being given drugs (willingly or unwillingly.) The body weighed close to 90 pounds, but Hughes had been 6'4". Some believe the body buried was not Hughes's. Others say it was Hughes, but he had been dead some time before. Only a few people know the truth. The trick is figuring out which ones they are.

Hughes had always talked of leaving his vast fortune to his medical institute (HMI.) He drafted such a will, but according to Nadine Henley never signed it. Whatever his intentions, the effect was that the CIA grew quite rich by Hughes' death. And Meier knew where the bodies were, er, kept. ☛

If you're not already a subscriber to **PROBE**, now you know what you are missing! Order a subscription on our catalog page inside. We bring you the connections from past to present, reminding you why your history matters. Join us today! Subscribe to **PROBE!**

CTKA

P.O. Box 5489

Sherman Oaks, CA 91413

SEND TO:

MR. JOHN KELIN
1205 N. TEJON
COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80903

Last issue will be: 9/22/96

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Culver City, CA 90230
Permit No. 113