```
Voice: Conversation number thirty eight dash ninedy fi\downarrow:ve (0.2) Portion of a telephoon conversation \(\cdot h h\) between the Presidint? \(\cdot \mathrm{h}\) en H.R. \(h\) Haldemin. \({ }^{\circ} \cdot \mathrm{p} \cdot h^{\circ}\) This portion? was recordid on April eighteenth \(\cdot h h \underline{\text { nineteen sevendy }}\) three \(\cdot h h\) between \(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{u}}\) welve oh fi:ve \(\cdot h\) hen twelve twenty a.m.u
(5.1) ((dead tape))
(1.5) ((loud rustling noises))
Nixon: \(\quad h\) Heyllo? \({ }^{2} m h[h h h\)
Hald: \(\quad[\mathrm{Oh}:\) yessir. \(=\)
```



```
keep the fai: th, \(h h-\underline{h m}[\underline{h} h m h h\)
Hald: \({ }^{1} \quad[\) Yes \(\underline{\text { si-:-:-r. } \downarrow h u h \text { How'd the } \mathrm{t}(\mathrm{h}) \text { inner go } \cdot h h u h[h ~}\)
Nixon: [Well
\(\downarrow\) ih w'z fi::ne \(\downarrow\) great. \(n h\) Er great succ \(\downarrow\) ess=
Hald: \(\quad=W\) 's Sinatra okay?
Nixon: \(\quad h\) Oh he wiz \(\downarrow\) fi:ne. \(=\) Jus’ \((0.2)\) did a beautiful \(\downarrow\) jobmhm \(\cdot t \cdot h \underline{a} h h h^{\circ} \mathrm{en} \mathrm{sk}^{\circ}\) eh standing ovation for ' \(\underline{i m}^{\prime}\) 'nhhị- \({ }^{\circ \circ} \cdot h i h^{\circ \circ}(0.2)^{\circ} \underline{\text { evverything. }}{ }^{\circ} h h h r h h\) \(\downarrow\) uh R[eally \(h u\) Really went we:1l, \(\cdot h u h e h e h h e h\)
```



```
(•)
Nixon: \(\quad 2 \quad h \underline{O n e} a^{\prime}\) the more \(\uparrow\) difficult ones I had \(\downarrow\) yuh know? hhuh-heh \(\cdot\) hhehhh \(\downarrow\) 'thwhat I had ọn mah mI'in evrythi:ng?=
43
\({ }^{1}\) The word "sir" is produced just short of plosively. It sounds just short of laughter.
\({ }^{2}\) Nixon's "hhuh-heh" sounds like unvoiced laughter
\({ }^{3}\) In standard orthography "'thwhat I had on mah mI'..." would be "with what I had on my mind".
```



1
2
3

Hald: $\quad h$ ogy I don't think so I don't theenk he wen $t \underline{u}[p$.
Nixon: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
): (0.3)

Nixon: $\qquad$ _
${ }^{\circ}$ heen $\operatorname{har}\left[y^{\circ}\right.$
$[\cdot \mathrm{p} \downarrow \underline{\mathrm{Oh}}$ yah. $h \mathrm{H}[\mathrm{m} \downarrow \mathrm{hm} \underline{\mathrm{m}}$ ? $h m h h h$

Hald:
[He- he: $(\cdot)$ had iz (0.4) conference with 'm but I
don't think he went, tih the jury.
${ }^{\circ \circ} \cdot \mathrm{tk}^{\circ \circ} \cdot$ pwuh
(0.3)
${ }^{\circ \circ} \cdot \mathrm{t}^{\circ \circ} \downarrow \mathrm{Yeb} m h h m \underline{h m h} \cdot \mathrm{p}-\mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{tch}$
(0.3)
(Nixon): $\quad[(\downarrow \mathrm{mgh})$

Hald:

Nixon:

I'mhmhh hah'll be a witnėss $\downarrow$ b't I'm not $\downarrow$ gunnuh be a defendant $h h \cdot h u h h h$
(•) Yih know, [hh

$(([w h h h))$
( Ø ): |
(0.8)

Hald:

[Yeah
( ):
(1.4)
${ }^{\circ 0}(r h i \prime)^{\circ \circ}$
(0.4)
${ }^{\circ} \cdot \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{hy}$ eah ${ }^{\circ}$
Hald: $\qquad$ Well $(\cdot)$ he will. $=$
$={ }^{\circ} h m h h \underline{m} h\left[h h h^{\circ \circ}\right.$
( Ø ):

'Mean that['s
$\left[\cdot \underline{p l k} u h h{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{N}\right.$ jes's say here's the truth $h \underline{u} h ? m h$

Hald: $\quad h H \underline{e}$ : he- I'm $\downarrow$ sure that's what hị'll deu

Nixon: $\qquad$ $\downarrow h \mathrm{Hm}$ h́$? h h=$

Nixon: $(1.8)=(($ swallow $)) h h m h \cdot t \cdot h h e ́ y a h y a h$
Hald: $\qquad$ $h E t$ jist- the only $(p)(0.3)$ problem is if he thinks he['s
 (([skwkthp))

Hald: being helpful $\downarrow$ on sump'n yih know? 'n- $(\cdot) \downarrow \mathrm{e}[\mathrm{n}$
Nixon: $\qquad$
(•)
(1.2)

Nixon:

Hald: $\qquad$ pehhh $\downarrow h u h h h m$

B't I don't think he will now I think he understands.
Nixon:
$\cdot \mathrm{klk} \cdot$ tch $\underline{\underline{k}} \downarrow$ 'T's right $\downarrow \cdot h e h e h h e h e$ What $\uparrow \underline{\text { is }}$ the $\downarrow:$ mgh-hghm: hhh klk!
-huhh $\underline{\text { One point } \downarrow t h \text { it I: } f h h \text { ez I s-urged terday is } \downarrow \text { the } t h z \underline{\text { zu }} \text { in Joh:n mghm }}$ $\downarrow$ naw: dihmorruh afternoon $\downarrow$ we ${ }^{\circ 0} h h^{\circ \circ}$ oughta meet again in $h \cdot h h e h h e h h e$ (0.8) hen: $\cdot t l k \cdot k l k \cdot t k$ ụreally loo(•)k ụhhard it what’s comi:ng hend $\downarrow$ uh::: yịh know en wh lookit $n h$ the na:mes $\underline{\underline{i n}}$ so forth in: $\cdot \operatorname{huhh}(\cdot) \downarrow$ and uh::: $\downarrow$ : $m h h h$ yih kno-:w? (0.2) $\cdot h a h h \downarrow h$ uh::: ${ }^{\circ} \underline{u} u t^{\circ}(0.4)$ jis’ be prepared for it mghm nI think too: the $[\mathbf{t}$ uh




Nixon:
((various soft, clicking noi[ses))

$\cdot h a h h(0.2)$ the Dean thi: $\mathrm{n}[\mathrm{g} ? h m h h h[h h$
$[$
$([h h) \quad[\mathrm{M}[\mathrm{m}[\mathrm{hm}$,

$[\cdot \mathrm{p}[($ No other $)$ plans $\uparrow \underline{I}$ don’t know
whether •hehhe somebọdy really ought'n dih talk $\downarrow$ to 'im. $h$ h B'I don' know
whetherhhhis should $\underline{b}^{\prime} t$
${ }^{\circ} h \underline{e h h e h u h u h}{ }^{\circ}$

1

Nixon: $\qquad$ $h \mathrm{I}$ :ee uh he mus' think about tha:t $a$ s tuh whether (1.3) $h$ whether it's

```
( ):(0.9) `.huhhuhhuhhuhhu\mp@subsup{u}{}{\circ}
```

Nixon: $\qquad$

``` \(\underline{\text { He's }} \underline{\text { obviously }}\) on the kiek iv uh \(h h m h \underline{h}((\) swallow \()) \cdot\) tchk! \({ }^{\circ} \cdot h e: h^{\circ}\)
Nixon:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` saving 'im \(\uparrow\) self \(h h=\)
\((\quad): \quad{ }^{\circ} h m h^{\circ}=\)
Nixon: \(\quad=\downarrow_{\text {m }}\) an \([\mathrm{d}\) uh \(\downarrow]\)
Hald:
```



```
Nixon: \(\quad=h h \mathrm{mgh} h h \mathrm{~m}(0.2)^{\circ} \cdot h o o p e h\) yeheháaheha \(a^{\circ}{ }^{\circ \circ} \cdot \mathrm{p} \cdot \mathrm{t}^{\circ \circ} h \mathrm{Uh}\) en thè: U.S.
Att \(\uparrow\) orney is gunnuh have=tough \(\uparrow\) problemhhmh but hmh \({ }_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{I}\) think thih
U.S. Attorney ul \(\cdot h u h h u h h \underline{e}\) my guess is will: \(h=\)
( ): (1.0)
Nixon:
``` \(\qquad\)
```

$={ }^{\circ 0} h h(0.4) h m h h m h\left[h h^{\circ \circ}\right.$ [yịh know give 'm the immūnideehmhmh
Nixon: $\quad \mathrm{p} \cdot \mathrm{t}[\mathrm{lk}$
Hald: [Think 'ee wị:ll uh?
(0.4)
Nixon: $\quad$ plk $\underline{\text { Well I would } \downarrow \text { think } \operatorname{so} \downarrow \text { Bog } b, h m h ~}$
(•)
( ): •t
Nixon: $\quad h[\underline{m} h h] m h$
Hald: $\quad[\mathrm{Hmh}]$

```
(0.2)

Nixon: \(\quad\) Ând uh::huhuhh 'n \(\uparrow\) nen ọf course \(\uparrow\) wi'llhuh \(h \underline{e} h \underline{e} h \underline{e}\) If the \(\underline{U} . \underline{S}\). Attorney is giving eem immunity so the \(t\) 'ee c'n \(\downarrow\) tell the \(\uparrow\) truth \((\cdot)\) that doesn' bother
```

Nixon: me 'hehhe(\cdot) B't if they give 'im thē eemmunity in terms uff he'llawh
·huh (0.3) hif it's incenee' fer 'im \uparrowlie:,,heyuhh that's thė that's:: the thing,

```

```

        (0.5)
    Nixon: }\quad\uparrow\mathrm{ But they iv course hev theịr lehhhehhhave theịr otherhhehh hwitnessiz
en so forth tuh try dih corroborrate ih \cdott\cdothehhh [-(0.6)-] hhI do ho(*)pe=

```

```

( Ø ):
Nixon:
$\downarrow$ uh:: one thing thet uhhheheh thet the other thing we've gotta do is tuh $h$ $h \underline{e}: h h(0.3)$ Bob is tih get $\mathrm{s}: \uparrow$ some: kind iv $\downarrow \mathrm{a}<(0.7) m k h l i::$ ne with regard to $h u h^{\circ} \cdot h e h h \underline{e} h^{\circ}[-(0.7)-]$ tih-oo: $\downarrow$ to: this whole business ọf=

```

```

${ }^{\circ \circ}(([\uparrow \text { wuh wuh }]))^{\circ \circ}$
( Ø ) :
$=$ helping the defendents: $h$ ah mean that's: hehheh $\left[-(0.3)^{-}\right] h h \mathrm{I}<$ just $=$

```

```

( Ø ): (([klk klk]))
Nixon: $\quad=$ fee:l s::some way tha( $\cdot$ )t oughta be able dih be done yih know wuddeh mea:n thet uh $\cdot h u h u h \underline{e} h=$
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Hald: } & ={ }^{\circ} \mathrm{M}\left[\mathrm{m}^{\circ}\right. \\ (\quad): & { }^{\circ}\left[w h^{\circ}=\right.\end{array}$
Nixon:

``` \(\qquad\)
``` \(=h \mathrm{Uh} h h \mathrm{I}\) don'know whether ther- ther \(\underline{\text { is }}\) any \(\uparrow\) wa \(:\) : \(\downarrow\) though is \(\operatorname{er} \downarrow h h\)
(•)
t•hihh
Hald:
```



``` We:lll? (•) eh \(_{\text {yth }}\)
( ): (1.5) •hehheh
(•)
Hald:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` Nixon:
```

I thin $(k)<(0.7){ }_{\mathrm{g}}$ Ah doh I don't see anything other then the $[(0.3)] \cdot h$ the $=$
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${ }^{6}$ ???
${ }^{7}$ The first time that the demand for money for the Watergate defendants is mentioned is at the 'cancer on the presidency' meeting (March 21, 1973), initially between Nixon and Dean, and at some point joined by Haldeman. The person Dean speaks of is not William O. Bittman (Howard Hunt's lawyer), but Paul L. O'Brien, a lawyer for the Committee to Re-elect the President, whom Hunt had approached and asked to deliver the demand to John Dean (Jeff Trans:38:13-39:26). Perhaps this is the meeting Nixon is referring to above, when he speaks of the "information about Bittman" and says, "you [Haldeman] were there".

```
Nixon:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` \(h\) And uhhuhuhuhuh the way Dean might<(0.3) put that ez et well en ehh \(\cdot h e h \underline{e} h e h \underline{e} h(\cdot)[(0.4)] \uparrow\) ghhm \(h\) he k-eez \(\uparrow\) gotta figure thet maybe he c ' \(\mathrm{d}=\) [ ] \({ }^{\circ}(([\text { p-tk] }]))^{\circ}\)
Nixon: \(\quad=\) say well he w'z in the Presid'nt's o \(\uparrow\) :ffice \(\downarrow\) un told the President that 'n he \((\cdot)\) that of course he shouldn't. \(\underline{\text { rea }}\) [lly do.
Hald:
```



```
([Right)
```


## (0.3)

```
Hald:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` Yah?
(0.6) ((p-t-k))
Nixon:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` But uh what's yer guess on that \(h[m h h\)
Hald:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` \(‘ t \cdot h h u-\underline{I}\) jist ey jis(0.2) \(\boldsymbol{t}\) can' \(t(0.4)\) I don' know. \(=\downarrow \mathrm{I}\) thI jus' can't conceive
```



``` thet 'ee would.=
( ): (0.7) \(={ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} m h m h h^{\circ}\)
Nixon:
\(\downarrow \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{gh}} \mathrm{mh} \underline{m} h\)
Nixon: •plk
( Ø ):
thk
Nixon: \(\quad{ }^{8} \quad{ }^{\circ} h m^{\circ \circ}\) But the \(:\) n héllhuh \(\cdot h \underline{e} h \underline{e} h \underline{e} h\) wílll ruh- wuuv- \((\cdot)\) course report thet
```



``` couldn' do anythi:ng? \(h h n\) hen thet- \((\cdot)\) wuuz discussed with Mit \(\downarrow\) chell. \(h=\) Right? \(h n=\)
```

[^0]```
( Ø ): \quad 'tk, tk-k (`) tk-k-tko
    (0.9)
( Ø ): ptk=
Nixon:
```

$\qquad$

```
        =\downarrowEnd uh whoee W'z he present it them room thet time ['nd}h\cdothehhh
        |
                                    (([ptk))
( Ø ): (1.6) =ptk}(\cdot) pt
        (0.5)
Nixon:
```

$\qquad$

``` Yih know when they said thet Mitchell said \(\uparrow\) well iss tak’n \(\uparrow\) care of \(\uparrow h u[h h\)
```



``` (0.8)
Hald: It wiz \((\cdot)\) Ih wuuz
( ): tch=
Hald: \(\quad=\) John thet \({ }^{\prime}\) ee \({ }^{\circ} \uparrow\) talk \({ }^{\prime} \downarrow\) tuh. \({ }^{\circ}\)
Nixon: You were present.h Ehrlichmin presėnt,
Hald:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` \(\operatorname{Mh}[\underline{m} ?<\)
```



```
( Ø ):
```



``` \({ }^{\circ \circ}\left[\underline{t k}^{\circ \circ}(0.3){ }^{\circ \circ} \mathrm{tk}^{\circ \circ} \mathrm{tk}-\mathrm{k}\right.\)
(0.6)
Nixon:
``` \(\qquad\)
``` \(\cdot \mathrm{pt} \downarrow\) Wellhahnh (0.2) \(\cdot \underline{t h k e e}(0.2) \cdot\) plk kluh \(\downarrow\) Shows I spoze knowledge ih sid \({ }_{\mathrm{p}}\) why dindju go tell the \({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Pr} \underline{\mathrm{e}} \uparrow\) sidint \({ }^{\circ} \downarrow\) then \(h \cdot \mathrm{t} \cdot h \underline{u} h h h\) (0.3)
Nixon: hhhhehheh.heyah
(0.7)
Hald: \(\quad\) Well there a \(\uparrow\) gain \(\downarrow\) it wiz< (0.3) ih yik you c'n (0.2) you c'n argue cuz there \(\uparrow\) was \(\downarrow\) there were \((\cdot)\) dere wiz a sep'rated amou:n \((\cdot) \boldsymbol{t}\) spe \(\uparrow\) cifi \(\downarrow\) cally fer fees in fer (1.0) [fer th-]
\([\) Right \(] \cdot p\)
```

```
```

Nixon:

```
```

Nixon:
Hald:
Hald:
\uparrowfamily \downarrowproblem 'ee had,
\uparrowfamily \downarrowproblem 'ee had,
(0.2)
(0.2)
Nixon:

```
Nixon:
```

$\qquad$

```
·klRi:ght,hmh
```

·klRi:ght,hmh
p
p
(0.6)
(0.6)
hmh(·) hmhmh'
hmh(·) hmhmh'
(4.5)

```
                                    (4.5)
```

Nixon:

``` \(\qquad\)
``` \({ }_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{Mm} \downarrow: h m h-h h-h h \cdot \mathrm{plk} \cdot \underline{\mathrm{k}}\)

Nixon: \(\qquad\) \(\cdot k l\) Well give it- \((\cdot)\) that one s'm hare:: \(\downarrow \downarrow\) thought. \(h\) Yin know? en, \(e h h[h\) [ (([to))
Wald
Hall:
Yah,
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新


-






```

Hald: $\quad$ Thed jist $<(0.2)$ Thet's $<$
Nixon: $\quad \underline{h h}$
Hald: th-almos' beyond [belief. $=$
Nixon: [•klk

```

```

$\mathrm{n}^{\mathrm{h}}$ ot whadduhhh $\cdot h \underline{a} h h h h \downarrow$ but uh $\downarrow h m h(0.2)^{\circ} g k^{\circ}(0.3)(($ swallow $)) \downarrow$ the

```

```

hnhhnh glk tlk $^{\circ \circ} \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{k}^{\circ \circ}(1.0){ }^{\circ \circ}((\text { swallow }))^{\circ \circ}$
Nixon: $\quad$ plkCourse the problem $\underline{\underline{i}: s}$ thet he $c$ 'n $\operatorname{talk}($ ' $)$ tuh me in $h \cdot h e h e h h ~ h e n: d ~$ ị-thet day I talk' God damn ${ }^{\circ} \uparrow$ freely with $\downarrow$ 'im ${ }_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{I}$ said well what the hell where you gunnuh $\uparrow$ get $\mathrm{it} \uparrow(\cdot)$ nyeh knowhu $h^{\circ} \cdot$ hehehh $^{\circ}(0.4) h \downarrow$ end uh $\downarrow=$ $h m h h m h h$ ih siz we don' do=we doon hạve the money, $\downarrow \mathrm{hmh} \cdot \mathrm{p} \cdot \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{h} \boldsymbol{u} h$ how much is it ' n yell be a million dollar[s in I] said $n h$.hahhh good God $\downarrow \mathrm{I}=$ [ ]
Hald:
Nixon: = says.huhh $\cdot$ hehh
( ): $\quad{ }^{\circ} \uparrow \mathrm{eh}^{\circ}=$
Nixon: ${ }^{10}=h$ En they mittid id the $\uparrow$ black $\downarrow$ mail thing. $\downarrow=\underline{\text { He }}$ said this is blackmail ' $n$
$h \mathrm{I}$ said $h \cdot \underline{t} \cdot \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{t}-\underline{\mathrm{k}}$ we can't be blackmailed er: somebuddy said thet er $h \uparrow$ he
37
${ }^{9}$ In standard orthography, ...he'll do id $\underline{\text { th }}$,hhehehf 'ee..." would be shown as "...he'll do it, heh if he...", and "he $m^{\text {hay }} \mathrm{n}^{\mathrm{h}}$ ot whadduh..." might be "he may not want to".
${ }^{10}$ In the March 21,1973 meeting between Nixon and Dean, Dean tells Nixon, about the men arrested in the Watergate break-in, that "they started making demands" for "attorney's fees". Discussions with John Mitchell followed, at which Dean "was present, that these guys had to be taken care of". (JeffTrans 33:12-21). Nixon thereafter refers to it in the same words, that "you're taking care of witnesses." (JeffTrans 35:3-4).
Subsequently, Dean says "this is going to be a continual blackmail operation by [the Watergate defendants]" (JeffTrans:36:26-37:3]. He uses that reference again [JeffTrans:38:13 and 40:3], and sums up by saying "[T]here's the problem of the continued blackmail. Which will not only go on now, it'll go on when these people are in prison, and it will compound the obstruction of justice situation", adding "It'll cost money. It's dangerous. . . It's a real problem as to whether we could even do it", and concluding that "there's no denying the fact that the White House and Ehrlichman, Haldeman, Dean are involved in some of the early money decisions." At which point Nixon asks "How much money do you need", Dean answers ""I would saay these people are going to cost a million dollars over the next two years", to which Nixon responds "We could get that. . . ." $\left.{ }^{[ } \mathrm{Y}\right]$ ou could get the million dollars and you could get it in cash. I know where it could be gotten." (JeffTrans:44:22-46:15).

```
```

Nixon: $\quad \downarrow$ did. $=$
Hald: $\quad=h h \underline{I}[h h$
[
[Yih gotta say tọ his credit didn'ee
( Ø ): $\quad{ }^{\circ \circ}$ tuh-tee ${ }^{\circ \circ} \mathrm{khh}$
Hald: ${ }^{11} \quad$ I'm not sure 'ee di:d. En the $t-(0.9)$ thAh min thih- not $h \mathrm{Ah}$ 'm not sure 'ee

```

```

Hald: $\quad=$ that $[($ road $)]$
[ ]
[•I WI]SH THERE WERE a WA: y we $\downarrow c^{\prime} \mathrm{d} t s h n-k h n \underline{h} \dot{\underline{e}}$ - et least
$\underline{h u h h}-\underline{h}-\underline{h} \cdot h \underline{e h h h} \mathrm{~s}::$ ep'rate Ehrlichmin out I don't know hhow you ca:n, $h$
becuz uh, hh •tkl $\cdot h u h h h(0.4)$ hís uhmhhh (0.2) $\cdot \mathrm{t} \cdot h u h \underline{u h h h} \cdot \underline{k l u k} \cdot h u h \underline{m g h h} \downarrow: m$
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${ }^{11}$ Prior to Haldeman's joining the meeting, Dean suggests that "we should begin to think in terms of how to
cut the losses. How to minimize the further growth of this thing. Rather than further compound it by ultimately
paying these guys forever." (JeffTrans:82:13-23). After Haldeman has entered (which he does at JeffTrans:91:
23-26), Nixon says to Dean "The point is, your feeling is that we just can't continue to pay the blackmail to
these guys." Dean answers, "I think that's our greatest jeopardy", to which Nixon responds, "Now let me tell
you it's no problem, we could get the money there's no problem in that." (JeffTrans:119:7-11). A bit later,
Nixon says to Dean, "So...your feeling at the present time is to hell with the million dollars? In other words you say to these fellows I'm sorry it's all off and let them talk. Correct?" Dean says "Well," to which Nixon responds "That's the way to do it ( ) If you want to do it clean". Haldeman concurs: "Yeah the clean way to do it, that's the way you can live with it. Because the problem with the blackmail, and that's the thing we kept raising with you [Dean] when you said there's a money problem, when you needed twenty thousand or a hundred thousand or something? was yeah that's what you need today but what do you need tomorrow and then next year? and five years from now?".

```
(2.3) ((various clicking noises))

Nixon: \(\quad\) See the luh- \((\cdot)\) the vulner'bil'dy iv a law \(\downarrow\) yer here is è-is enormous \(p \bar{e}[\mathrm{cuz} z h y] o u\) know yih see it jes(•)t it's a deestrucshin of iss:: of \(\mathrm{iz}=\)
\(\left[\begin{array}{ll}{[ } & \\ {[\text { ah }]}\end{array}\right.\)

Nixon: \(\qquad\) =c'ree: r .
(•)

Nixon: (1.3) •pt•hahhahhah

Nixon: \(\qquad\) But uhe, \(h(1.1)\) there \(=\) other things tih \(\uparrow\) do \(:, h \underline{m} h h m h h h p k l \underline{k r} k(\cdot) \cdot t k u h{ }^{\circ} \cdot h u h h^{\circ}\) (0.7) \(\downarrow\) and uh \(\uparrow: \downarrow: h h h \mathrm{I}\) don' kno:w.hhuh

Nixon: | \(\quad \circ \cdot k^{\circ}\)
(1.7)

Nixon:
\(\qquad\)



Hald:


Nixon:
(2.6)
\(={ }^{\circ} h h^{\circ}\)

Hald: \(\qquad\) \({ }^{\circ} c^{\prime} n\) make \({ }^{\circ}\) a point on any a' that,

Nixon:

\({ }^{\circ} h m h m h m h{ }^{\circ}\)
(1.0)

Nixon: \(\qquad\) \(\cdot \mathrm{p} \cdot h a h h h e h e h e h h<(0.4) h \mathrm{ee} \underline{\mathrm{Yu}}(\cdot) \mathrm{p} h \mathrm{ih} \uparrow \underline{\mathrm{i}}: \mathrm{s} \downarrow\) a long \(\uparrow\) ways hhehhhh \(\downarrow\) and uh in thé \(h\) mean \(\downarrow\) time a' course I'll \(\downarrow\) (0.3) [-(1.6)-] \(\downarrow\) be a \(\uparrow\) const'nt problem wohn’ it.hmhh Well \((\cdot) \cdot t \cdot h \underline{e} h\left[h h^{\circ \circ} h h h h^{\circ \circ}\right.\) No use tọ borrow any more trouble then we \(=\) [
[•tlk
Nixon: \(\quad=\uparrow \mathrm{go}: \mathrm{t}\) is er.\(h m[h \underline{h h}\)

Hald:
[No?

Nixon: \(\quad \underline{h m h h} h a h h h \cdot h u h \downarrow\) But let's:: lit's sit down en just púdown'n a piece=pap\(\downarrow\) er
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\({ }^{12}\) Frederick Cheney LaRue, according to the 'Profiles of key figures' in The Watergate Hearings (pp.846-7), "was an intimate friend and political lieutenant of former Attorney General John N. Mitchell." In Lukas' profile (pp.351-2), he is characterized as "passing messages, briefing witnesses, delivering cash - the indispensable jack-of-all-missions." Assistant to John Mitchell at the committee to re-elect, he was involved in the 'hush money' payments (Lukas, p. ), pleaded guilty to a charge of one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, sentenced to one to three years, sentence reduced to six months (Jaworski, p.339).
\({ }^{13}\) Robert Mardian, initially John Mitchell's assistant Attorney General, became deputy manager of the committee to re-elect (Lukas, p.339), indicted on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice, sentenced to serve 10 months to three years in 1976 (Jaworski, p.339) when Jaworski's the Right and the Power was published, the conviction was under appeal).
\({ }^{14}\) Paul L. O'Brien and Kenneth W. Parkinson were hired in June, 1972 to represent the Committee to Re-elect the President in the Watergate matter. John Dean (Blind Ambition, pp.161-2) refers to Ken Parkinson and Paul O'Brien as members of "the middle-level cover-up group", and as "serving as intermediaries with Hunt." And (according to Lukas, pp.395-6) on March \(16^{\text {th }}\), with March \(23^{\text {rd }}\) set as the date for sentencing of the Watergate burglars, Hunt met with O'Brien with a demand for \(\$ 132,000\), telling O'Brien to take a message to John Dean saying that if he didn't get his money he would have to "'review his options'". On March \(19^{\text {th }}\), O'Brien passed this message along to Dean. According to Lukas (p.430), O'Brien was among those whom Dean, on the morning of April \(14^{\text {th }}\), told Haldeman and Ehrlichman " \(m\) mght be involved in potential obstruction-of-justice problems' and might be indicted." (Dean's foreboding apparently did not materialize -- Paul O'Brien is not mentioned in Jaworski's 'Status Report of Cases' ('appendix a', pp.348-354 in The Right and the Power), a comprehensive list of those indicted, and the outcome of their cases.)
\({ }^{15}\) Elapsed time between the end of Nixon's "...O'Brien?" and start of Haldeman's utterance: (2.1)
```

( Ø ): (0.6) ${ }^{\circ}$ kreek-kriko=
Nixon:
$\square$
$={ }_{\mathrm{m}}$ On the $=$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ( Ø ): (0.6) } & { }^{\circ} \text { kreek-krik }{ }^{\circ}= \\ \text { Nixon: } & ={ }_{m} \text { On the }=\end{array}$
Hald: $\quad=$ what $\operatorname{Joh} \uparrow: \mathrm{n} \downarrow$ said they $\downarrow$ did,

| Nixon: | ${ }^{\circ \circ} \cdot \mathrm{t} \downarrow \mathrm{Un}$ the $\downarrow^{\circ \circ}$ coverup? $h m[h$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hald: | $\left[\downarrow \mathrm{O}^{\prime}\right.$ Brien en $(\cdot) h \mathrm{en}$ uh |

(•)

```


```

            \(\begin{array}{cc}{[ } & ] \\ { }^{\circ}(([\text { thukka }]))^{\circ} & {[([\mathrm{dk}))}\end{array}\)
    Nixon: $\quad=$ import'n I think thet we $\cdot \underline{h e h h h}$ get $\uparrow$ that $\downarrow$ che know eh so thethnhnh $/ /$
((tape cuts))

```
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\({ }^{16}\) Kenneth W. Parkinson and Paul O'Brien, two attorneys hired in June, 1972 to represent the Committee to Re-elect the President in the Watergate matter. John Dean (Blind Ambition, pp.161-2) refers to them as members of "the middle-level cover-up group", and as "serving as intermediaries with Hunt." At one point, Parkinson brought in a memo from Hunt that spelled out the Watergate defendants' money demands. In a telephone conversation with Colson, Hunt speaks of the money problem, saying "...and uh Parkinson who's been the go-between with my attorneys doesn't seem to be very effective..." (JeffTrans 8:11-12). Parkinson was indicted on March 1, 1974, on one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice and one count of obstruction of justice; pleaded not guilty; acquitted January 1, 1975 (Jaworski, p.340).```


[^0]:    50
    ${ }^{8}$ In standard orthography, "wị'll ruh- wuuv- $(\cdot)$ course report..." would be shown as "wé'll re- of- $(\cdot)$ course report..."

