

knowledge

Quite separate from any <sup>legal</sup> ~~legal~~ questions of presumption of innocence are other means of forming opinions on guilt or innocence.

It is possible to be guilty of criminal act but innocent under the law because of technicalities, because of violations of the rights of the accused and many other reasons recognized as good reason by law and society in general.

In a book the <sup>author's</sup> ~~autor's~~ concern is not legal guilt or innocence but fact. He asks "What does the evidence prove?"

People generally form impressions from behavior. They ask, "Does he act like an innocent man?" or they say, "He acts guilty."

From the moment of the arrests, Nixon acted only like a guilty man. He talked, of course, as though he were completely innocent and as he had done throughout his troubled political life, adopted the role of an innocent man beset by enemies of evil intent who never told the truth about him.

First his spokesmen and then he proclaimed the desire and intent and later the practise of telling all, of nothing holding back. In practise it was always the opposite. He held everything back. Had what he held back been helpful to him he would not have kept it secret. In itself this is guilty conduct. Then he was always contradicting himself, ~~saying~~ proving that he lied. Preparation for public lying are explicit in the transcripts as they are in testimony about and transcribed tapes of briefing sessions, where Nixon and his spokesmen were preparing for lying and trying to make it appear that they would not be lying.

His stalling is one example. While saying he was anxious to get everything out and everything over with he practised the opposite, holding back all he could and delaying to the degree he felt he could get away with.

Chesterfield Smith, president of the American Bar Association, put it politely in a "Meet the Press" appearance May 26: "The President has not been interested in expediting this in any way," he said. He added the opinion, "It is clear to me that he has impeded it [the investigation] for reasons of his own....I think he is thinking of himself as somebody being investigated."

Why would he say, for example, that he had directed his counsel, John Dean, to make a thorough investigation when in fact he had not and as the transcripts show, had done the opposite, had Dean sit on and hide everything? Here are the actual words:

)Pick up Dean quote)

When he could ~~xxxxxx~~ continue this false pretense no longer, he pulled the same trick, announcing April 17, 1973, that he had "begun intensive new inquiries," meaning what was later styled as Ehrlichman's investigation. Of this Ehrlichman testified to the Senate ~~xxxxxx~~ Watergate committee that he had, in fact, not conducted any real investigation.

Why would an innocent man lie at all? About anything.

Especially a President of the United States.

Do the innocent lie? Or feel the need?

(Those wanted to deceive themselves only doubted his guilt of something criminal by this point. Immediately afterward, on Easter Sunday, Republican Senator Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts said on nationwide TV that Nixon "had to know" in advance of the ug bugging. Post 5/11/74)