

U
 Colson: His "Tremendous Sensitivity to Personal Ethics" for Nixon of "Very Strong Better Instincts"

Accurate reporting often means faithful telling of lies. We have just seen two examples, reporting as late as more than two years after the truth was known that Hunt was not a White House employee at the time of the caught break-in and that Colson is and ~~was~~ always has been a man of "tremendous sensitivity to personal ethics."

Another took hold at the time of the daring Colson-Baker new defense of Nixon. Lies were told as truth simply by honest reporting of dishonest statements. It helped hang the whole impeachment process and hung the country up with it.

Committees are composed of members of Congress of both parties, the majority party holding the majority of seats. The House Judiciary Committee of 38 members, ^{The proportion was normal, 21 to 17} an unwieldy number - all lawyers - was mostly Democrats. So, begun by White House spokesmen, that committee, regardless of what it did - even when it acted unanimously - was called "partisan."

All the Democrats were afraid of this propaganda. One result is that the entire political process was stalled by the fear alone. Elected politicians feared speaking out. And the impeachment process became a "partisan" process in which the Democrats, only because they were Democrats, were out to get the innocent Nixon, only because he was a Republican.

The Republicans were never called "partisan." No matter how unreasonable what they said or how they voted, they were never "partisan."

+1 from 2
 No questions were asked. Nobody wondered in print how it was, if the Democrats were partisan in Congressional consideration of impeachment when they had a clear majority on the committee and in the House they hadn't voted impeachment for two years. The fact is that fear of the Nixon false charge actually delayed the beginning of even consideration. When consideration began, it was entirely without any original committee investigation. The committee merely gathered evidence from other committees and sought what it could get voluntarily from the White House.

2

Nixon's public-relations strategy was cunning and successful. This example of its stalling of the impeachment hearings coincided with the delayed issuing of its report by the Senate Watergate committee. There were no stories reporting charges of "partisanship" by its Republican minority because they disagreed with majority conclusions. Nor were they charged with stalling to have the two functions overlap, delaying both and making both compete for news space and attention.

Baker was one of the influences delaying the Watergate committee's reporting of legislative remedy for Watergate and what it represents. In advance of the agreed-to report, Baker issued a separate, unofficial one.

Colson sought and received considerable attention. He made two dramatic moves that enhanced the attention he could have expected anyway. That one coincided with the Baker report synergized it. *3/15/76*

tr to 2 Simplifications of complicated matters are neither safe nor definitive. But consideration of "partisanship" based on what was known indicates the Republicans have more reason for bias and acted in a partisan ways the most apparent of which is laying the accusation falsely against the Democrats, who were leaning over backward to avoid it. Political advantage for the Democrats lay in stringing the sensational scandals out closer and closer to the elections. Political disaster for the Republicans lay the same way unless impeachment were voted. But the stalling was by the White House, not the Democrats, and it was open stalling. Impeaching Nixon was a political benefit for the Democrats yet they did not rush it. If Nixon were to be impeached and convicted by the Senate Gerald Ford would become President. As the incumbent in 1976 he would enjoy political advantages. The longer he was President, however, the more he was inextricably associated with the serious economic consequences of the Nixon administration. Hence the sooner the Democrats had him in the White House the greater his 1976 liability and the better the prospects of the Democratic candidate. The simplification is that the Democrats would have been better off if they were partisan or selfish in hastening impeachment, but they did not nor did they use their voting power to override Nixon's unhidden delaying tactics.

The Colson and Baker's operations were so closely correlated whether or not there was actual coordination is immaterial. In politics and the black arts and in chess or physical sports of actual war moves are anticipated. What allies and opponents each are most likely to do can be and is estimated.

Nixon's war against impeachment was reaching a climax with the coming of their reports by the committees of both ^{branches} ~~houses~~ of Congress. His position was comparable to that of the general of a side that by all ~~measurable~~ measurable factors should lose the war. His strategy was to delay the final decision, the crucial battle, encouraging attrition of the opposing side, promoting disunity while he was mustering his own weaker/~~forces~~ ^{strength} so that he could apply maximum force with minimum effort at the optimum time.

One of his weaknesses became a strength. His side had been reduced to an unquestioning hardcore that followed him blindly and to those who, while unwilling to follow, were in a political situation that dominated their actions and decisions because this hardcore could control elections in their constituencies. Meanwhile, there was the inevitable disunity in the more numerous opposition, natural with so many colonels and generals each the proponent of his own tactics and strategy.

The first really crucial battle for Nixon was the ~~vote~~ committee vote on impeachment. To make it appear to be what it was not on the part of the Democrats, his strategy required that they seem to be partisan, his enemies not his judges. It also required that they have more wild geese to chase, more false trails to follow, while there was diversion for the press and the people. These were among his primary tactical needs as part of his grand strategy in continuing to avoid impeachment that by any honest, non-partisan, meaning not pro-Nixon standard, was long overdue and more than justified on so many counts they were lost in the morass of the available evidence.

This was the timing, this his situation, when the combined Colson-Baker operation served this immediate need. Each also was a major obfuscation of one of the more certain impeachable offenses centering around Hunt and bribery and blackmail.

Colson's alleged conversion to decency, honesty and the true faith was not new when he invoked it with all the dramatic sideplays so easy for a master of the office of dirty works. The situation was so ready for exploitation and the impeachment forces

his and Nixon's
1

were so disunited and torn asunder over disputes in tactics that Colson's carelessness went undetected and unexposed. His first feint as he launched this new counterattack was to make news of the not new. His fellows in his new faith did it for him.

This Byzantine method can be better understood with some background from two sources, Nixon's released versions of his tapes and some of Colson's maneuverings once he knew he was a grand-jury target.

Just before Nixon had to let those two of the "finest" public servants even, the end of April, 1973, Haldeman and Ehrlichman, resign, he and they discussed Colson. They were considering who is loyal to Nixon and who might not be. "How about Colson?" Ehrlichman asked, adding after a little more discussion that everybody hates him. "You see you can make a hell of a circumstantial case on Colson, Nixon said. "He's the guy that you know he's Dean's buddy, and he knew Liddy well...Colson is closer to this crew of robbers than anybody else."

Then when Henry Petersen is updating Nixon on all he should not have told anyone Nixon asked him about Colson. Peterson told him that "Colson was a big fish in my opinion." (~~quoted from Village Voice 6/213/74~~)

Colson had, as Nixon's top men told him, been spreading stories. When he had himself to defend, as Nixon said, Colson was capable of anything. His stories included the CIA.

Among the documents stolen from me were a series in which Colson is referred to as a close friend of Robert Bennett, and in connection with all sorts of matters that figured in prosecutorial investigations and could in impeachment proceedings. Bennett was CIA. "e as well as his agency worked for it until these scandals forced an end to the relationship. There is reason to believe that Bennett's "public relations" work included planting anti-Colson stories, as Colson charged in 1974.

The CIA retaliated as soon as Colson started his own operations. The March 5, 1973 issue of Newsweek carried an article headed "Whispers About Colson." It linked him to surveillance of people like Teddy Kennedy, the ITT-Dita Beard affair and other jobs in all of which Bennett figured. Bennett was Colson's source on these, through Hunt. The inference is that in Watergate Colson was the man "in the cross-hairs."

When it came time to defend himself in court, having been indicted in the March 1, 1974 obstruction of justice cases, through his lawyer-partner Shapiro Colson filed a number of motions and a long affidavit on March 29. One of the motions was to dismiss the charges because of "prejudicial pre-trial publicity. Referring to the Newsweek and other stories Colson alleged it "and others were intentionally generated by the CIA in order to divert attention from a CIA cover agency, "Allen and Company," to which he attributed the leaks about him and motive over its employment of his friend Hunt.

After reading two top-secret CIA case-officer reports, Judge Gessell said in court, "you may assume that the CIA did inspire the 'Whispers About Colson' story." (Village Voice 6/13/74)

There developed this feud between Colson and his former friend Bennett, Colson and the CIA and a community of interest because of it between Colson and Senator Baker. Taking the CIA on was an act of desperation of one of unique courage.

While all this was going on Colson left the White House, then claimed to have found Christ, and in this found new allies.

The trial of Ehrlichman, Liddy and the Cubans/began June 26, 1974. June 3 came in the Ellsberg break-in
Colson's first new bombshell: he entered a plea of guilty. (AP, ~~6/4~~ Wash Post 6/4/74)
He also had been charged in this case in the March 7 indictments. But he had not been charged with the offense to which he confessed guilt, "unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did corruptly endeavor to influence and impede the due administration of justice in connection with the criminal trial of Daniel Ellsberg," the case that was dismissed. He said he had done this by leaking defamations and through his part in attempting to get and use further derogatory information to use against Ellsberg. (Post 6/4/74)

This was a strange maneuver. Charged in two indictments, Colson copped a plea on a charge not levelled against him and avoided trial on what he had been charged with.

This the man Seymour Hersh had quoted as saying of himself "I had a tremendous sensitivity to personal ethics" a month later.

Tracing Colson is never an easy matter so it had best be done chronologically, beginning with his in-court statement on entering this pleas. He spoke like man who had found the true faith, Holy Colson:

6

"I have told the truth from the beginning but I have been unable to testify fully... if this is to be a government of laws and not of men then those men entrusted with enforcing the law must be held to account for the natural consequences of their own actions...I know how it feels to be subjected to...leaks from various congressional committees...the CIA deliberately planted stories with several major news organizations accusing me of involvement in criminal activities. ..." (Post 7/4/74)

One man pot and kettle. He was pleading guilty to "criminal activities" and in telling "the truth from the beginning" he had denied any wrongdoing.

June 4 Colson had much of his old "enemy" The Washington Post, more than half the front page with a banner headline and about two pages inside. With more of the new contrition address to Bessell - that in attending an earlier hearing the judge's words about a government of laws had turned him on and "prompted his decision to enter his plea." ~~Newly~~ Newly white-hatted Colson saw The Watergate as "one of the most divisive and bitter controversies in our history" and he wanted "to be free to contribute to that resolution no matter who it will help or hurt - me or others..."

The good-guy buildup had begun the the previous evening's TV news, where it was reported on the networks that Colson had refused to accept a deal to plead guilty to a misdemeanor, which would not jeopardize his license to practise law and entailed lighter punishment.

In all this build-up of the new Colson it was forgotten that the old Colson's claimed finding of Christ coincided with the word that the grand jury was after him.

Fear of him was also attributed to Nixon. ~~Stark Bernstein contributed to the~~ The Woodward-Benstein front-page contribution was headed "Colson's Plea Worries White House." It "created considerable consternation at top levels," they wrote. By the time this phoney story about Colson's turning down a lighter sentence was being aired they knew that White House fear was because Colson could "both buttress and damage aspects of President Nixon's Watergate defense." One leaked fear is that Colson had "information" that Nixon "was aware of the... cover-up three months" before he acknowledge. Or, obstructed justice. Still another fear was because Colson had "virtually unlimited access" to Nixon, and the He thus could pull the plug on other criminal deals being investigated, like IMF/ dairy money.

This seems to be the beginning of the notion that Colson would get Nixon and the

other higher-up for all their nasty cracks about him being capable of anything.

This also was the time of another phoney deal, the origin of Colson's decision to plead guilty. That man of faith both real and limitless, Senator Hughes, came forward to tell how "It all started about a week or ten days ago when Chuck came and started to some of us" in the prayer group. The last of these chats under holy spell ended 1:30 a.m. It was with Hughes and three fellows in faith. "The guilty plea is a result of his conversion to Christ," according to Hughes, not all those charges in two series of indictments, with more possible.

There was no limit to Hughes' commitment to Colson and his reformation as "The work of Christ." "...he intends to tell all he knows...wants to help his country... has much to tell, an important story." This "baby in Christ" achieved "a sudden maturity" so Hughes was "proud of him." The night before the plea was pretty "sudden." (NYTimes 6/6/74) It was a long and tearful session. (NYTimes 6/6/74) ⁶ ~~over~~ over, Billy Graham. Take to the storm cellar, Richard Nixon. When Colson "accepted Christ full truthfulness was" inevitable.

The combination of Christ, Hughes' endorsement and the knowledge Colson could be expected to have led to the belief he would do the job on Nixon.

But the truth was that Colson's lawyers had begun plea-bargaining earlier ~~than~~ than Colson's taking counsel with his fellows in his new-found faith, as Evans and ~~Novak~~ ^{6/26} ~~Novak~~ ^{Evans and Novak} reported. (Post 6/5/74) His plea did damage the Ehrlichman defense. "Demolishes the badly ~~at~~ [^] tattered national security argument," ~~they~~ ^{Evans and Novak} wrote, adding that because "Mr. Nixon has for a solid year" had "linked his own fate with Ehrlichman's," Colson's plea "would further undermine the beleaguered President."

This truth - that there had been no offer of a plea to a more misdemeanor - and not until after the plea was entered and accepted was their the debunking of that the accompanying and false reports that the case against Colson was "paper thin." could not have originated with the prosecution. The Colson propaganda lengthier these kinds of stories kept up, longer in Sunday editions.

When Colson was sentenced by Gesell to one to three years he was again worth more than two pages in the Post, more than half of the front page and another banner. The major story was headed "Accuses President..." The subordinate head quoted Colson as seeing the sentence as "Lord's Will," and there was a long human-interest story

conservative

The first leak was to the hated Post's opposition, the Star-News, more than half of the top of the front page of whose June 24 issue had the sensation headed, "Colson Says Nixon ~~Heard~~ Feared CIA Power Play."

A coup! And against a Nixon? If it should not have played in Peoria, it did play well in Washington. Everyone, electronic media included, went for it.

Nixon really feared "they" had come into the White House to make all this trouble for him, he really planned to kick his own CIA director, William E. Colby, out and "bring his own people in" and conduct an "internal investigation" and the "announce everything he had discovered to the American people."

Only Nixon's chief of staff, General Alexander Haig, "was persuaded that the case was shaky -and he has very strong better instincts- to shay for even the President. Haig prevailed on his (Nixon's) better instincts ~~[sic]~~ not to take down the whole intelligence establishment ...to save yourself from impeachment."

To call the non-existent "shaky" is to suggest there was a basis. There was none at all. It wasn't even an exaggeration. It was a complete, a total manufacture, out of nothing.

There were cute touches to this propaganda. It was Nixonian in that he was portrayed as the pure and the persecuted, typical of his own kind of paranoia in which the whole world was out to get him, to prevent him from making a better world for the people who just loved him. On the one hand his Watergate was the CIA's, to ruin him. And the bad, ~~but~~ bad CIA, intent upon a take-over, but, sigh and tears, he just had to sacrifice himself for the national good.

Colson, who never denied introducing Hunt into the White House, saw him "as the key to the CIA's involvement" in framing the innocent Nixon. Because Mullen was a CIA front. The Star-News did not recall that Bennett was Colson's close pal. Proof was lacking because it was a hoked-up story, but to support it there was news that was fact, Bennett "has now admitted under oath that he was reporting everything he was doing to the CIA every two weeks." With it and him in the same city and phone calls were local he reported "everything" no more frequently than "every two weeks?" Colson overplayed that one, but it washed.

"Colson based much of his theory," Robert Walters wrote, "on a "arch 1, 1973 classified

inter-office memo which he said he had seen...25-page document...written by Eric W. Eisnestadt, chief of the CIA's 'central cover staff' in charge of liaison with all CIA-affiliated organizations...Bennett is quoted as saying that 'through his father, Sen. Bennett, he can handle the Ervin committee if the CIA can handle Hunt,' Colson said.

"Bennett said 'he had been feeding stories to Bob Woodward of the Washington Post, who was 'suitably grateful' and he has 'continued to give stories of this nature to the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, Newsweek and Time magazine,' Colson quoted the memo as saying."

It took no CIA investigation or inside reporting to dope out what I had earlier and had warned a Post editor about, as reported earlier. It was obvious from the Post's reporting, whether or not the major editors realized it or were in on it.

Colson tied the Democrats in on his Watergate plot to ruin Nixon the innocent of those "very strong better instincts" through the truthful irrelevancy that before Pullen and Bennett represented Howard Hughes in Washington Democratic National Chairman Larry O'Brien had. That, of course, was in the past. Hughes' corporations had been CIA covers. But the fact though accurate, was without meaning except as propaganda.

In all of this there was not question about how Colson had seen this memo. It turned out to be the real thing, if not as he represented it. And the only apparent source is the Baker clique of the Watergate committee, Nixon's defense on it. Colson had been out of the White House and out of government more than a year. The CIA is super-secret about this kind of material, how secret we shall see. That Colson could cite this memo is proof that he was working with someone. But the press was unquestioning.

And for the morning papers Colson had a seeming denial ready. It is a standard propagandists device. The Post's headline read "Allegation Is Denied By Colson" but the so-called "denial" is restricted to Colson's "knowledge" that "Nixon was considering firing" Colby.

The original story lead to quotation of Congressman Lucien Nedzi, chairman of the Armed Forces Intelligence Subcommittee that in effect supported Colson by confirming the

existence of the Eisenstadt memo. Nedzi had it "for many months" and with it had its summary of "relationships between the CIA and ~~Mullen~~ the Mullen company. The memo, according to Nedzi, "produced no conclusive evidence of an undisclosed implication of the agency [CIA] in the Watergate scandals." (Post 6/25/74)

It took several days for the official denials. Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger had headed CIA, as Nixon's personal choice to replace Helms when Nixon fired Helms. (Colby was Nixon's personal choice to succeed Schlesinger, regardless of the Colson fiction about him.) Schlesinger denied the CIA had "planted false news stories about" Colson. (AP 6/29/74)

ABC News had reported three days after the Star-News exclusive that the Watergate committee had documents showing that Schlesinger had "supplied the Mullen firm with agency [CIA] files to use in planting cover stories." (AP 6/29/74)

ABC News "planted an erroneous story in the March 5 issue of Newsweek magazine asserting that...Colson was in charge of dirty tricks" but "Schlesinger did not authorize anything like that," his spokesman said. This is "an erroneous story?"

The denial attributed to Bennett is hedge in semantics: "...also denied that his company planted any news stories designed to hide its ties with the CIA or that the company had been told to do so by CIA officials..." What the "company" did was not the question. What Bennett personally did was. Nor was the "design" of the news stories the issue. Neither was the intent "to hide its ties with the CIA." Denials like this, in which the immaterial is denied and the relevant is ignored, amount to confirmation.

Colson, working through Bast, whose actions were as predictable as any could be, did succeed in launching a major diversion which became a major Nixon defense, influencing more than his unthinking hardcore but also fortifying them. The stories continue for a long time and were finally picked up by Baker, who had been working on it pretty much in secret all along.

A full week later Colson's alleged denials were still being quoted: (pick up on 8)

Two weeks later (7/6/74) the Post carried a column by an old CIA hand of the administrative level, not a mere agent, Tom Braden, "Interpreting the Colson Scenario." Braden questioned the sincerity of Colson's religious conversion, attacked him and defended the CIA, an automatic reaction with him going back to the exposure of the CIA's foundation-front scandals, of which Braden had been part. When it was no longer a question Braden had Hughes as a convenient straw man, "If the Howard Hughes organization was indeed a 'cover' for ~~the~~ CIA and CIA wanted to know how much O'Brien knew of the relationship, why not ask the Hughes organization? The whole thing is preposterous." What is "preposterous" is the Braden approach, his statement of the false question, and his assumptions: that there was no CIA-Hughes connection and that the reclusive Hughes would talk or would allow his people to discuss any aspect of this. When as Braden had to know a Hunt-type assassination was part of the Hughes-CIA "scenario," any kind of Hughes comment was at best improbable and in all likelihood entirely precluded.

By the time the newsweeklies got into it ~~that~~ Colson's ~~was~~ ~~quoted~~ attributing the tragic crash in which Dorothy Hunt lost her life to the CIA, was featured. Time reported Colson "confessed to Bast: "I don't say this to my own people. They'd think I'm nuts. I think they killed Dorothy Hunt."

If the official investigation of that crash is to be ignored there would remain the question why would the experienced spooks run all the risk of causing a plane crash, which is always investigated, and kill all those extra people when offing Mrs. Hunt was child's play for an experienced exterminator? She could have been killed at home or any time she left it with ease.

This is ~~ax~~ a line Colson stole from some of the more irresponsibles like one Sherman Skolnick of Chicago, one of the more persuasive of the more sick-minded who had constantly shifting version of this assassination by airliner in which no improbably invention discouraged attention or support. One of his more outlandish is the allegation that when the crashing plane was 500 feet up a mysterious man, who somehow had injected cyanide into the pilot and many passengers -without being seen by any of the survivors-

and then somehow managed to open and close a door and parachute out to safety - again invisible to passengers or people on the ground.

Colson and the skolnicks have this in common: they hide and they help hide the relevant while they get considerable attention for themselves.

They all did Nixon's work while their excesses protected the CIA from its own transgressions, the real ones not assailed by the Colsons and the Skolnicks.

("Colson's Commandment: Tell the Truth") quoting him as saying "I do not intend to be an advocate" or "frame a case" but "will tell the truth." He also was "sure there are guys in the White House sweating" but there was his commitment to Christ *To be met.*

Jack Anderson *added* to the belief that Colson would be an important addition to pro-impeachment efforts; ~~in his June 22 column~~, "Nixon Warned *Yn* Aides, Colson Says." (Post 6/22/74) had an item in his June 20 column favorable to Colson: "The Watergate prosecutors have drafted a favorable secret pre-sentencing report...acknowledging they would have trouble convicting him..." ~~Next~~ (Post 6/20/74) Two days later *he*

Behind the scenes Colson was giving secret testimony. A leak to the Evans-Novak column of June 26 (post 6/26/74) noted his "accusations of sinister CIA participation in Watergate duplicate what he has privately told Senator Baker...Colson's picture of the President as a terrified captive of the CIA..."

The end of that month and the beginning of July, just before Colson started serving his sentence- *at an Army post,* in softer confinement to keep him available for Washington interrogators- there was a flurry of stories *inspired* released by private investigator Richard L. Bast, an experienced "wire man." The thrust: the CIA did it to Nixon and would Bast, James Bond that he is, alone and unassisted investigate the CIA for Colson *whole* (and Nixon).

(There is no public record of Bast's finding Christ. *He* does not enjoy that kind of reputation, either. And it soon turned out that he had bugged Colson, as Colson should have expected.)

SA-C ~~Inevitably in these stories that are propaganda Colson was ready for the follow-up:~~ he was misunderstood and it wasn't quite that he ~~did~~ the CIA did it. Only that "every possible theory" had to be explored. No, he did not mean that "Nixon felt imprisoned or threatened by CIA sympathizers at the White House." *He meant* No more than the talk of street people, "a lot of people around the President were people with close ties into the military *and* the intelligence establishment." (Post 7/1/74)

SD-E Had the counter-revolution really come? *continuing reaction to* Coinciding with the Bast blast - not protested by Colson, who had placed no restrictions, careful lawyer and operator that he is - *is* the Hersh interview.

Colson began to speak less equivocally while seeming to be consistent in his criticisms.

It is false to say that "most of" Nixon's "horrors" came from Bennett. Bennett merely gave the White House, especially his chum Colson, what he knew was wanted. But because it is true that Bennett did supply these tips and because he received them from others not always visible and because Hunt was working for him just about full time, there is an important combination of facts Colson hid in his mixture of twisted truth and fakes. Bennett, connected with the CIA and with others serving the CIA, subsidized Hunt, with federal money, while putting the Nixon horror-workers up to still more evil than they had conceived themselves, under circumstances that make it impossible not to believe that Bennett's some of ~~his~~ own connections were not ^{him} putting Bennett ~~either~~ up to ^{must} this kind of operation or putting him in a position where he'd think of them himself.

None of this was new. The reader knows the sources from which much earlier I had assembled a case proving the same thing. What was new is that the key man in it, hiding his own role, repeated it, without the press of the Congress carrying it forward.

Two weeks after the Hersh interview and the Today appearances, in Jack Anderson's July 15 and 16 columns, that Bast had bugged Colson became known. Colson had to have expected this. ^{out} He had to have had use of the tapes in mind, part of his scheming. If not his reason for seeking Bast, whose reputation was well known.

Nixon has "done a tremendous job as President," he said

"I had a very good relationship with him, but he used me in a way that he found

effective, but it didn't enhance my popularity standing in the White House." Colson-

troubleshooter. "Break all the china... I don't give a damn. I'll back you up. Just

get this done." Nixon said, "Colson did."

"I consider him [Nixon] a personal friend... qualities that I enormously admire..."

During all this time just before he started his term at a military post in Baltimore,

not a real jail, Colson was getting enormous attention. Only the blind did not then

see that he had become Nixon's staunchest defender, painting him as a good man imposed

upon by others he trusted—others unworthy of trust. Mainly the CIA and its types, but

not in any sense did he accuse Nixon, despite the headlines, of anything worse than *importance*

Mr. & Mrs. people's interests

and misplaced trust. Certainly no impeachable offense.

His TV appearances include three on the top-rated morning program, NBC's Today,

taped in advance and aired on three days beginning June 28. "I reran the CIA line,

adding the involvement in misleading by Bennett clients with CIA connections like

Howard Hughes. "Most of the horrors were suggested to Mr. Hunt by Mr. Bennett." (True.)

"I had the highest motives" but "people never really lose the CIA." *This is*

another interest and ignored truth as we have seen, important because it was a

public statement by a witness, not what I had resurrected from oblivion: *Hunt was working*

Colson

for time for Bennett with the break-in. Or, Nixon was being subsidized in these crimes.

Two weeks later, in July 15 and 16 columns, Anderson had the story of *Hunt's*

being Colson (who had to have expected it). The best tapes are a story of "a Seven

Days in May" type of takeover of the government, "And the CIA is 'blackmailing' Nixon

with "evidence that still more campaign funds were diverted by the Nixon family for

personal expenses." Not by the innocent Nixon. By his family.

For two days beginning with the appearance of the second Anderson column Colson

testified in secret before the impeachment committee. The worst he said is that Nixon

was in on the false cover story when he got caught having the FBI investigate CIA

newsmen Dan Schorr, a Colson "enemies"-list man, Nixon did not order anything wrong.

indirectly

"But Colson said it would not have happened had the President disapproved it." (Post 7/16/74)

Mr. & Mrs. people's interests

Hassling Dan ~~McGee~~ Schorr is something less than an impeachable offense.

But it is true - and it is important to understand this as having more significance than ~~as~~ only a clause in a single sentence - nothing would have happened "if had the President disapproved it."

The President bears a legal responsibility for the acts of his agents, as do ordinary people, whether or not he knew what they were doing. The legal doctrine is known as respondeat superior. (~~Baker, on "Face the Nation" 3/24/74~~)

extra space

There was much more attention to this extensive Colson public relations operation. If one wonders whether he really pulled it off, there is the opinion of the astute columnist Joseph Kraft, ~~who~~ "Colson's present stories have a detail about them which rings absolutely true." (Post 6/27/74)

And if one wonders whether he served Nixon's interest as well as his own, that he did not incur Nixon's displeasure is "for sure" and that he did what Nixon wanted is probable if not certain. Why else would there be "White House sympathy for ex-aide Colson," the San Francisco Examiner's headline on a UPI story belatedly (7/7/74) reporting the official honoring of the self-confessed felon as he left ~~for~~ to begin his sentence?

"The White House is sympathetic to Charles Colson...much sympathy..."

"il- continue with last 3 grafs in full

When Colson, "one of his closest," was on his way to jail and after he was serving his felon's sentence he was doing Nixon's work, helping his unimpeachment.

If he and Watergate committee vice-chairman Howard Baker had sat down and conspired to coordinate, they could not ~~have worked better~~ pulled more in tandem harness to keep Nixon unimpeached and to blame the CIA for his impeachable offenses.