

## The Fatal Shot

PRESIDENT ADMITS WITHHOLDING DATA; TAPES SHOW HE APPROVED COVER-UP was the double-banner headline across the top of The Washington Post's front page August 6, reporting Nixon's statement of the night before.

Nixon, finally and publicly, admitted he was a criminal. Explain it as he tried, "withholding data" was obstructing justice. If the least subversive of his crimes, it was a crime. A very serious crime, ~~and any~~ crime by any president is <sup>the</sup> most serious of crimes, *the most important of all crimes*

Even for Nixon, who by then had spent two years scraping intellectual barrels, his explanation was pretty limp.

He ignored his known and reported earlier "review" of the tapes - as though anyone could forget the kinds of solutions to the kinds of problems he faced - he claimed to have "made a preliminary review of some of the 64" subpoenaed tapes in May. "Among the conversations I listened to at that time were two of those of June 23. Although I recognized that these presented potential problems, I did not inform my staff or my counsel of it" because "I did not realize the extent of the implications which these conversations might now appear to have."

Having no choice, being faced with wholesale desertions by those who would no longer be the victims of his dishonesties, Nixon <sup>yet sought to</sup> presented himself as a real decent, responsible man: "This was a serious act of omission for which I take full responsibility." Having <sup>thus</sup> protected his lawyers from the choice of being disbarred or quitting <sup>with their own and public explanations,</sup> publicly, Nixon looked ahead to future ~~disclosures of other~~ <sup>per</sup> exposures of other crimes and dishonesties by <sup>claiming</sup> ~~alleging~~ his "review" disclosed "no other <sup>representative</sup> major inconsistencies." The key word that pretends a lie is not a lie is "major." This typical Nixon semantics actually forecast more "inconsistencies" that in his ~~mind~~ <sup>mind</sup> are not "major."

Much more than with other released tapes conflicting emotions and reactions pummel the mind in reading these transcripts. This was a man of extreme pettiness who refused to concern himself with the real business and need of the nation. His worries were over the ~~the~~ tiniest inconsequentialities. He confessed his inability to grasp the basic problems of economic and international life to the point where he refused to talk about them. His <sup>with</sup> preoccupation was staging himself on TV cameras and whether the

hair of the women in his family would in place when they were on camera, not one strand ~~would~~ blown.

To this man who posed ~~himself~~ as and claimed time after time to be the great leader of the world, the ~~basic~~ <sup>incomprehensible things were</sup> essential problems of the world were beyond his grasp, they bored him, he said so, and he displayed an ignorance of affairs of such simplicity a high-school student would be flunked for that ignorance.

Bracketing this secret display of incompetence and disinterest, in secret he was vainglorious about his writing that was not his <sup>Even</sup> and the name of the ghost of <sup>who did his writing he</sup> which he ~~could not even remember~~. All he could remember is that to him it was great and that he was so overwhelmed by "his" <sup>of wisdom</sup> greatness that the night before he had lain awake and reread his words ~~that were not even his~~. He wanted his whole staff to reread them. He directed that copies be obtained so they all could.

The world on the verge of ruin and Nixon relived <sup>an ersatz</sup> a ~~fictitious~~ past and looked forward to a ~~phony~~ <sup>fictitious</sup> future.

Haldeman, the real if unelected President, had to bring some of these urgent world problems to Nixon's attention. Here is a sample of the man's true greatness:

*[Handwritten bracket on the left side of the transcript]*

H...Did you get the report that the British floated the pound?  
P. I don't think so.  
H. They did.  
P. That's devaluation?  
H. Yeah. Flanagan's got a report on it.  
P. I don't care about it. Nothing we can do about it.  
H. You want a rundown?  
P. No, I don't. ...It's too complicated for me to get into (unintelligible)...  
H. Burns [Federal Reserve Board chairman Arthur] is concerned about speculation about the lira.  
P. Well, I don't give a (expletive deleted) about the lira. (Unintelligible.)

<sup>also</sup> Nixon didn't give a deleted expletive for his personal situation with his men having be caught in <sup>more</sup> common <sup>of his/their</sup> political crime a few days earlier. Haldeman brought it up, without being asked. What was certain and was also unreported is the manner in which Haldeman did this. It discloses previous knowledge. He opened it this way:

"No, <sup>w</sup> on the investigation, you know, the Democratic break-in thing, we're back in the problem area because the FBI is not under control, because Gray doesn't exactly know how to control it..."

The solved problems did not stay solved because "we're back in the problem area"

footnote on 3

Long after it should have been impossible to avoid, - two and a half years later -  
the 11/17/74 Washington Post headline read "FBI Is Probing W. Mark Felt,  
Ex-No. 2 Man." That same weekend the Justice Department also released a report on  
the illegal domestic intelligence extending into activist criminal activity by the  
FBI under Hoover and Felt.)

-which says they thought they were out of it by whatever they had done - and because Nixon's hack Gray wasn't controlling the FBI.

After a long explanation, Nixon's concern was, "What about Pat Gray - you mean Pat doesn't want to?" (Meaning <sup>prevent</sup> ~~frustrate~~ any real investigation.)

"Pat does want to," Haldeman told him. "He doesn't know how to."

Haldeman, of course, was looking ahead. There were "ambitious" people inside the FBI they could use ("Mark Felt wants to cooperate because he's ambitious") and they could blame it on "across the river," meaning the CIA, whose main offices were on the other side of the Potomac. *// mte*

This is what <sup>Haldeman</sup> he used to reach Nixon and get him cooking on the framing-up.

Haldeman's opening of the subject shows what anyone knowing anything of government should have assumed, that Pat Gray was keeping the White House fully informed. It is in this case, however, not merely that it was a safe assumption. It is more - and worse in terms of the failures of the so-called protections of society. Pat Gray's letter to Haldeman with the accompanying memo detailing all the FBI had learned, ready for Haldeman on his and Nixon's return from Florida, had actually been public domain from the time of the Gray confirmation hearings. There, in the printed volume, is where I found it, But it was entirely ignored! In that proceeding and in the other subsequent investigations, whether or not Gray was a witness, nobody - ever - went into it!

This was ~~just~~ <sup>there followed</sup> the first of a series of Gray written reports to Haldeman so that Nixon would always know the state of the criminal case against Nixon <sup>and his associates</sup>. If not all, more than enough are public and were before the Watergate investigations began, <sup>in the printed Gray hearings</sup>

Aside from this direct, written reporting there were various back channels, other officials and phone and personal conversation. The White House always knew and Nixon, whether or not interested, was always told because there was no choice.

So, in this long introduction to update Nixon, Haldeman laid out how the ~~man~~ Mexican laundry had been exposed. By then it had been traced to both Barker (called (~~"Barker~~ "this guy") and to the Mexican bank and to Ogarrio and to the Texans and Dahlberg/

In the explanation Haldeman credits Mitchell for cooking up "the only way to solve this."

Dean "concurs" and "we're set up beautifully to do it, ah, in that- and that-"

Stuttering a bit Haldeman switches momentarily to TV coverage of "a massive story on the Cuban thing."

Everything was a "thing" in the Nixon lexicon. *"Break-in thing; Cuban thing."*

Whether Haldeman switched around here because he gagged inside at what he was about to propose, whether he wanted the unspoken notion to occur to Nixon or whether he wanted Nixon to <sup>comprehend the usefulness</sup> ~~get the full~~ potential of the "massive story on the Cuban thing" - *which was "massive" at all* is uncertain. But the ~~major~~ digression is not pointless. <sup>H and M had</sup> ~~These~~ notions to be planted in the imperial mind. One is that General Vernon Walters owed his entire career to Nixon, whose translator <sup>Walters</sup> ~~he~~ had been in Vice Presidential days and who was then Deputy Director, Central Intelligence, <sup>(by Nixon's grace)</sup>. Another is that the Cubans could be blamed for the entire thing. NBC's legitimate coverage inseminated the crooked scheme.

Haldeman resumed his outline of the plot:

"That's the way to handle ~~it~~ this now is for us to have Walters call Pat Gray and just say, 'Stay the hell out of this - this is, ah, business here we don't want you to go any further ~~into~~ on it.' That's not an unusual development, and, ah, that would take care of it."

Irrelevant to the scheme to corrupt the entire system of justice and history and free elections that here was germinating but not irrelevant to the consciousness of those with a decent concern about the society in which they live is the disclosure of <sup>ability and</sup> ~~predictable~~ crookedness <sup>of</sup> by the federal intelligence and police agencies. <sup>This assumption of the corrupt-</sup> Lying, covering for each other? "That's not an unusual development." Or, to the knowledge of the White House, crookedness and dishonesty are not unusual for the FBI and the CIA. *frank*

As Haldeman spelled the conspiracy out. Nixon was a little dense. Somehow he had trouble focusing. He went through Walters calling Gray "who will then have this basis." Gray would "call Mark Felt ["because he's ambitious"]...and say 'We've got this signal from across the river to put the hold on this. And that will fit rather well because the FBI agents who are working on the case at this point feel that's what it is.'"

Nixon, who knew the truth all along, could not contain his excitement; "This is CIA? They've traced the money? Who'd they trace it to?"

*The truth, it was*  
Haldeman had to disabuse him. But Mitchell, who ran CREEP, had told Nixon, ~~and that~~ <sup>naturally enough, on</sup> is one of the non-existing tapes.

facts for The Fatal Sher, p. 4

Nowhere is this totality of corruption, including perjury, ~~paid out in letters~~ fuller detail than in WHITEWASH IV. It has never been put more explicitly than by former CIA Director Allen Dulles ~~xxxx~~ in the formerly TOP SECRET transcript reproduced in facsimile (pp. 36-121). The more pointed remarks never expected to be seen by anyone else are on pp. 52-3, 61-6 and 72. Aside from criminals to the top these were "terribly bad characters," some with "very limited mentalities both in the CIA and the FBI."

Nixon knew this money was "from the committee," actually "from State<sup>N</sup>," so there can be no doubt he had been informed. Haldeman confirmed "It's directly traceable." But <sup>leave-and-order</sup> that noble Presidential spirit soared, his mind started putting it all together, and there emerged a noble <sup>noble expression</sup> ~~obscure~~ representation of the heights to which the office raises the man:

"Well, I mean there's no way - I'm just thinking if they don't cooperate [meaning the actual donors of the secret stash in illegal money used illegally] what do they say? That they were approached by the Cubans<sup>(C)</sup>. That's what Dahlberg has to say, the Texans, too, that they -"

Haldeman had to haul Nixon down <sup>to earth,</sup> ~~out of the heavens,~~ warning him "we're relying on more and more people all the time. That's the problem," a danger they could eliminate "if we could take this other route." Nixon agreed, "All right."

Note that Nixon was aware that ~~they were~~ "we're relying on more and more people all the time." He didn't have to ask about the inherent danger. He knew it.

*and all long* Haldeman merely reminded him. Or, <sup>This is additional</sup> ~~Nixon still other~~ evidence that Nixon <sup>had been</sup> was informed and ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~participating~~ <sup>ed</sup> in the obstruction of justice politely called "cover up" ~~all along~~.

"The other route" was getting the CIA to call the FBI off. Haldeman laid their <sup>already planned</sup> ~~planned~~ scheme, ~~already laid~~ <sup>ed</sup> out in detail, for Nixon; how he and Ehrlichman would call Helms and Walters in and lay the law down. Nixon didn't need <sup>d/</sup> details. He interrupted with one of the more fascinating and unexplained series of volunteered statements, none prompted by anything Haldeman had told him. The first is

"All right, fine. How do you call him in - I mean you just - well, we protected Helms from one hell of a lot of things."

"That's what Ehrlichman says," Haldeman replied.

What Nixon and Ehrlichman knew that Nixon's chief of staff did not know <sup>that "hell of a lot of things"</sup> ~~from~~ which they had protected Helms, was not leaked. Naturally, with so much of the leaking traceable to the CIA. It would be like asking the prosecutor to prosecute the prosecutor. One inference is that <sup>this</sup> ~~this~~ "things" were in the domestic area. That was Ehrlichman's assignment, domestic affairs, of which he was Nixon's chief. We have seen a fair amount of this, all illegal.

And here, of course, all that phoney CIA testimony already recounted and in particular Walters' secret offer to bribe the Cubans here ought be recalled for full comprehension

6  
of what lay in the minds of the exalted men who led the nation.

Nixon continued without any prompting with <sup>significant</sup> these words as soon as Haldeman quoted Ehrlichman. ~~Next~~ There had been no reference to any of this in anything Haldeman said. There had been no suggestion of it, no matter how remote. Of course there had also been no mention of Hunt's name:

Of course, this Hunt, that will uncover a lot of things. You open that scab there's a hell of a lot of things and we just feel that it would be very detrimental to have this thing go any further. This involves those Cubans, Hunt, and a lot of hanky-panky that we have nothing to do with ourselves. Well, what the hell, did Mitchell know about this?"

If Nixon seemed unable to keep his mind on a single subject, Haldeman told Nixon ~~not~~ that Nixon didn't know but what <sup>Haldeman</sup> did know, "I think so. I don't think he knew the details, But I think he knew."

This told Nixon that his old pal was ripe for a setup.

But let us go back to this semi-incoherent Nixon <sup>blathering</sup> babbling about Hunt and probe its possible meanings.

First of all, Nixon's isn't kidded about Liddy and his alleged leadership. He makes no reference to Liddy and he does introduce Hunt's name.

This is not in connection with the break-in. That is not what is in Nixon's mind. Looking ~~xxx~~ into Hunt " will uncover a lot of things." Other than the break-in. He describes it as what will be ugly and visible if the Hunt "scab" is "open." Whatever he may have had in mind, there is no doubt he did have knowledge of Hunt, what Hunt had been involved in, <sup>and</sup> that it <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ pretty rotten stuff.

In short, no Nixon innocence and full Nixon knowledge and appreciation at this very early date - before the FBI had completed the trading of that illicit Mexican laundry. This was only the beginning of his third working day after his return to Washington.

What follows is ambiguous, the uncertainty magnified by the editorial "we" in "we just feel it would be very detrimental to have these things go any further." The interpretation of detriment to his interest seems least likely. That the detriment is related to " a lot of hanky-panky" seems more likely. In the context of pinning it all on the CIA it is credible. But with this there is a problem: how could Nixon pin Hunt, who had long since retired from the CIA, in any way on the CIA? How could he expect to



connect Hunt and the CIA in any way? He had, obviously, knowledge of some connection, but he displays no knowledge of any current connection.

Unless we assume that Nixon was living in a dream world, making up whatever at any moment suited his purposes, we have to assume that Nixon had some basis for this combination, the scab of Hunt and the "detrimental" effect of <sup>"opening"</sup> ~~lifting~~ it.

There is a perfectly reasonable explanation in Nixon's <sup>relevant</sup> having/knowledge of Hunt's <sup>of the time</sup> career not when their careers coincided, at the time of the Bay of Pigs, but as of the time Nixon became President and Hunt was with the CIA <sup>both</sup> directly and, what Haldeman gives no indication of knowing, indirectly, through the Mullen agency, which was CIA. <sup>Nixon</sup> He was not long in giving undetected and unreported confirmation of this, confirmation Haldeman seems to have missed, <sup>This</sup> which is indicative of Haldeman's lack of knowledge of <sup>of</sup> extreme cleverness in feigning it.

The two facts that follow also require exploration. Nixon links "a lot of hanky-panky" and "we have nothing to do with it ourselves."

There is no doubt that this is Nixon's admission of what he described as "hanky-panky" and there was "a lot" of it, again to his knowledge. Haldeman was not his source. Haldeman does not react to this in any way, but where he had knowledge he generally displayed it with a "yeah" or "sure" or some similar indication, when he did not add detail.

But whether or not Haldeman had knowledge of this extensive "hanky-panky," Nixon without <sup>doubt</sup> ~~did~~ and <sup>by</sup> ~~at~~ this extremely early date. If as can not be discarded this does not mean he knew before anyone was caught in any criminal act, it is without doubt that he did know, promptly and in considerable detail. What needs to be considered with this also confirms it. ~~Nix~~

Nixon did not say "we have nothing to do with" all this "hanky-panky." What he says is "we have nothing to do with it ourselves."

It is not likely that he can have any indirect connection through the CIA. <sup>A</sup> ~~The~~ <sup>possible</sup> ~~more probable~~ alternative <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ that he had in mind the GREEP, which he could imagine was not "ourselves" through the fiction that he had no relationship with his own creature, his means of separating his re-election from the regular Republican machine.

But "purselves" could also refer to two other connections. One through the Bennett operations at Mullen, which were connected with the White House. The other is a variant of this in which "purselves" refers to Nixon and Haldeman, those in this secret meeting at which there were no others.

There soon comes a point at which Nixon introduces some clarification. ~~But~~ first he limits further and makes what is at once a clear distinction between those doing his dirty work for him and an admission of knowledge still secret. It comes about when he returns to the covering up on the Mexican laundry, <sup>and "He [Mitchell] didn't know</sup> whether ~~Mitchell knew~~ how it was going to be handled." The form in which Nixon addresses Mitchell, that <sup>"He/</sup> ~~he~~ didn't know," is not what <sup>"</sup>aldeman told him. There had been no conversation on whether Mitchell knew of the money. Haldeman has just said he believed Mitchell knew about the hanky-panky <sup>had agreed with Nixon</sup> but not the details and that the money had been handled through Stans.

But there is no <sup>existing</sup> record of how <sup>so even</sup> Nixon knew Mitchell had nothing to do with the Mexican money or how he knew that Stans did. This means that someone told him prior to this meeting, that it was not Haldeman, and it can explain the "sinsiter forces" that ended all record of Nixon's prior conversations with Mitchell himself. Mitchell certainly had the scoop before he spoke to Nixon, to whom as head of CREEP he had to report. The rest of the details account for the need for the disappearance of any and all records of this reporting.

This entire section can also be interpreted as Nixon's effort to learn what <sup>"</sup>aldeman did know because it is clear that Nixon displays knowledge <sup>"</sup>aldeman seems not to have had.

In this exchange on Mitchell Nixon then asked, "Well, who the hell is the asshole that did? [handle the money] Is it Liddy? Is that the fellow? He must be a little nuts." Haldeman's response, "He is," can mean Liddy is ~~the~~ nuts, that he is the asshole or both, but in context it is not really a response on who handled the money. Instead he tells Nixon that Liddy "was under pressure, apparently, to get more information." This has nothing to do with handling money. And of all <sup>those</sup> ~~the subordinates~~ in CREEP above Liddy, when <sup>"</sup>aldeman refers to this "pressure" to "get more information," Nixon interrupted him for a single and correct guess, "Pressure from Mitchell?" Haldeman's

reponse, "Apparently," satisfied Nixon.

Here Nixon departs<sup>V</sup> from normal human reaction in two ways. First, with this great calamity facing him, he express no ire, no resentment, spoke no single expletive to be deleted. And then he admitted what he spent the rest of his Presidency denying:

"All right. Fine. I understand itx all. We won't second-guess Mitchell and the rest.<sup>2</sup>

Another sentence follows without interruption, but here it should be recognized that Nixon~~was~~<sup>was</sup> without resentment at what had happened to him, which can be interpreted as subconscious recognition of his own involvement in it. And he admits "I understand it all."

This book began with<sup>Having</sup> the inevitability that Nixon had to "understand it all" at the least and probably had personal involvement. Analysis was enough to make these probabilities. Fact that was<sup>officially</sup> ignored made them certainties. But Nixon kept saying otherwise and kept getting away with it. As late as the House impeachment hearings there was still the alleged need for that "smoking gun."

The sentence that concludes the "I understand it all" paragraph is even more revealing. It was totally ignored and it may be the most important single sentence in all this transcript:  
<sup>history-changing</sup>

"Thank God it wasn't Colson."

Why in the world should Nixon be content that his right-hand man, close associate, campaign manager, former partner<sup>law and then Attorney General,</sup> (was so deeply involved in all this "hanky-Panky" and ~~is~~ <sup>so</sup> grateful that it was not <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~assistant,~~ <sup>hand</sup> Charles Colson?

It was better for the manager of the entire re-election campaign to have been implicated in all the dirty works than for a hired hand?

No, not at all. It is, rather, Nixon's gratitude that the man he knew was in actual charge of all his superabundance of dirty<sup>o</sup>-wrks operations, Colson - not Ehrlichman - had not been implicated. It is an expression of Nixon's awareness that had Colson been implicated in any way, he, Nixon, was done.

So overwhelmed was Nixon at this great good fortune he didn't express the slightest regret at being caught or resentment over it. This departure from any normal, human

reaction - this complete obliteration of it in his mind - adds to the sense of real relief Nixon expressed in "Thank God it wasn't Colson." (Exclamation point removed in Nixon's transcription.)

His Presidency could be ~~not~~ tottering, his re-election could be made impossible, and Nixon was without resentment at being caught and is so lucky that Colson hasn't been connected with anything.

Allen Dulles used as the title of his book on the CIA, "The Craft of Intelligence." Intelligence is a "craft." But it is also an art. The ~~art~~ art lies in analyzing available information and from it reaching a conclusion. Working around voids in available information is also an essential of the art of analysis, which is the essence of intelligence.

There never really was any secret that Colson was a key if not the key to the concatenation of Nixon subversion and crime known by the rubric The Watergate. The reader has seen how this was woven together from what was discernible through all the efforts at obfuscation and how it was pieced together from the bits of tangible evidence that ~~was~~ <sup>were</sup> so often misinterpreted and ~~was~~ <sup>r</sup> ignored in the official investigations.

Nixon remained unimpeached and as President presided over disaster ~~in~~ tumbling atop disaster as the spirit of the country eroded and the economy went to hell only because this Colson clue was missed and with it the Hunt clues were missed by those who did not see, missed by those who did, and rejected by those many to whom they were offered. With Hunt there were not all the gaps in evidence. There was solid fact, the most tangible. And it all led back to Nixon, to Colson, and to the Mullen-Bennett operation that ~~again~~ <sup>also</sup> led to both Nixon and Colson.

Nixon returns to this in what may seem to be an incomprehensible expression but isn't. Prior to that he and Haldeman kick around how they are going to kick the whole country and the workings of justice around so Nixon may escape retribution.

It begins with Haldeman's <sup>unintended</sup> testimonial to Colson, interviewed by the FBI the day before and thereafter <sup>by him</sup> persuaded not to "think that there is anything at the elections committee," with a possibility that "it was ~~not~~ Cuban and the CIA " or perhaps something "non-political."

"<sup>And</sup> after their interview of Colson yesterday, they concluded it was not the White House but are now ~~convinced~~ convinced it is a CIA thing, so the CIA turnoff," the very *schme*

11  
he and Nixon were at that very instant hatching, would work.

"I'm not going to get that involved," Nixon said, without praise for Colson spectacular services. Without mention or <sup>any</sup> comment, in fact.

"We don't want you to" be involved, "aldeman" assured Nixon.

"You call them in," Nixon ordered, meaning Helms and Walters.

"Good deal," Haldeman replied. Within minutes it happened. Nixon continued with his directives:

"Play it tough. That's the way they play it and that's the way we are going to play it."

There follows some subdued elation over a wanted resignation <sup>and</sup> a directive to "start firing" (expletive deleted) government workers. "I really mean it. Cut 'em off." These are followed by <sup>Nixon's foreboding over</sup> ~~these deep worries~~ about the financial plight of Britain and the impending Italian bankruptcy. More political criticism of Congress when it will not rubber stamp <sup>come next</sup>.

Then suddenly, disconnected from what they have been talking about and in the middle of a sentence to which it bears no relation, Nixon blurts out an order, "say 'Look, the problem is that this will open the ~~Bay of Pigs~~ whole, the whole Bay of Pigs thing, and the President just feels, ah, without going into details - don't, ~~it~~ don't lie to them to the extent to say there is no involvement, but say this is a comedy of errors, without getting into it, the President believes that it is going to open the whole Bay of Pigs thing up again...don't go any further into this case, period..."

Throughout there <sup>is</sup> scattered "(unintelligible)" which <sup>does not seem to</sup> ~~may~~ account for the shortness of the transcript compared with the time they talk <sup>ed. Other</sup> or ~~may be further~~ deletions <sup>of</sup> of the embarrassing <sup>may have been made. From the transcript</sup> it appears that this is what Nixon orders <sup>ed.</sup> Haldeman to lay on the CIA through Helms and Walters.

It wasn't even good greasy kid stuff in this sense because, so far as the CIA <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ concerned, <sup>The Bay of Pigs is</sup> ~~that was~~ far in the past, the least of its worries, and as Helms described it to the Senate, "completely liquidated." It was no way to lean on the CIA. It was the ~~zazzzzzzk~~ argument least likely to influence them simply because it was all exposed, all that it cared about, anyway.

*Could really,*

Nobody inside or out of the CIA ~~believed~~ that airing what really happened at the Watergate or really investigating it would "open" the unclosed, "the whole Bay of Pigs thing."

That Nixon could and did conceive this effect is rather a reflection of what lay heavily on his own mind, his own unreported involvement in "the Bay of Pigs thing." *With Hunt.*  
That ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> the only "new" part to come "open."

~~He~~ <sup>Nixon</sup> and Haldeman met again at 1:04 p.m. The transcript is obviously incomplete.

Two of the three paragraphs of Nixon's words deal with <sup>Hunt</sup>. In neither case ~~did~~ <sup>does</sup> Haldeman mention Hunt or raise any question or issue leading to him:

"Just say (unintelligible) ~~was~~ <sup>very</sup> bad to have this fellow Hunt, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> he knows too damned much, ~~if it gets out that this is all involved, the Cuba thing, it would be a fiasco. It would make the CIA look bad. It's going to make Hunt look bad and it is likely to blow the whole Bay of Pigs thing which we think would be very unfortunate...I would just say, lookit, because of the Hunt involvement, whole cover basically this.~~"

"Go <sup>d</sup>/move," Haldeman opined as he trotted off to do it, to return at 2:20 to report "No problem."

Now Hunt's name had appeared because of the records found in the Cubans' room. He had also disappeared. But he had been "involved" in ~~nothing~~ to that moment. The illogical and the logical make an informative pattern. There was nothing "very bad" for the CIA in anything done by a former employee. There was nothing to "get out" about the Bay of Pigs or Cuba that could ~~hurt~~ hurt the CIA. Books had been written about it, stories and articles without end and JFK had fired the Director over it. What could come out, what was not public, is Hunt's and Nixon's companion roles. But this was no "fiasco" for the CIA, would not "make the CIA look bad." It would make Nixon look bad. When details then not public were known it could make the man Nixon had just made commandante of the Marines look bad. The illicit aid the CIA had given the White House could look bad but Nixon would have had to have had knowledge of or involvement in that to have it in mind and again it would make him "look bad."

He knew the CIA would not go for this. But he also had to know that they would recognize that they were being blackmailed and they just could not be told, "Lookit, you take a bum rap for Nixon." What could he use to lean on Helms and Walters with except fictions - or guilty knowledge, meaning still more personal, criminal activity?

12

This alone could be a tender CIA area. What Nixon may have known about the Hunt/Mullen/Bennett-CIA operation may be subject to conjecture, although there is enough to lead to the belief he did know all about it. The CIA certainly knew what it was into and there can be no doubt that by this time it knew it had a vulnerability because of its "assets" and "proprietarys" still not publicly reported and never until now put together.

134

Nixon probably trusted Haldeman more than anyone else in the White House. But he faced danger in telling Haldeman what Haldeman showed every sign of not knowing <sup>Nixon's</sup> ~~it all~~, the reason for that "Thank God it wasn't Colson," <sup>exclamation. Colson disclosed his secrets and Hunt did later</sup> ~~Nixon's involvement in all over which~~ Hunt later blackmailed <sup>Nixon</sup> through Colson. <sup>Hunt alone blackmailed Nixon - successfully.</sup>

In this babbling, logic being impossible, Nixon discloses still more about not less than guilty knowledge in saying Hunt "knows too damned much" and in saying that "the Hunt involvement" was over "the whole cover." <sup>Here "whole cover" can't refer to the Watergate break-in.</sup>

Even Nixon's saying "it's going to make Hunt look bad" is an expression not <sup>his</sup> of concern <sup>for</sup> over Hunt but of the consequences of any Hunt reaction <sup>To</sup> ever looking bad. Nixon really didn't care how anyone else looked. His own "looks" often <sup>weighed</sup> ~~were~~ least in his scale of values.

The only way of making sense out of warning Helms and Walters about danger in making Hunt look bad <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ as a warning to them that they, Nixon, or <sup>all</sup> ~~both~~ could be hurt.

One of those common "(unintelligibles)" in Nixon's <sup>own</sup> transcript of Nixon tapes precedes Haldeman's first substantive comment on his meeting with the CIA's top two, just ended. "Walters made the point," he says, the point relating to Nixon's "(unintelligible)" but it seems to be that the question Nixon asked related to Hunt- his first question. The reader can decide whether this interpretation is justified by the full <sup>following "(unintelligible)"</sup> Haldeman quote:

"Well, it was kind of interest. [sic] Walters made the point and I didn't mention Hunt. I just said the thing was ~~going to~~ leading into directions that were going to create potential problems....harmful to the CIA...."

<sup>Haldeman</sup>  
When ~~he~~ returns with fuller detail it is again in a context that makes no sense in terms of any CIA fears over the "Day of Pigs". Accidentally or not, the transcript immediately preceding this quotation is garbled:



"...don't lie to them to the extent to say there is no [CIA] involvement" in his directions to Waldeman may refer to this. Short of plain lying there seems to be nothing else Nixon could ~~have~~ have had in mind.

If it were not a lie to say there was CIA involvement and if it could not have been over the Bay of Pigs and <sup>the</sup> if/CIA were to have any basis for believing it, whatever Nixon did have in mind had to be something the CIA also would understand and <sup>react</sup> respond to.

Not a lie, a reality.



(unintelligible) the problem is it tracks back to the Bay of Pigs and it tracks back to some other leads run out to people who had no involvement in this except by contracts and connection, but it gets to areas that are liable to be raised? [sic] The whole problem (unintelligible) Hunt. So at that point he [Probably Helms, possibly Walters] kind of got the picture. He said, he said we'll be very happy to be helpful (unintelligible) handle anything you want. *A. C. G. "tracks back to the Bay of Pigs" essential is no "problem"*

*"Contract and connection" - unspecified is another matter.*  
~~XX~~  
~~XX~~

~~XX~~ Nixon either had no curiosity or lacked no knowledge because he asked no question.

This means he had to have known enough if not all about Hunt and about the new key words Haldeman introduces for the first time. Or for the first time in what was not destroyed, which may not be for the first time. (An added importance of this would be as a reflection of whether Nixon knew without being told.) These two words are "contract" and "connection," meaning with the CIA.

It was not then generally known, but Martinez was getting a retainer of \$100 monthly. Although he was arrested ~~inside~~ <sup>probable</sup> inside the Watergate, it is not ~~likely~~ <sup>probable</sup> he would be enough for Haldeman to use as a weapon ~~of~~ for the CIA to capitulate so completely over.

What is likely, what there is every reason to believe Nixon, Haldeman and Colson all then knew, is that the Mullen Agency was virtually started by the CIA. It was under "contract" during and after the Bay of Pigs. It was still a "connection" of the CIA, in southeast Asia and in Europe. *And it employed Hunt before and after he "retired" from the CIA.*

Mullen/Bennett exposure could be a real <sup>also fits</sup> problem for the CIA. ~~It meets the require-~~  
~~ment of~~ "the problem" that "tracks back to the Bay of Pigs" and it rather than Martinez can be described as "it tracks back to some other leads run out to people ~~of~~ who had no involvement" in the break-in.

Bennett, son of an important Senator, ~~worked~~ <sup>friendly with Nixon</sup> directly for the CIA ~~and~~ running an agency that worked for the CIA ~~and~~ <sup>it</sup> had provided Hunt with a cover for illicit pre-Watergate activities when he was officially a CIA employee and as a cover as well as a source of pay for his Watergate work, engaged in "seamy" activities with and for the White House. <sup>Bennett/Mullen</sup> ~~while himself~~ <sup>above</sup> working for the CIA ~~he~~ <sup>etc</sup> was enough to persuade the <sup>etc</sup> top men

~~of the CIA to "be very happy to be helpful" and to be willing to "handle anything" Nixon~~  
*any part of the Hunt/Bennett/Mullen/CIA/White House combination would have been*  
 might want. The Bennett/Hunt combination, both CIA, both White House, ~~but~~ either would enough to be "the problem." *Any combination was more than enough and suits the rest of Haldeman's intention.*

~~Without adding~~ ~~have been enough. Both together plus whatever else the CIA might have known were more~~ ~~that~~ what it required to be persuasive, to get the CIA's top people into a new series of unpunished criminal acts/ and offers.

*This is a*

*Column 15A-*

This is what ended it all, but in the end it still was not put together for popular comprehension. The press and the politicians were satisfied that these tapes were irrefutable proof that Nixon participated in the ~~the~~ obstruction of justice. Satisfied, neither went farther.

*Too little was enough.  
Enough was too much.*

The poor, childlike people just could not take any more was the pretense. These are the same ~~the~~ not childish people who had been clamoring for more- for all ~~and~~ whose pressures alone gave the political ~~forces~~ <sup>came</sup> the little courage they summoned for the ~~the~~ inadequate exposures they made. There were exceptions, but not enough ~~and none among~~

*of them - None in the parties'*

~~the~~ nationally known. In the crunch if not before then, when their own integrity was at issue if not before that, there was a corporal's guard in the Congress who joined the tiny number who had been making insistent demands for full exposure.

*leadership. The meligmed people would full exposure. No political body - no forum - no court - no prosecution - provided it. Or would*

~~But not one was capable of that.~~

Yet it was all, as in <sup>Poels</sup> the story of The Purloined Letter, there to be seen. If Nixon turned it all around, as <sup>in</sup> Through the Looking Glass, <sup>As much</sup> ~~more than most~~ was still out in the open, as this book shows.

What even the fatal shot proves is that even it adds only minor detail. Its importance is the first-person admission, not ~~the~~ new information in it.

The press may heap prizes upon itself, easier with a little CIA help, for its "investigative reporting" when there was no real investigating. The Congress may be busy scaling the hillsides of pride for laurel with which to fashion wreathes for its noble head. But both failed. There was conspicuously good reporting. There were members of the Congress of the most exemplary behavior and highest dedication. But when there was this great crisis both <sup>instat utimo</sup> failed.

Neither has admitted it. If any form of representative society is to continue, the people would do well to recognize this for <sup>each day</sup> ~~daily~~ authoritarianism, always dignified. <sup>as principle or need,</sup> with a title of principle, encroaches more upon freedom. Daily the influence of the

15A

# Extra space

Nixon's gratitude and relief that it was his former close friend, Attorney General, law partner, close adviser and then his campaign manager, Mitchell, who has implicated rather than just another hired hand in the White House is without official investigation and exposure. It is one of the larger defects <sup>many</sup> among all the defects of all the investigations. <sup>for Colson's activities to remain largely unexposed</sup> That it was possible is still another tribute to the resourcefulness and lack of ~~skill~~ <sup>scruple</sup> of which Colson lost naught in his claimed acquiring of the spirit of Christ.

When the House Jusiiciary Committee filed its official report on the "Impeachment of Richard M. Nixon President of the United States" on August 20, it <sup>included</sup> ~~had put together~~ but <sup>did</sup> ~~done~~ nothing else with a partial chronology of Colson's action, conversations and meetings known to it. This report, as all others of which I know, contains no reference to the phone call Hunt reported making to an unidentified White House official at about 4 a.m. June 17, 1972, considerably less than two hours after the five were in jail and after Hunt had taken care of many other details. <sup>Who would he have called other than Colson?</sup>

The committee <sup>noted</sup> ~~did report, however,~~ that ~~xxxxxxxx~~ when the Secret Service informed Ehrlichman of Hunt's involvement, that afternoon, Ehrlichman "immediately called Colson."

(p. 43) That afternoon "Ehrlichman and Colson talked about how to handle the records of Hunt's employment at the White House; and about Douglas Caddy," (p.43) <sup>dropping it there why did Caddy concern these two? "handle the records" means don't touch them. there also was no investigation of these</sup> ~~committee went into this most basic matters. and this committee does xxxxxxxxxxxx~~

say that not until after talking with <sup>Colson</sup> Hunt did ~~Ehrlichman~~ Ehrlichman call Key Biscayne, "in the late afternoon," when he talked to Ziegler. (p.43) <sup>obviously this can not have been the first walk to Nixon and Haldeman.</sup> ~~before it in secret,~~

Based on Colson's testimony, perhaps the only testimony but certainly neither dependable nor in this case rational, the committee reported that "On June 18, 1972, the President also called Colson from Key Biscayne. He told Colson he had been so angry about the involvement of McCord in the Watergate break-in that he had thrown ~~an~~ <sup>its</sup> ashtray across the room." (p.44) Odd how with this display of temper and the supposed-to-be-believed cause, McCord's involvement, just a few days later, in hours of conversations with Haldeman, Nixon never mentioned McCord's name and never stopped introducing Hunt's. <sup>Colson yarn</sup> Grown men actually believe this when both Lidfy and Hunt were known by Nixon to have been involved, McCord had never worked for Nixon, Eddy had and

*was a Nixon employee*

Hunt still did, ~~was he had~~ at the moment of the crime?

Of Colson's testimony that he and Ehrlichman and Dean had met on June 19, the first working day after the break-in, the ~~the~~ committee ~~quotes~~ says they talked about there being no record of Hunt's "termination" which ~~is~~ <sup>7) ~~is~~ *explained*</sup> explained only by what the committee does not say, ~~he~~ <sup>Hunt</sup> had not been terminated; and of the contents of Hunt's safe. (p.44)

The committee's next accounting of a Colson involvement in the deliberations over the problems of The Watergate is, "On June 19, 1972, the President phoned Colson. They talked for approximately one hour about the break-in." (p. 45) With Colson supposedly not in any way involved, all that time talking about his non-involvement? Nixon spent ~~only~~ <sup>only</sup> nine minutes with Haldeman before ~~Haldeman met~~ <sup>Haldeman met</sup> on June 23 with Helms and Walters, and that was an important meeting for Nixon. (The transcript of these nine minutes is but a single typed page!)

*for this Nixon-Colson hour of June 19,*

The reason the committee appears to have swallowed <sup>is</sup> so that Colson could tell Nixon about "administration" meetings "to determine how they should react." (p.45). For this Nixon needed Colson when he had them all <sup>reporting?</sup> The entire Department of Justice beginning with ~~the~~ Attorney General? ~~and~~ <sup>The head of the FBI, too?</sup>

Colson was not in on the Haldeman-Nixon meeting of June 20, early in the first morning after their return from Key Biscayne, <sup>when Haldeman had Gray's summary of the FBI had learned of the tape of this meeting</sup> ~~and~~ the committee repeats what had long been public and proven in court, that the erasure was deliberate and "obliterated that portion of the ~~transcript~~ conversation...referred to Watergate." <sup>(pp. 46, 245)</sup> ~~(p. 46)~~. However, or converse Nixon did meet/with Colson this day also, this very critical day, from 2:20 until 3:30; from 8:04 until 8:21; and from 11:33 until five minutes after midnight <sup>(p. 46)</sup> on the 21st. ~~Nixon spoke with Colson more on the 20th than he did with Ehrlichman.~~ <sup>and each time there was nothing party. Nixon and Colson alone - head to head.</sup> (p. 46)

Not, certainly, to learn what the "administration was still, planning to "determine how they should react" to The Watergate!

This day busy beaver Nixon, who spent so much time with Colson and Haldeman, did not find a minute for his Attorney ~~General~~ <sup>supposedly</sup> or FBI Director, while he was trying to learn what the administration of which he was boss was doing about Watergate? (p. 46) <sup>On the basic fact impossible</sup>

Nixon did talk to Mitchell, but the tape of the conversation does not exist ~~and~~ <sup>he did, later, dictate a memo on that conversation. But</sup>

his formerly dependable dictabelt machine <sup>just</sup> ~~just~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~happened to~~ to preserve his <sup>that, either. (p. 46)</sup> ~~confidential~~  
~~later summary of his conversation with Mitchell. (p. 46)~~  
~~and his dictation about what transpired between Richard and Nixon. (p. 46)~~

None of this is new. There is no reason to believe it is complete. It is cited  
~~single~~  
from an official source because others can satisfy themselves more easily from it.

~~If complete it has~~ <sup>was</sup> Colson (an extraordinarily busy man during these crucial ~~early~~  
early moments. One wonders how much inquiry throughout the government it took to require  
hour-long reports to Nixon on the results! ~~One~~ also wonders, with all the others engaged  
in identical pursuits and the White House in direct contact with the entire administration,

why Colson <sup>had</sup> had to gather the readily-available information. And make such lengthy reports.  
If he did, that is. <sup>And what if, as is probable, this is less than a complete</sup>  
<sup>is accounted for</sup> ~~a~~ account of what Colson did in those first days of such dire peril?

The flurry of Colson activity subsided as soon as he had persuaded others to  
create false records - the gentle committee does not put it this bluntly - that Hunt  
had ceased his White House employment "as of April 1, 1972." (p. 48)

It was, <sup>naturally</sup> ~~naturally~~ for Colson, fabrication. How <sup>else</sup> ~~can~~ go to Christ save from this  
kind of past?

Perhaps the most provocative of all these strange and unexplained Colson activities  
is that when he spoke to Nixon he and Nixon were always alone. What they talked about was  
secret from all others, including those on whom Nixon depended <sup>so</sup> ~~so~~ heavily. Colson himself  
was so secretive about all of this - even to hiding his true relationship with Hunt - that  
he had GSA crack Hunt's safe when he had the combination to it. ~~Admitting~~ <sup>work</sup> Admitting he had the  
combination would have been admitting the closeness of their relationship to his colleagues.  
Only because Colson was really the one in charge of Hunt's "seamy" ~~work~~ <sup>work</sup> for Nixon did Colson  
have to keep these dark secrets - to protect himself as well as Nixon. Colson's possession of  
this knowledge was a lever he had on Nixon. It accounts for Nixon's expressed apprehensions  
about Colson when he spoke to others in Colson's absence. And Colson could have been the source  
of much of what Nixon knew where the transcripts give no indication of how Nixon knew and Nixon's  
claims make it impossible for him to have known. <sup>It</sup> Colson has to have been the hub, <sup>of the Nixon Watergate</sup> ~~of the Nixon Watergate~~

- of all the dirty work

Hunt ~~was involved~~ and his gangs revolved around this Colson hub.

This Colson hub was also ~~the~~ part of the rack on which Nixon could have been tortured.

Colson reported directly to Nixon, in privacy. He is the <sup>only</sup> one who could and did pass through the Haldeman-Ehrlichman wall around Nixon.

He could have ruined Nixon, as Nixon could have ruined him. Each in protecting the other protected himself.

This also is that "too much" Nixon said ~~Hunt knew~~. ~~Thus~~ <sup>thus</sup> Hunt alone could and did blackmail Nixon and thus the pressure for it was applied through Colson when the pretense was that Ehrlichman would pay if Hunt were not taken care of.

Extra space.

The June 23 transcripts are what

people on their lives and their ability to exert any influence even when combined in the greatest number wanes.

This is not alone the story of The Watergate. It is also the meaning of the non-investigation of The Watergate and the unimpeachment of Richard Nixon.

Had Tad Sculz not lied the very day after the break-in, who knows what the difference might not have been? Had the Hunt story begun to come out the very first day, when it was possible, with all that we have seen woven into a tapestry of fact and incrimination, how different the world <sup>is</sup> if not the country might <sup>be!</sup> ~~not~~ have been.

If the Pulitzer Washington Post had exposed the Mullen-Bennett operation instead of making a deal with it, given the truly superior effort and performance of the Post's other work, two and a half years of agony and their legacy of inflation and <sup>and depression,</sup> disgust and disillusionment, <sup>might</sup> could easily have been avoided. <sup>Or if the prestigious New York Times had not down-played the story so long to crucial early stages.</sup>

~~And~~ There are countless other examples each with real possibilities, each already recorded.

This is a record of failure, not of glory.

Of failure that goes marching on who knows to what destiny.

Extra space

This is also the story of a midget of a man magnified into ~~something large~~, <sup>been but for artificialities</sup> something he neither was nor could ~~survive~~ those ~~artificialities~~ and devices that have come to dominate American life, thought and actions and reactions.

Nixon, a nothing who knew he was a nothing, had as one of his sicknesses <sup>paranoia</sup> ~~companion~~ <sup>belief that</sup> ~~the paranoia,~~ that the world was crammed with his enemies, his justification for <sup>in deed</sup> any failure; and a compulsion to be forever assuring himself that ~~indeed~~ he was something, <sup>only by this world of Genemio</sup>

All his non-secret tapes overflow with endless repetitions. This earliest of the undestroyed/ tapes repeatedly show him repeatedly telling himself and Haldeman how great he was in his great vision that wasn't his in the book that wasn't his, Six Crises. With ~~this~~ his world about to collapse around him, still again out of nowhere, for no apparent need and connected with nothing, with all there is for a real President to do,

17  
relives his past crises,  
Nixon launches into the book, without shame, without awareness <sup>of his</sup> ~~the~~ self-disclosure to his top assistant, <sup>Without feeling important enough even though he hold the office of</sup> President of the United States! <sup>An intelligent eye peering looking into a magnifying mirror?</sup>

"I was thumbing through the, ah, last chapters of (unintelligible) last night and I also read the (unintelligible) chapters (unintelligible). Warm up to it, and it makes, ah, fascinating reading.... So on and so on. I want you to reread it, and I want Colson to read it, and anybody else. ... And anybody else in the campaign. Get copies and give it to each of them. Say I want them to read it and have it in mind. Give it to whoever you can... Actually the book reads awfully well - have to look at history. I want to talk to you more about this later in terms of what it tells us... Could find out from him what chapters of the book he worked on... But you could find out which ~~extra~~ chapters he worked on. Also find out where Moscow is - what's become of him - what he's been doing ten years. Say hello to him (unintelligible) future despite the (unintelligible). You'll find this extremely interesting, ~~and~~ read (unintelligible)..."

This is but a fraction of the first time he wasted so much time <sup>on it in</sup> the midst of these terrible and crucial events, <sup>himself to himself and</sup> selling (himself and his past as others recorded it for <sup>to the man</sup> him in his name ~~belaboring the man~~ who acted as president for him. What was poor Haldeman to do or say? When he could not avoid it, he injected an occasional "Yeah," "O.K." or "Sure will."

Just before Ron Ziegler interrupted to discuss the regular briefing Nixon was back at it again, this time with his defamations of an old friend and loyal worker, Herb Klein. ("He just sort of blubbers around" and "He just doesn't really have his head screwed on."):

...that Six Crises is <sup>a</sup> ~~a~~ <sup>demanded</sup> good book and the (unintelligible) story reads like a novel - the Hiss case - Caracas was fascinating. The campaign if course for anybody in political should be a must because it has a lot in there ~~about~~ of how politicians are like... [several "unintelligibles"] and how you do things... Wonderful item to put in."

Haldeman asked, "Is that in the ~~3~~ book?"

"It's in the book! Hell yes. It's in the book."

As though in disbelief, Haldeman again, "It is?"

"(Unintelligible)," Nixon told him. "Why ~~didn't~~ <sup>re</sup> you read it? ~~Again~~."

Even after Haldeman pocketed the CIA for Nixon and reported the capture, Nixon <sup>to "has" masterpiece of masterpieces,</sup> returned still again <sup>to what he alleged Dulles had done to him in his book,</sup> Dulles had told him the truth and because Nixon had lied, as we saw earlier, Dulles became an "expletive deleted" that is worse than "SOB" which is not deleted.



From this collection of the crude and the crass, of proof of his conspiring in crimes and connivings to in<sup>ordinarily</sup>criminate others in them, of his lack of honesty or the decent regard of men, it should not be believed that Nixon was without awarrness of what it means to be President of the United States, the most powerful man in the world running what was the world's richest country when he took it over. Nor can it be fairly alleged that he was not conscious of what it means to be the man the push of whose finger could incinerate a large propor<sup>would be</sup>tion of the world and ruin what was not totally destroyed. He displayed a statesmanship no whit inferior to Warren G. Harding's and when great emotion over the most pressing of <sup>events</sup> of transcendental importance siezed him he was ~~an~~ of an eloquence not in the least inferior to that Of Calvin Coolidge.

Once the expletives were deleted he was not a man without warmth or unaware of what is really important in life or to the presidency or where the most urgent needs of the country lay or that after five years of his rule there were still these uncounted thousands ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-educated and ~~prepared~~ <sup>not unable</sup> to live in decency.

Nay, never should it be said or believed that Richard Milhous Nixon was a man without compassion, a man on whom the most urgent needs of others did not weigh heavily.

Immersed as he was in the great travail that became the greater travail of two and a half years of The Watergate, his bugs caught and his tapes preserved for posterity the coursing of his blood and the rise of his spirit when he became aware of the most dire of human needs.

Before sending Haldeman off to take the intelligence estab<sup>lishment</sup> into camp and make it responsible for Nixonian crime the great ~~and~~ <sup>man</sup> found time to remind Haldeman how important it can be for a candidate to have his picture taken with a celebrity. Even Democrats could come in, be photographed with Nixon, and go out and use the picture in their ~~campaigns~~ <sup>overt</sup>. No <sup>man</sup> suggestion that this would help Nixon, of course.

With all this ~~new crisis~~ <sup>newest of his crises</sup> meant and all the time he'd spent rereading ~~his own~~ <sup>the account of all those earlier crises bear- ing his name, Nixon</sup> masterpiece of those endless earlier ~~crises~~ crises, he had still found time for a long ~~compassionate~~ talk with Pat and Tricia over the ~~problems~~ <sup>crisis</sup> they would face at the upcoming ~~convention~~ <sup>convention</sup>.  
 And a few of those of their parts.

¶ When Tricia was not received as she'd have liked there were "labor thugs out booing."

~~How terrible.~~ In Allentown, Pennsylvania

In Boston "the press were pretty vicious...one even refused to ~~shake~~ shake,"

*That a princess could be so treated*  
meaning the hand of the princess. But Tricia has a "good brain in that head." After *initial* disbelief she restricted herself to safe Republican groups.

Haldeman though it was nice, "Julie giving that time to the Museum in Jacksonville."

But Nixon was less sure: "The Arts, you know - they're <sup>the</sup> Jews, they're left wing - in other words, stay away."

Loyal, faithful Pat was also worried the night of these troubles that could make her husband the first President ~~first kicked out and then jailed~~ *forced out of office*. She, too, is intensely human: "First, she says the moment they get the helicopter and get off and so forth, it destroys their hair and so forth." Her "second point," Haldeman appraised it as "the big point," was Pat's "doing" the delegations of the states. "On TV," ~~of course~~ course. But Nixon had had word from "some of our stragetists...not to overuse them and cheapen them" by overexposure." Haldeman, "couldn't agree more."

No, the cares of The Watergate did not dehumanize Richard Nixon!

Ner did fame change him. At his pinnacle he was true to the belief and the expression of belief that was his one qualification to be Eisenhower's Vice President; "The Arts, you know - they're Jews, they're left wing."

Unchanging as the tides, save for an occasional wavelet. Jews were "left wing" instead of the "Communists" they were to the Congressional inquisiter.

His world was beginning to crumble as the entire world was beginning to tumble, but when he ~~was~~ bethought himself of the struggles past and coming of his woman, from the "good brain in that head" to "the big point," not once did he utter a fuck, a shit - ~~even~~ *little* or even a piss.

"TAPES SHOW HE ADMITTED COVER-UP" his enemy Pest might proclaim but never could it allege that Richard Nixon, for all his feul language, more feul because of *nature's* ~~the~~ limitations *not prepared and rehearsed* on all his ~~unprepared~~ language, ever once uttered an expletive to be deleted when talking of his loyal women.

*He remembered his mother Hannah, as we shall see.*