

## FOREWORD

There has never been a news story of the magnitude of The Watergate.

Not even the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, then called "the crime of the century," came close.

The assassination was a single, super-spectacular event followed by a series of other stories, all less important and all controlled by the government, which controlled the official investigation - the only real one of that period - and through it and occasional leaks of what it wanted known limited what could be known. The hearings were not public. After only a few were there essentially meaningless handouts.

With what has come to be known by the code name The Watergate it was and is different. Even what is meant by The Watergate differs. To the White House<sup>and its partisans</sup> the phrase is limited to the single caught crime, when five men, acting for Nixon, were caught in Democratic National Committee headquarters in the office part of The Watergate complex in Washington about 2 a.m. the morning of Saturday, June 17, 1972.

To everyone else, this rubric encompasses and extensive, related series of criminal acts including but by no means limited to other official burglaries; false swearing, including perjury; <sup>numerous and most</sup> the most/corrupt political/financial crimes in a history unfortunately well studded with them; the most fundamental and repetitious violations of the Constitution and the ~~right~~ supposedly inalienable rights of all Americans; the obstruction of justice; the misuse of federal agencies and power for the President's personal, political and generally vindictive objectives and self-indulgences; and an assortment of other felonies and misdemeanors that once would have been thought absolutely impossible, involving a staggering number of people, most of high rank, including the President and all his top political aides.

The Watergate story began as the reporting of a weekend burglary. Initially the press treated it gingerly. The Washington Post <sup>at</sup> ~~alone~~ from the first regarded and covered it as the major story it was. For this the Post won an assortment of prizes, including journalism's most prestigious, The Pulitzer Prize, for "investigative reporting."

When the Post's work, at first chiefly by ~~two~~<sup>two</sup> young city-desk reporters, the conservative Bob Woodward and the liberal Carl Bernstein and then by a large crew of both city and national-desk reporters, became its own separate sensation, other newspapers and magazines felt the competition and in time all the media reported The Watergate extensively and continuously.

Also exceptionally well by normal journalistic standards.

The professionalism of the reporting was exceptional. In as complex and large a story, the accuracy of the <sup>daily</sup> reporting was of conspicuous excellence. This is no inconspicuous achievement for a story of this nature when daily deadlines had to be met.

When the United States Senate's major investigation (there were a series of related inquiries in both Houses) began May 17, 1973- ~~xxxx~~ 11 months to the day after the arrests at The Watergate - Television and radio covered every word of every witness until that investigation petered out.

Officially it was called The Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities. It was generally called The Watergate Committee or the Ervin committee, after the respected septagenarian chairman, Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina.

Here television coverage achieved its finest hour, not only by bringing every word of the proceedings to the people but by the perceptiveness of its reporters who presented other news and details during the numerous intermissions required by the Senate's business as well as before and after each session and on regularly-scheduled and "special" newscasts. TV's reporters also encapsulated with consummate skill and fidelity.

All reporting was really superb when measured by tradition and the unprecedented nature, scope and significance of the story.

And thus the people were led to believe that there was nothing they were not told and told fully and honestly.

But this was not the case.

There is also one other conspicuous attribute of Watergate reporting. It is an almost complete absence of real investigating.

Almost any real investigation,

Or analysis, real analysis, which in journalism is no more than giving meaning to the fact, especially the meaning not readily apparent.

There is a uniqueness to this defect in the reporting: there was never a story that in any way approximated the magnitude of this one on which investigation was as easy or analysis as simple.

There is also a tradition that has come to be almost a false god of American journalism. It is called "objectivity." This means that if the President tells the biggest lie conceivable his words are reported accurately and he is not described as a liar.

The media got hung up on "objectivity" and by it lost its true objectivity.

It did not report what it could and should have reported.

What came to be regarded as "investigative reporting" was no more than the clever, ~~extensive~~ diligent and continuing pursuit of leaks and reporting of them so accurate that considering the multitudinous problems of daily reporting and its deadlines is truly a remarkable achievement.

But it was not investigating.

And often it served the special interests of those leaking. While loudly and endlessly protesting what it regarded as the unfairness of this leaking, the White House was a conspicuous leader in it and, as some of its secret records were officially exposed, it was exposed as the regular conniver at manufacturing and leaking what it wanted known and believed, painfully often without regard to honesty or fact. Other who leaked were those with special and personal involvements. Some leakers calmed their consciences. Others bought immunities.

It is not only that the major media did not investigate. Within my personal experience a major part of the major media refused to investigate. It also refused to carry stories of significance, some of which will be reported in what follows, for reasons that varied but seem to range from the lack of officialness of the source to stark terror of the story itself and the inescapable meaning.

In time the media came to fear its own creation, The Watergate story and its real

meaning.

It had never been called upon to report wholesale White House felony ranging from the initial ~~is~~ uncommonly common crime to unprecedented felonies the least of which were of unprecedented crookedness. The more dire ranged from actual and political <sup>planning</sup> assassinations to the subverting of the Constitution and the basic law, a real plot to change the form of government and society.

Nor was book publishing different. The binderies disgorged volume after volume of the repetitious and the commercial quest for a quick buck but nothing of real substance, nothing that told the people what they did not know or prepared them to better serve the responsibilities of citizenship in representative society.

Here as with the refusal of the media to investigate my experience is personal and painful.

In my youth I had been an investigative reporter, in the old-fashioned sense not of exploiting leaks but of sensing and following clues by seeking and acquiring evidence, particularly documentary evidence. I had been an investigator and analyst for the Senate and for the Office of Strategic Services in World War II. The OSS was the predecessor of today's Central Intelligence Agency. Harry Truman established the CIA.

I had spent the <sup>nine</sup> ~~time~~ years before The Watergate investigating the investigations of the <sup>and other assassinations</sup> ~~them.~~ JFK assassination and writing numerous books about <sup>them.</sup> ~~it.~~ This meant investigating the investigators, particularly the FBI and the Warren Commission, whose investigator it was. It also meant inventing the "underground" book because of a similar publisher fear.

I did not plan a Watergate book. But the names of several of the first-reported characters were in my files together with FBI reports on them, FBI reports/<sup>on them, their associates and their activities</sup> that were quite inadequate, to the point of covering up. Following this initial separate interest it turned out that the path of one of the central characters and my own had crossed in 1965, without benefit to me and with apparent but possibly unrelated harm.

As I retrieved, developed and otherwise acquired evidence, only some of which will follow, I offered it to the media. In some cases the offers were rejected. In others reporters came and copied files in wholesale lots then wrote stories that were "killed"

by their desk~~er~~ editors.

Of all the many instances, the one that probably more than any other made me decide to write a Watergate book is the proof beyond question that one of the central characters and a member of Nixon's personal staff at the time of the break-in had earlier plotted the assassination of another head of state. This story was refused by both the printed press and TV. When I gave it to the Times of London, which front-paged it, no American paper picked it up.

At first, in those early Watergate days, it seemed probable that with a story so utterly incredible, that so much crime should be official and should center around the President personally, along, definitive study would be required for comprehensibility. What this really meant was writing a series of books in which the various parts would, in effect, be separate books. By the time I had completed several such individual studies, one of which was the coervng up by the prosecution and another that by the FBI and its temporary second Director, L. Patrick Gray, my agent said what is not true, that this task is beyend the capacity of any one man.

<sup>A</sup>onsense.

It is merely beyond the willingness of publishers.

Before the end of 1973 I had completed a part of this overall work that was larger than any book that appeared on the subject in~~x~~ the two years after the initial, caught crime. It was a relatively easy task, except for the time required, and it was comprehensible. Meanwhile, publishers who sought me out ~~in excitement~~ and ~~referred~~ conferred with me in excitement after seeing samples suddenly fell silent.

When I submitted to an agent drafts of two sensational chapters then not yet reported by the papers but all public domain I lost the agent. A year later both were and remained front-page stories and the subject of continuing official investigation.

This was all as it had been with the Warren Commission. Fear and policy were the determining factors, not whether the material was publishable or of merit.

As the second anniversary of the caught break-in of Democrtic headquarters approached

it seemed to me that while a definitive, all-inclusive book is the need of history there had been a vast change in popular understanding. All the excellent reporting had told enough to make unreported details comprehensible without long, even prolix explanations.

It was also apparent by then that all the many official investigations were ~~mainly~~ dominated by a variety of self-imposed fears and by Richard Nixon and those serving him and his interests. Required investigations deliberately were not made. Evidence that could not be avoided deliberately was ignored. And crimes of which there was proof went and incomplete uncharged while inadequate/indictments were handed down.

Deals without end were being made, openly and covertly.

And much of the truth remained secret when almost without exception it was readily available, publicly available.

While most of what follows will seem new, the actuality is that it was merely ignored. There are a few genuine secrets, but they were readily available. With facilities, there is no doubt much more also was.

It is limited to a few aspects. It does not by any means represent all the easily-developed material I have. These are those that at the time of writing I believe to be among the more important of the unreported and the suppressed. It is restrict to what without the perspective of history lead to the unimpeachment of Richard Nixon, to what, had it been reported by the media or the official investigations, might have altered interred history.

It had hardly been begun when Nixon, in an act of desperation, released his own selection of his own transcriptions soon proven unfaithful of his own unprecedented bugging of his own offices and phones and thus his conferences and conversations. This illegal bugging had been disclosed, whether or not by accident, by Nixon's former deputy assistant to the President, in his surprise appearance before the Watergate committee Monday afternoon, July 16, 1973. It is published in that committee's sixth volume of hearings, pages 2073-2090 (H 2073-90). He then swore that all that was bugged was taped and the tapes preserved by the Secret Service and that he had the system installed, with only Nixon, his top assistant H.R. (Bob) Maldeman, Maldeman's

(H 2072)

assistant, Lawrence Higby, "and the Secret Service people I would prefer not to name" knowing of it. (6H2077).

Butterfield was promoted to Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency (6H2073), a high post he retained after making this astounding disclosure and making it prior to asking the Nixon's or any other White House permission. This is not typical of the vindictive Nixen.

When Butterfield was promoted, Haldeman authorized him to cue his successor, Steve Bull, in on the bugging operation (6H2080).

The phone bugging was activated by a change in voltage when Nixon picked his phone up. That of the rooms was activated by the sound of the voice and by accident by noise. (6H2079). The system was tested regularly and despite later White House allegations, "it was always working properly" (~~6H2078~~), (except in the rarely-used Cabinet room, where Nixon activated it by hand), so well that "voices, conversations, were picked up very well, very clearly...even low tones were picked up very well" (6H2078, 2081).

~~While~~ The transcripts Nixon released are neither full nor faithful representations of the 33 hours of conversation they ostensibly cover. This was also a minuscule part of his personal bugging and a tiny fraction of what by then had been subpoenaed by the Office of Special Prosecutor, which had been set up to prosecute Watergate crime, by the Watergate committee, and by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which was then deliberating impeachment.

However, these selections Nixon did disclose hold much relevance to what was suppressed, to what follows, especially as it relates to Everette Howard Hunt. Hunt had been a career CIA agent who joined the White House staff after retiring from it in the summer of 1971. He had been a prolific boiler of the literary pots, mostly spy fiction. His own account, titled The Road to Watergate, is his 43rd book.

And investigation of Hunt, clearly a central figure, is one avoided and refused by the press and neglected by official investigators. Without these failings, the whole story would have been different.

But any real investigation meant evidence and proofs of crimes and criminals neither unofficial nor official investigators were willing to confront.

If Hunt was a career spook, his spores were not all that hard to follow. It is where they led that inspired official and journalistic terror.

Nixon was the center of the main web. Another spidered out from Hunt.

In all 1308 pages of released transcripts, Nixon indicates fear of two men only.

One is Hunt.

extra space

This book is written without contract or assurance of publication.

It is written as the obligation of a writer with dedication to a free society.

It is written in the belief that free society and official or unofficial suppression of what the people should know cannot coexist.

It is written under limitations and problems equivalent to that of the daily press because it is about a "breaking" story, with the further handicap of the infinitely longer time required for a book to appear.

But it is written in hope: in hope that it can appear and in hope that somehow, free society will survive The Watergate and the abdication of all the ~~protections of a~~ intended ~~free society all its institutions~~ the institutions designed to keep society free.

The failure of these protections led to the unimpeachment of Richard Nixon.



Post 9/25/74

Several House members appeared before the committee today to testify on the subject. They were sure that the Nixon's involvement and conduct was told to the from bills on the Water for to know member Rep. said to the full roll of the given hand of the guilty