*A Communication*

Post 11/10/73

# 'Why Not Keep a Permanent Special Prosecutor?'

Any Republican who has enjoyed 1973 must have been having an absolutely incredible sex life.

Being a Republican, I am not exactly awaiting with impatience the television analysis that will accompany the network's year-end roundups. I plan on going to Pangkalpinang in the Sunda Islands over the New Year holiday and just try to think it all out for myself.

As a result of the year's events, I have already stumbled on one idea which, I am sure, has some merit but needs thrashing out in public. Why not maintain a permanent Watergate Committee and a permanent Watergate prosecutor? First, however, let's define the phrases. They no longer mean the investigations of the breaking in at the Watergate complex on June 17, 1972. The terms "Watergate Committee" and "Watergate Prosecutor" now mean those investigating any and everything the President has done, members of the White House staff have done, the whole administration has done, and all the President's friends and associates have done. Well, why stop with President Nixon: Why not keep it going for all future Presidents? And, why not call them what they are — an anti-Administration Committee and an anti-Administration Prosecutor?

All presidential papers would be available to them, all notes relating to private conversations held with the President would immediately be Xeroxed and handed in to their staffs, and all of his personal friends would be prescribed by law to undergo intense questioning into their pasts, the results of that investigation released to the public.

Unfortunately, there are a few things wrong with the idea, and they must be taken into consideration before advancing the matter further.

First, most would agree that it would be unfair to future Presidents to subject them to the kind of treatment we have given President Nixon. President Nixon, of course is President Nixon, but why do it to someone else? We didn't care who befriended President Johnson or any other President.

Secondly, we have to face the fact that though our motivation would be high in making it apply equally, it would, in reality, only apply to Republican administrations. Past events should tell us that, and current events should confirm it. We all know the interest and concurrent investigations of the FBI, the IRS, the Senate and the House regarding Gerald Ford, the man who has been nominated to be a heartbeat away from the presidency. We also know, however, there doesn't seem to be *any* interest or investigation of the man who *is* one heartbeat away from the presidency. Of course not. Republicans never demand such things. The man next in line, after all is a Democrat named Carl Albert and he must be a fine man. We will just go on trust with him. No need for investigative reporters checking him out. No need for the FBI and IRS and the House and the Senate taking any interest there. No need for any of the television networks to do any documentary profiles on him. Let's stick only to Republicans. That's in the public interest.

Third, if we really stretched this thing to all Presidents, some of the public may start clamoring for investigations of senators and representatives, and how could they perform their duties while under continual investigation? Take, for example, Senator Weicker. What if we didn't take the horror he shows at misdeeds on face value alone, and started investigating his ethics and morality? It would crimp his style, spending too much time looking over his diaries and facing hostile questions, which none of us would like to see detour him from the fine job he is doing.

Fourth, as soon as that happened that public out there might want to know all there is to know about some of the television commentators who analyze the news. That would be terrible. Can you imagine Walter Cronkite on the stand being asked about what he did in Cocoa Beach in February of 1962? Can you imagine him looking through his logs, with innuendo and false stories leaking through the nation, and then seeing him on television that very night telling us the news? Being under investigation himself, he might lose all credibility. Then who could we believe? There might even be some demands for CBS to fire him. It is unbearable to think of kids outside CBS headquarters with signs saying, "Honk if you want him fired." It just wouldn't be fair.

One other thing. Let's assume we *could* just stop this thing at future Presidents and no one else would have to go through such a damaging procedure. We would probably end up with impeccable men as Presidents who have never done anything wrong, because they have never done anything at all.

The more I think of it, the worse the idea becomes. We better stop with President Nixon. At least he can take it. And it's educational. We have all read about lynchings and kangeroo courts, but so few of us have ever been witness to them. It's nice to see the good old days come back, especially when we know we can go back to modern times of equal justice after Jan. 20, 1977.

BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN
Deputy Special Assistant
To the President.