

OUR RESIDENCE HALL WAS INTERFERED WITH. MY ROOM WAS ENTERED AND SEARCHED. I AT LEAST WAS

under at least physical surveillance. A reporter was fired for not being "objective" when this

surveillance reported he had been drinking with me on his own time. Not in Hitler's Germany-in
footnote on 8 Memphis and under the eyes and nose of the federal court. *which knew of Carl
Sullivan on me*

I was Ray's investigator and served other functions in the volunteer, unpaid
defense which sought to force the working of the system of justice by granting Ray a
trial. He was never tried. As though to argue the doctrine of this book, in its efforts
to prevent the federal court from ordering a trial, it and most particularly W. Henry
Haile, State/Assistant Attorney General, pulled a series of Watergate dirty trick from
the time the case reached that office all the way to the Supreme Court. There was no lie
too base or outlandish, no place too sacred for its telling. The press repeated them without
question, the courts accepted them with placidity even when they were proven to be both
lies and deliberate - after they were clearly established as no better than manufactured
contrived falsities. Open and repeated contempt of court went entirely unpunished because
that contempt of court orders requiring the delivery of suppressed evidence to us was by
current or former public officials. All were friends of the judge, from his stratum of
Memphis and Tennessee society, all fellow lawyers.

So completely did the State press prostitute itself that Ms. Pat Welch, who had sat
through all the evidence and testimony, reported in a ^{long} Nashville-Tennessean roundup story
published ~~12/11/74~~ 11/10/74 that, when among the new testimony and the ^{public} first testimony of
by James Earl Ray were his unequivocal denial of being the murderer and his proffer of
proof that he was elsewhere when the crime was committed she wrote he testified to
nothing new. When Jim Cesar and I dredged the swamps of official secrecy and come up with
documentary proof that Ray's Constitutional rights had been violated beyond remedy ^{we were}
^{us} ^{we presented in court} portrayed as playing trick. The documents that officially ordered the interception of all ^{for}
Ray's ^{and} ^{his} ~~mail~~ communications, including with his lawyers; copies of this correspondence and
letters to a judge - even copies of his notes for his own defense stolen from his cell
while he slept by the guard supposed to keep him from being killed - all of which we
~~prosecutor's office~~ ^{all these unprecedented transgressions and many others} forced the ~~prosecution~~ to surrender were to her without meaning or legal significance.
And that the defense not the system of justice of those who conspired to defraud it, she
told her readers were "on trial." John Siegenthal, her publisher, had been a high U.S. Department
of Justice functionary and had written a book, ^{about political assassinations} ~~misnamed~~ ^{It said} The Search for Truth, saying justice
doesn't work except in the papers. So also did Pat Welch write. Nobody learned from The Watergate

From the fable of the Emperor's Clothes to the wisdom of Ecclesiastes, Through
the Lookingglass though the Bradens and those whose interests they serve want us to see,
it is all there and there is nothing new under the sun.

The same abdications and transgressions by the same people protected the same
way, the same institutions all failing.

The same lessons not learned.

Within the memory of those old enough to read this there is another on history's
endless precedents from which society's institutions did not learn when they then and
since ~~committed~~ committed and perpetuated the same failures.

When John Fitzgerald Kennedy was shot down in broad daylight on the ~~main~~
streets of a major American city and questions about his assassination could remain
unasked and unanswered, could it be expected that anyone would ever be safe, more
any political leader and ~~as~~ more than that, any one who, like JFK, had determined to
reorder national priorities around the needs of the people rather than of a policy of war?

Is there really any mature person with any knowledge at all who believes the
official account of that assassination? Does the major media really believe this
official account? Even the members of the Warren Commission didn't. And as reported
in the fourth of the Whitewash series, its most conservative member, the late Senator
Richard B. Russell, encouraged my quest for further proof that the ^Report he was deceived
into signing was not acceptable and did not tell the truth.

The newest disclosure of official corruption and deception of the courts and
of the intent of the Warren Commission not to investigate fully or report fully is
one of a series of interruptions of the researching and writing of this book. Another
not irrelevant because it typifies the same failures and dishonesties was my work in the
defense of James Earl Ray, who had been accused of assassinating Dr. Martin Luther King
and then had been intimidated into pleading guilty by his own lawyer, the country's
most famous criminal lawyer, Percy Foreman.

I had sued for ~~an~~ ^{the} improperly and illegally transcript of the Warren Commission's
executive session at which, among other "seamy" disclosures, there was that of the former

Where this transcript they had just studied proved the official intent was not to investi-
gate and to cover up and/^{when it}disproves the Commission's factual conclusions, that net com-
memorated the 11th anniversary of that assassination by rerunning the endorsement of
the official mythology it had aired the year before.

Footnote where ind on 9

The Washington Post published and syndicated an honest story. AP and UPI also had
honest stories in their major or "A" wires. The attention of individual papers ranged
up to the more than 40 column inches on the first page of the Sacramento Bee. (11/22/74)
But not a single book wholesaler in the entire country phoned or wrote to ask for a copy.
And all the indications are that the couple who had the book in stock had not put it out
in a single store.

chief spook of them all, Allen Dulles, that from him down all in CIA would commit perjury or keep secrets from anyone and so would the Director of the FBI and everyone under him. Jim Lesar and I took time from our work on the Ray case to bring this book out.

Now here it was in the era of The Watergate and there was this until-then "Top Secret" deliberation - an actual stenographic transcript of the members themselves - and there was no major-media interest. *from page 98*

I offered it exclusively to one TV network. It pondered for two months and declined.

94

① I wrote a letter and made three phone calls to a second network. All went unanswered.

When the book was out copies were left for the third net when Jim and I had to go to Memphis for the hearing. They never picked them up. So, we made the same arrangements all over again and the books were accepted. As I write this six weeks later there hasn't been even the formality of a rejection.

Yet in some ways that transcript is "scamier" and more subversive than any of the disclosures of Nixonian corruption. It is not the words of a sick man. It is not the conspiracies of the authoritarian-minded power-hungry. It is not a gathering of politicians seeking political advantage.

It is the deliberations of the most respected, the most eminent, that went to the integrity of society as nothing else could and about what is more subversive of any kind of representative system of government than any act can be, about a political assassination, which makes a nullity of elections and the entire system itself.

And here these eminences were, with so sacred an obligation, pondering in such secrecy they expected that not even their trusted staff would ever know their words, how they would get around their duties and obligations at the very outset - the month before they called their first witness. (Appropriately, that also in secrecy, as they heard all their witnesses.)

Experience had taught me that it would be as Ecclesiastes says, so for more than another month I was away and preoccupied with the Ray hearing so intensively it was not possible to read the papers. ^{major} The/conspiracy trial was then being held in Washington.

fnote on 10

also evaluating
This/was the conclusion of NBC's legal reporter, Carl Stern, in ~~reporting~~ the
after that of
testimony/~~of~~ the last witness, Kenneth Parkinson, on the network's evening news of
that day, 12/18/74.

Ordinarily a writer would be worried about not keeping up with developments in so complicated a case to which there was so much public attention and in which the major witnesses would be testifying in public, under oath, with penalties for false swearing. It gave me no trouble because it was as certain as anything under the sun that nothing new and of any major consequence would evolve at that trial.

It didn't, either.

My wife clipped The Washington Post for me for the months these interruptions required. Friends who read both the Post and The New York Times and the reports of both major wire services covered me with them.

It was, indeed, as Ecclesiastes says, nothing new under the sun.

Nor did it require great insight or exceptional wisdom to anticipate this. It is more than merely predictable because it is the repetition of long history. I was so certain of it that I planned no rewriting of what I had written and was confident that there would be no disclosures that would require it.

The fact is that save for these conclusions the earlier part of this book was in completed draft. That draft will require editing, as all do, more in this case because of all the many interruptions. But it will require no rewriting to include major new disclosures of the trial. This is written the day after the papers required to be filed in the Memphis court were mailed by Jim Lesar, the day before they must be in the hands of that court. The prosecution's case has been presented. There were a few details in Nixon's own words from previously-undisclosed tapes but they add drama, not new information. The Hunt memo is a other example. If one can hardly talk of lilies and gildings with such utterly wretched events as the subject, the essence of the figure applies.

Trial produced nothing new for the people to know. It provided no means for the purging and healing of the political system. It produced no encouragement for the depressed and disenchanting. It gave the young no basis for hope or faith in their society or its leaders.

So that this may be apparent now and in the future, there are no incorporations

other than of a few notes of any of the trial's developments. In it there is the proof of the point with which I began, based on experience as an investigative reporter, Senate investigator and intelligence analyst and especially on 11 long, hard years of investigating the investigation of the JFK assassination and other, similar political crimes: the system fails in time of crisis, as it always does.

The Establishment never learns how to serve its own, most basic selfish interests.

If it did, Nixon would never have gotten to be President nor would he have been able to appoint a Ford to succeed and protect him and his.

If it did, there would have been full exposure of all the Watergate crimes long before any book could be written.

The jails would be overflowing, the political blood-stream would be cleansed, the political body again healthy.

Instead incompetence and corruption are enshrined on the rot of all the earlier corruption by all the earlier incompetents so many of whom remain in the same high stations while the world rushes wildly to hell, destroying wealth and the value of money in the predictable economic disaster.

The new emperor wears the same clothes to the oohing and aahing of those who influence and ~~exercise~~ control what the people may know. As this is written he has just returned from a major ^{self-} promotion that could have served no other purpose and had he the capability of dealing with the crisis he had finally had to acknowledge/^{existed} was at best delayed in ~~that~~ dealing with it and in actuality was ~~never~~ pretending it didn't exist and if ignored long enough would finally go away. So he was off to Japan, where everyone knew his meeting with the prime minister was all that delayed the ousting of that prime minister and this made the trip impossible of purpose and meaning. He went to the military dictatorship of South Korea, a mendicant requiring no dignifying with the visit of an American President, it being enough that we subsidized and kept that repression in power. And the touted meeting with the leaders of the USSR, which was no more than a sanctification of what underlings had already agreed upon and in any event

It was not an agreement to reduce the ruinously oppressive cost of increased militari-
zation or to decrease nuclear rocketry or stockpiles. Both countries/^{already} possessed the capability
of ending all life many ^{times} ~~times~~ over. They agreed to increasing this excess. With all the
~~unmet~~ ^{unmet} and unmeetable needs of the peoples of both countries! This extravagance, this
indulgence of the military, military-producing industry and the political paranoids of
both countries was in fact ~~that~~ ^{the} guarantee that in both countries urgent needs would not
and could not be met.

12A
Was exactly the opposite of what it was supposed to have been and meant.

Through the Looking Glass and Orwell again. Limiting military power and extravagance in actuality was an agreed increase in nuclear capability when each side was so overpowered it could destroy the world many times over in a matter of minutes. War is peace. Demilitarization is further militarization.

And the peoples of both nations bleed and need while the leaders, incapable of solving the world's problems, publicize themselves in the hope of helping preserve themselves in power thereby.

Crises spawned new crises, all coexisting and producing still more crises but nothing else changed.

This is the history of The Watergate and the ~~lost~~ heritage it gives us, as it is the heritage of earlier crises unmet, like that of the JFK assassination.

Babies need pick up a hot iron only once to learn but grown men running a world play with hot irons and the innocent alone are burned.

Anyone following the secret developments of ~~them~~ of the non-investigation of the JFK assassination that was (Through the Looking Glass and Orwell still again!) called its investigation knew that its course was being controlled by careful leaks and that the press was being subverted by these leaks, distributed with generosity and care. This, in fact, is also how the late sainted J. Edgar Hoover dominated before it had a chance to dare be free what the Warren Commission could dare do. This, too, is in their secret executive sessions. They knew.

Anyone following The Watergate developments with care and understanding had to know that the leaks in it had the same purpose, to defend those ~~markings~~ seeking the defense and direct and control what would and would not be done.

And anyone with my experiences, generally and in The Watergate, knew as certainly as though he were looking backward what would be.

This is written two and a half years after the story broke.

In all this time there has been no authentic investigative reporting by the major media.

Honor itself as it will, does and did, the press did not really investigate The Watergate and within my personal experience the entire major media refused to.

The Congress shone on the tube but did little else. Nothing compared with what it could and should have done, only the least it dared. It began too late with too little and in the end did little more and that also too late to prevent the waste of the land and what may be a decent society even more, the destruction of popular faith in government or society and the destruction of any reason to impose faith in either. The destruction of the economy and the competitive uses adversary and competitive systems and countries would make of it were certainly predictable to the informed leaders of the nation but all cowed in fear. There was this fiction that the people could not take the strain of full exposure combined with the reality that even a mortally-wounded president retains enormous power. Nixon and those around him who wielded his great power had records of a willingness to use and misuse it when their needs were less desperate. That in desperation they would use it could not reasonably be questioned.

What is in some ways sicker than a sick President is that no matter how sick or dishonest or evil there are so many who will and in this case to the bitterest of ends did support him and what he did, not matter what he did or its consequences. This ranges from the Rabbi Korffs who sought to equate a single ^{flawed} man with the institution and in a nationwide campaign sought to excuse all his wrong as necessary to the preservation of the institution. This is like refusing to excise a cancer because it is part of the body. And in political life there would those who simply refused to see or believe, who pretended not to understand and to see no real evil no matter what was proven as Nixonian evil - authentic hurt to the nation and all its institutions. To them it was enough that they shared views they believed to be his. They perceived a need to defend him to defend their views and thus themselves.

These are some of the automatic self-destructs built into the machine that runs the lives of us all. They are guaranteed to fail in time of real crisis.

With Nixon, with The Watergate, they all did.

They failed in raising so nugatory a man to the pinnacle of power then remaining
mute and impotent while he, conceiving no ^{constructive} use of that vast authority, ^{assailed}
the basic struct^{ure}/or both government and society. The foundations were seriously undermined
before his own crimes, corruption and always-false account forced him out in a shabby series
of deals that preserved all his the extremely valuable perquisites of honorable service
for him and simultaneously immunizing him for all crimes committed as well as those both
unexposed and unknown.

While all ~~the~~ systems malfunctioned he was busily engaged in ^orworking the country
into his own paranoid authoritarian image and digging the foundations of authoritarianism
yet to come, the only answer those unfit ~~xxxx~~ to lead have for problems they do not begin
to understand and then cannot begin^g to address, leave alone solve.

It is not enough to say that in the end he was forced out. He did it to himself.
It was not done by the so-called protections of free society. It took two years for the
political cowards of the cumbersome machinery to set it into slow motion, more before he
saw and seized the alternatives that these same cowards were too cowardly to ~~frustrate~~
frustrate and instead also seized upon to hide them from their own terror of doing their
sword duty. It is not enough to say that individuals were brave and persevered to do well.
^{They}
~~This~~ were the minority whose good intent was as puissant as the body vapors of a colicky
infant broken into the howl of the ~~mixing~~ swirling political tornado. The havoc wreaked
by those more than two years of storm may never be repaired. Patches are not yet
visible and patchers not at hand.

It is not enough to say that the exposures of The West Washington Post were a great public service, ~~which do not constitute a great public service~~ without doubt or that they were in the best tradition of American journalism, which/they were.

Nor is it nearly enough to say what is also true, that in their better moments on the tube the Senate Watergate Committee and the House Judiciary Committee had individual members who did their jobs remarkably well. Nor does it in any way satisfy that there

~~was~~ were indictments and convictions, that some crimes were, if only slightly, punished.

What is much more important is that these fine services to society were much less than each institutions owed and each could have rendered.

Yet it is also essential to understand that at the outset, because of the authoritarianism of the modern presidency and because of the established willingness of a Nixon to abuse his power, it did require a stout heart to stand against him. a real dedication to oppose and expose him. To the Post's credit and to that of a small fraction in the Congress, they had this courage. If they did less than what the nation required, they also did much more than others, who had the same responsibilities and less courage.

What remains not understood is that so much is still unexposed and that when the organs of society started to function they all, deliberately, functioned less well than they could and should have. In the end, little more was known than appeared in the papers. There is the appearance but not the reality that the Congressional committees carried this significantly further. Actually, with the press, they saw to it that other and needed exposures were not made. We have seen this with the Post as an example.

The leaks were of piecemeal, uncoordinated information. As each person and institution, like the FBI and CIA and Department of Justice in particular, felt the need to leak what served its interest or directed attention away from him or it and toward another, reporters were leaked to. As a result the institutional failures remain neither exposed nor understood and in time of another crisis they can again fail and again expect to get away with it.

The theoretical system of checks and balances is not real in time of crisis.

The failure of the FBI is set forth in considerable if less than full detail in the Senate Judiciary Committee's published hearings on the confirmation of L. Patrick Gray. The press was present but it neither told the entire story nor attempted to put it together nor took the time when the hearings were published to do what the Congress also never did, go over them, make sense out of them and make use of that sense. The hasty examination of those hearings makes clear that the FBI was controlled from the moment of the arrests and was never really able to do its job. And time after time after time Gray confessed that certain investigations were not made and the reason is they were ordered not to be made and the reasons for that is they were outside the charges being investigated. The simple mechanism was to limit the FBI to an investigation of the interception of communications. Thus time after time when asked of that small part of the entire Hunt operation for Nixon Gray said it was not investigated because it did not involve interception of communications.

This led to the prosecutors. Their excuse for overly-limiting their charges is that once they had convictions they would immunize those convicted and with this pressure extort more information from them. With real investigation the information would have been developed promptly and there was no need for this long delay while the country was rushed toward disaster. But even without investigation, these defenses, made by the local prosecutors in public statements and by their boss, Petersen, in public and before the Watergate committee (H), are fraudulent.

In the original form of this book, "Watergate: Fascism's Floodgate", there are almost book-length chapters on each of these aspects that are more than mere institutional failures. They are individual failures and individual corruptions as individuals sought self-benefit. The cases are that documentable from what is publicly available.

Nobody ever tried to take the defense of the prosecutors apart. They claim to have wanted to be able to really lean on those arrested, for all the world as though they were all who should have been, and by leaning get cooperation.

With the most superficial analysis this falls apart. It never was true and it was obviously from the very beginning untrue.

If this rather than protecting Nixon and self-advancement and protection were true, then the indictments would not have been delayed until so close to the election there could be no trial until after the election and Nixon would not have been re-elected. This were true there would have been immediate indictments and immediate trials. And if this were true, then the prosecutors would have used what has become the traditional prosecutorial device of overloading the accused with all the charges possible, which is what happens with the poor, the minorities, the politically-unpopular. Overloaded with so many charges to defend against, the accused and their lawyers go for deals.

Why then were Hunt's Bay of Pigs gang not then or even later charged with those other bag jobs easily charged against them? Examination of Hunt's expense accounts, which gave his ~~xxxx~~ travels and the dates and clearly coordinated with a whole series of crimes were enough for indictment. The Ellsberg job would have been pinpointed immediately by the simplest of police work, coordinating his and their and Lidd's travels with these known crimes. That of the Chilean break-ins and that of the NAACP Educational and Legal Defense Funds are also apparent. Charges could have been filed immediately against these same defendants in New York and Los Angeles as a minimum, from what is and was known. They were not and this rebuts the phoney official defense against prosecutorial participation in the covering up or the obstructing of justice of what it really means, protecting Nixon.

The same is true in the Washington jurisdiction. Charges could have been made immediately and there could have been close to immediate trial on what was never charged, violation of the communications law in using licensed equipment improperly, in using in these crimes those expensive transceivers licensed to the Republican National Committee only and for limited, convention use only. When it is recalled that these were licensed to and through McCord and that he is the one who first broke ranks the potential is also apparent.

One could go on and on like this. The defense of the system of justice, particularly of the prosecutors, is fraudulent.

They failed. They failed deliberately. In fact, Nixon appointed Silbert Acting United States Attorney and then sent his name to the Senate for confirmation. It was not acted on and it was clear that the Senate did not look with favor on either his Watergate record or his nomination. Nonetheless, Ford re-submitted his nomination. And the truth is that Silbert kept Nixon as President and made Ford President by simply not doing what he could and should have done.

It is the same with the CIA. It was not about to tell all because in the most simplistic of explanations it had violated the law with wrongful help to Hunt and others for the White House for illicit as well as domestic purposes, all proscribed by law. In a less simple formulation, full investigation and full exposure would have exposed a whole range of at best dubious CIA activities, some of which we have seen, and at the least, the operations of its "old boy" network in the initial stages of Watergate investigations.

Like those with more involvement, like Bennett and his company, also CIA, and those in and working for the White House and Nixon, all had selfish but limited purpose to be served by leaking. So, each leaked only what it served personal interests to leak. While the results were startling and authentic sensations, they were not correlated. The result was a series of piecemeal disclosures each of which was immediately disputed by the Nixonians and none of which were put together to have meaning discernable. The press did not interrelate individual stories as it could and should have. It was content to take each sensation as it came and simultaneously and traditionally protected its sources. Had it not the sources would have dried up.

And, of course, really been exposed promptly.

So, as it came out, The Watergate story remained fragmented. It was never worked into a coherent whole. The average person could not do this for himself and here there was an additional failing, no book publisher ever had it done by those many investigative reporters who were capable of it.

The people were shocked and horrified. They waited for more sensation. As it poured out the result was more confusion because the sensations were not interrelated. This worked to Nixon's benefit because it made delays possible and because there was and because when there was it was no focus to the exposures, not enough to overcome the Nixon lies when he had no choice but to lie.

The people merely reeled, unbalanced by the revelations, further confused by the minority that were unwilling to face reality or feared what it would do to them and hotly disputed the obvious meanings of all the disclosures.

After Nixon was able to frustrate the earlier Congressional efforts, after the stench could no longer be borne and the Congress appointed its Watergate committee, the Watergate committee did not conduct its public investigation as a real investigation to develop all the facts possible. Rather in what was despite its failures an authentic public service it organized its hearings to organize the fact. But it limited itself almost entirely to what was publicly known. It serves the function of writer rather than investigator. It took what had already been exposed in the leaks and made a fairly coherent story of it and put that on nationwide TV.

However, rather than putting new information out for the people on TV the committee in fact watered down what had already been leaked. One of the better examples of this is the subject of another book-length chapter of the earlier book. Nixon had a real plan for a police state, popularly called the Huston plan after the young former national YAF leader who sponsored and coordinated it for Nixon. There had been massive leaks of extensive documentation to both The New York Times and The Washington Post. These seem to trace to John Dean because they are among the papers he took from the White House and delivered to the Watergate committee. However, in publishing these papers (H), pretending there was a "national defense" issue, the committee suppressed from the documents it published in its hearings some of the more subversive and authoritarian details of this plan already published in the papers and reported coast-to-coast!

In fact, this committee did most of its work in secret and more than half its two dozen volumes are of documents few have seen and understood. Not unexpectedly this serves to hide the corruption of the wealthier and more influential individuals

and corporations who, at the same time, were also protected by the prosecutors and courts by being allowed to pay insignificant fines and not going to jail.

Where the committee did not work in secret it failed to do what it could have. Conspicuous examples of this are making it possible for Colson to avoid public testimony at all and for Hunt to get away with the most minor testimony that added just about nothing to what was already public. It suppressed in its files what it learned from the "oversight" committee about other illegal acts and about those of the CIA, not questioning the CIA leadership past or current about it.

It in fact got away with never putting even Bennett on the stand for public testimony. The press, already amply indebted to Bennett and through him to the CIA, was silent in its contentment.

Then came the time of the House Judiciary Committee, divided in party and belief and unwieldy in size. Getting 39 members to agree to anything is difficult. What this committee's majority was able to make public - and to their credit some Republicans joined the Democratic majority - added exciting and sensational detail. It produced some of Nixon's actual words instead of his edited versions of them in his transcripts. And as individual members argued their beliefs on TV each put another part of the story together and increased ^{public} comprehension. But it, too, failed to make significant addition to known fact and crime.

Here again I can cite from personal experience. One of the more aggressive members, one of those who was among the first to demand impeachment, responded to my offer of the new information in this book and the new and correlated information for which there is no space, ~~in this~~ with what amounts to a polite refusal. He ~~in~~ instead "commended" me for my "diligence in this matter." ^{his} ~~his~~ one entire aspect of the covering up remains and perhaps will remain unexposed.

Another phoned me, having learned of my work from one he called "a mutual friend." He arranged to come up and go over my files and take what he wanted. But he never found it possible. ^{he}, of course, was inordinately busy. So, however, was I and I could not transport these large files. However, when I wrote and offered to ~~reproduce~~

go see him, any hour of the day or night, and learn what interested him and then take it to him, he never responded.

And these were two to whom the contry is indebted for the fine work they did do.

But there was just so much that any political figure dared do. Political retaliation is the politician's Hamoclean sword.

The House hearings were an update on those of the Senate. They added detail. By then public and power interests had grown. By then the Establishment had decided that Nixon had to go. But as minimum danger to others not already embroiled. Like the corporate fatcats who financed his crime and escaped retribution, living to contribute to future political campaigns, if thereafter within the flexible laws.

There was the Pffice of the Special Watergate Prosecutor. It, too, sat onxx the volcano. it even suppressed public information. I was not able to get copies of two exhibits entered into court evidence and widely published, in part in facsimile, without going to court, which I was reluctant to do. It did not want more disclosed than it chose to disclose. For the first 39 pages of Hunt's grand jury testimony that were made public in the Ellsberg trial an experienced analyst with detailed informatoon and files might have seen what had not come out. And from the address books of the Cubans, entered into evidence in the first trial, it would have been apparent by merely asking those in it that the FBI had avoided any real investigation. So, the prosecutor was wfs supposed to be the exposed became the supressar, law or no law. Under the law (5 U.S.C.552) he had the obligation of making this public evidence available to any and all citizens.

When the first special,prosecuor, stuffed shirt former bureaucrat Archibald Cox, a Harvard Establishmentarian type of the right "democratic center, had no choice but to subpoena Nixon's tapes, Nixon fired him. This "saturday Night Massacre" kicked back harder than anything to that point had. Nixon had no choice because if he had not delayed delivering the tapeshe would not have delayed further exposure and ultimate ouster. Cox's successor, another Establishmentarian leader, Leon Jaworski, had an existing record of whitewashing as ~~XXXXXX~~ counsel to the Texas Court of Inquiry in its non-investigation of the JFK assassination. That was a crime under Texas law only.

When Jaworski was in actual charge of that non-investigation, he saw to it that those in Washington who wanted to control what did and did not become known never had any danger from Texas exposure. Particularly was this true of the report that the only accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, had been a federal informant, for either the CIR or the FBI, the subject of the TOP SECRET transcript I published in Whitewash IV. It also includes an offer by Jaworski to Washington to help suppress. (p. 153) He even offered to have a retraction printed in the ~~first~~ Texas paper ~~publishing~~ that published the report. Not surprisingly, that ~~2~~ paper had a foundation that served as a CIA front, ~~and~~ the Hobby foundation, and Jaworski was on the board and made large personal contributions through another, the M.W. Anderson Fund, to those illicit and improper CIA activities over which Tom Braden presided. Aside from the newspaper stories of the time of those 1967 scandals, clippings on file in the morgue or every major newspaper, there were books, like The Espionage Establishment, available for 95¢ and in most libraries, that include details.

Naturally enough, under Jaworski there were no CIA indictments, no CIA investigations even. It was predictable that he would do what he regarded as serving The Establishment's needs and no more. Once Nixon quit, Jaworski also quit immediately, his hobs done. These were first to get Nixon out and next to sit on all that could be sat upon.

It was also predictable that the prosecutions would be narrow and restricted, no more than was required to obtain convictions of the few indicted on too few charges. This is what happened, with trial producing no new significant disclosures. More details, but not essential ones. None adding to either public knowledge or public exposure. None bringing to light and punishing new crimes against all of society, which is what The Watergate really was.

So "incurious" was the office of the special prosecutor that Hunt easily retained secrets and he was not dragged before the grand jury still again when his memo to Bittman finally, no thanks to any prosecutor, came to light when it served Hogan & Hartson

22.
narrow self-interest to end suppressions. It had a copy all along & had kept it

secret. This firm, which had also done CIA work, as many law firms have, was not charged with obstructing justice for keeping this crucial evidence secret for ~~two~~ more than two years. The charge could have been made. It simply wasn't. And if none of its prestigious members, more than 50, or its competent staff read the ~~ms~~ papers, they were lawyers and they did know the proof of blackmail and other crimes in this single document it had. And to the knowledge of partners had.

This brief encapsulation, which does introduce ~~new~~ new evidence it was not possible to address in a single book, has a limited purpose: to illustrate with specific example the general truth that in this time of the greatest crisis all society's supposed protections failed and that in no case was the failure accidental.

Insultion?

One of the committee's more noteworthy services was compiling and printing in facsimile more than 30 volumes of evidence centered around Nixon and charges that could lead to impeachment. When it was on TV and in reporting much of this reached the people, but again only as it happened. The House would not vote a supply of these important volumes. The committee printed only enough for itself and the major media. Senators could not get copies. Nixon had enough influence and power remaining even when his impeachment was under consideration and the vote to impeach appeared certain to prevent more widespread use of this evidence, so much from his own files.