

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the coming years preachers and teachers will be spouting off about the lessons of Watergate. So will politicians. The press will pontificate about how it save the land, with an occasional pretense at self-analysis and a tapping on the chest it will tout as breast-beating. Books carefully calculated to commercial ^{ize} some aspect will glut the market, the great the glut the slight the minuscule prospects of books that could tell the true story and the fullest possible.

Clearly from the moment of the accidental arrests of the "assholes" inside the Watergate there were all the signs of a great crisis, one of history's ~~xxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ political floods. All the signs of disaster were visible. But in all the land there were none who would see.

From that first report it is certain that the antennae in all foreign intelligence services started vibrating in reaction to the ~~xxxxxx~~ signals ignored within the United States. Ignored, that is, so far as the people are concerned, for they were not told then or since what it meant. In their great good sense, in their guts, most people had understanding. But the people were without power, even influence.

The CIA's antennae picked up the same signals. So did those of the FBI. Each vibrated its own way, pipers dancing to their own tunes.

Each had its own purposes to serve. Each in its own way did. Neither was motivated by or gave serious consideration to the national need. Each, of course, had national obligations, but to any bureaucracy the first and only fully honored responsibility is to the bureaucracy itself. Bureaucracies come to equate self-protection with service to the nation. Unless the two are mixed self-service, self-protection is ^{the essential} intolerable to the bureaucrat and to the bureaucracy itself.

The theory is that governments exist to protect and serve the people. The practise is that governments exist to perpetuate themselves. Whatever is required for perpetuation of any administration or any system that administration or system does as best it can perceive the need and then meet it.

LA
ends on 2 at end of graf, as insert

For all the worlds as though it had not just happened, all over again, and criticism buried in the "Style" section as a review, the Post itself printed this of ~~the Nixon affair~~ ^{criticism} ~~the press of the Post~~. And about Nixon. Richard J. Walton ^{note} (Author of Cold War and Counterrevolution: The Foreign Policy of John F. Kennedy) and other serious works of foreign policy. He reviewed ^{Herblock Special Report} a collection of cartoons on Richard Nixon covering his entire political career by the ^{Post's} brilliant satirist ~~Herblock~~ ^{Herbert Block} ~~noted~~ ^{noted} Cartoonist Herbert Block's "unique perception of Richard Mr. Nixon" going back to the beginning of Nixon's career. Then,

"Good reporters also recognized that Nixon was a disreputable man who would do ^{able, even} disreputable ~~even~~ reprehensible things as long as he consider it necessary to his career. But they were not able to say so in the mainstream newspapers and magazines and on the networks. For the press, most of it, had a passion for respectability and a horror of being thought shrill or strident or extreme.... Indeed, if the press had not been so handicapped by its own gentility, if it had not been in such awe of men in high places, Nixon would probably never have been elected President."

This tells it as it has been and is about the press,

note 1 On 12/18/74

The courts?

It is ^{because} the bureaucracies of the intelligence services saw their survival needs and as individuals among the guilty sought to serve their own that what did come out about The Watergate oozed up out of the muck of political corruption.

Who other than some spook could have been the origin of the accurate report to Tad Szulc that Hunt was the honcho, the report about which Szulc promptly lied and sent the hounds ~~sniffing~~ sniffing the false spoor? And why should he have lied - why did he?

Who besides one of these with his own interest to serve could have fed The Washington Post against which Nixon and his wretched stooge Agnew had inveighed, the Post whose extensive and valuable properties were under Nixonian threat?

The Post that paid off with protection, whose honored reporters, as we have seen, refused important stories, refused to follow established leads that were certain to yield important stories that to this writing remain untold. Had the Post told the story of Hunt's ambition to assassinate the head of another state, had it told the story of subversive domestic intelligence, it would have lost its sources that it prized above all else.

If under threat the Post, too, had survival needs and if in its excellent reporting it told itself it was performing an important national service - as it did - it was also corrupted. It was, in effect, bribed.

In one form or another one kind of corruption or another permeated all of society and its institutions and all the protective mechanisms failed.

There is no single institution that performed as it is supposed to in protecting either society or the system of society. Not one did its job well. Not one met the most elemental standard of serving self-interest. Not the press, not the Congress, not the courts or the system of justice.

Imagine a federal judge praising the felonious Attorney General who admitted his crime - the same Attorney General who had the duty of cleaning the whole thing up but who was part of it - for been too loyal! Would he have praised the father who stole

"Sentenced"
Kleindienst

Kleindienst footnote on p _____

By Chief federal district court judge George Hart, who succeeded Sirica when Sirica reach mandatory retirement age as chief judge. As Harvey Katz, writing in The Washingtonian magazine (10/71) put it, Hart, while praising Kleindienst, from whom he accepted a misdemeanor plea instead of the possible repetitious felony charges, "has not hesitated to throw people in jail for committing misdemeanors like blocking a sidewalk or parading without a permit."

In plain English, the judge who praise Kleindienst, the felon/Attorney General and turned him loose with this blessing after Kleindienst had betrayed trust and the system, is the same judge who threw in jail those who protested in order to make this same system work.

food for his hungry children for his "loyalty?"

I can remember the Great Depression well. Men were shot and killed stealing a loaf of bread and cases where for the theft of what was then valued at less than a quarter they received long jail sentences, with no concern for the unfed children. In those same days bank officials cleaned out the vaults and received minor punishment. I can recall a case in London, Kentucky, where the town was virtually bankrupted by the embezzler who cleaned out the bank, refused to say where he hid the money, and after two years in jail became the town's richest and most unrespected citizen.

That is the kind of justice represented by praising the crooked Attorney General who did worse than fail - who was himself a felon, whose abdication of his responsibilities made the continuing secrecy about the unexposed crimes possible.

Today some of these crimes remain unexposed. Who knows how many criminals also remain unexposed and unpunished?

Common people spend their lives in jail for relatively slight offenses, but offenses against property. For these most serious and most subversive crimes there was no single stiff sentence. The crooked corporate executives paid what for them and their corporations insignificant fines and were free and respected. Kleindienst not only was praised, ^(Post 6/3/74) he didn't even lose his license to practise law. ^(Post 8/3/74) And soon the papers were reporting his successful beginning of a profitable ^{new} career, one client paying him \$120,000 a year. (Post 11/11/74)

3A The more repentant the Watergate offenders, the longer his sentence. This is the way "justice" worked. Kleindienst and others were free. The rich and the influential did not spend a day in jail. John Dean, whose marathon confessions helped expose what was exposed, was sent to one to four years in jail after confession and after considerable help in all the prosecutions in which he was used as a witness. (Post 8/3/74). He was also disbarred. (post 2/7/74) Dean's sentencing and Kleindienst's not being disbarred were the same day.

And Nixon? He and his wife will receive all the rewards of honored service, fat pension, office and other help, even protection. Ford tried to subsidize him with about another million dollars but the reaction was so violent it was cut heavily. But sub-

sidized and rewarded Nixon was.

The greater the offense against society the less the punishment.

As it was in the Great Depression, so it was with The Watergate.

The pediment of the Department of Justice ^{main} building is engraved, "The Place of Justice Is a Hallowed Place." That of the Supreme Court reads "Equal Justice Under Law."

That "hallowed" place is the same one that made the covering-up possible and joined in it. Justice is equal when the Nixons and Klenidiensts do not go to jail and are rewarded financially?

This is the lesson for our youth? This gives them the lessons they are to learn?

All society's protections, having failed, those responsible perpetuated ^{their} failures and perpetuated self-protections and the hunting of goats.

An incongruous example crosses all the lines, of lawyers, judges, prosecutors, the press and even the spooks.

In the course of his successful blackmailing Hunt wrote a threatening memo to be passed to the White House through Bittman. Bittman had sworn he did not have it. But his former partners and former law firm had their own needs and reputations and futures to protect, so the memo surfaced. (NYTimes 11/5/74; Post 11/19,20/74)

~~Hunt's threats~~ One of Hunt's threats is, "The Watergate bugging is only one of a number of highly illegal conspiracies engaged in by one or more of the defendants at the behest of senior White House officials. These as yet undisclosed crimes can be proved." (NYTimes 11/4/74)

Nixon was apprized and did agree, as one of the tapes used in the major conspiracy trial established. (Post 11/19/74) On January 8 Nixon told Colson, "Hunt's is a simple case." It would be handled by building public sympathy for him: "We'll build that son of a bitch up like nobody's business." "We'll get" Buckley to lead the campaign, Nixon added.

Bittman, when called to testify to the mysterious disappearance of this incriminating memo he had had and his firm had microfilmed, explained his having done nothing by saying that he had "rejectex" the contents. ^{Prt-11/20/74} He could defend his client without knowing what these other "undisclosed crimes" that are "a number of highly illegal conspiracies"

5A

Braden's patriot's blood boiled over Historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s letter published in The Washington Post November 25, the day the conspiracy-trial began. Quoting the exact words by Hunt that Braden would quote, Schlesinger said, "this extraordinary statement has met with nearly total incuriosity." To this Schlesinger added, "Yet I am aware of no presidential, judicial or even editorial demands that this startling assertion be followed up. Does no one care...?"

5B inside parens Jaworski, remember, was a leader of one of these same Braden funds, the Anderson fund.)

EA 5C

already had

In fact, the conspiracy-case prosecutors announced that they had no intention of using the trial to develop all the facts, all the crimes or all the conspiracies and the participants in them. As the man in charge - who just happened to be another of those on the earlier Justice Department's get-Hoffa squad with Bittman - James Neal, said in open court, he ~~didn't~~ and the rest of the prosecution were not going to "run down every rabbit track we come across in the snow." (Wall Street Journal 11/25/74)

5
are? Hunt's knowledge of them was in itself criminal, not less than misprison of a felony. But this is the testimony for which Judge Sirica sat still, the testimony that was not followed by blasts of editorial outrage.

What did follow it is the outrage of the former spook Tom Braden who in his writing and his public appearances remains the staunchest defender of the CIA what it does or is exposed as having done. It is he who corrupted students and engaged in all that nasty, illegal and subversive domestic operation exposed in 1967 as it centered around the National Students' Association but actually was broader and deeper, involving a large number of prestigious and wealthy foundations and funds. He responded to these exposures ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ by thanking God that the CIA did violate the law and the Constitution. (SatchyPost _____) His sincerity ought not be doubted. While the spookery is not a monolith, Braden representing what is called "liberal" in its factions and Hunt the "conservative," all factions are true believers and their beliefs are predicated upon the assumption that the end justifies the means. They alone know what is right and good for the country and the hell with the law and the Constitution when this perceived good is to be done.

outrage

5A So Braden addressed himself in ~~xxxxxxxx~~ to Hunt's testimony. Incongruously, too.

He called this paragraph of Hunt's successful blackmail threat "The last big mystery" of The Watergate in his syndicated column. (Post 11/30/74) And Special Prosecutor Henry Ruth was going to solve it. (Ruth succeeded Jaworski, who resigned, regarding his task as completed, as soon as the Ford-Nixon pardon deal was set and pulled off. 5B

How was Ruth going to "solve" this "last big" Watergate "mystery?"

By calling Nixon as a witness, to testify against himself. When Braden wrote this column Nixon was recovering from surgery to correct a phlebitis condition. There was then no doubt that for medical reasons alone Nixon would not be able to travel and taken the witness stand for months, as a panel of doctors Sirica had dispatched told him before Braden's column appeared. (Post 11/30/74) and as Nixon's own doctors had said long and loudly enough.

~~But "If Nixon's~~

6A
Nixon had assured the world, "I am not a crook."

But he had never said, "I am not a liar."

And what was he in claiming, "I am not a crook" if not a liar?

Why presume then, with all he had to hide, that if he testified he would testify any more truthfully than in all his many statements none of which was ever other than false?

Could anyone reasonably believe that suddenly Nixon would stop lying, tell the truth and the whole truth and further incriminate himself?

6B Hunt, then living it up with the added several hundred thousand from his autobiography, Under Cover, was barnstorming promoting it. He was all over coast-to-coast TV and radio and in the papers. Could no interview ^{or} in the media bludgeon or entice Schlessinger's or explanations from him? Not even after Schlessinger's reminder of Braden's ~~glibness~~ covering up?

is asking for, there will be nothing to stop him from pursuing the Hunt memorandum."

This is what encouragement Braden extended to the aching nation. All "if" and no sense.

6A -

Suppose Nixon's health did not improve? Suppose he died? Suppose Sirica refused to ~~grant~~ "grant" what Braden calls "latitude?" Suppose the rights of defendants are jeopardized? Or suppose Nixon merely stands on his Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination?

Then, of course, former executive spook Braden has exculpated all of those who failed as well as all those who ~~were~~ engaged in these unexposed conspiracies.

Beginning with his old CIA cronies and 2 fellow travellers.

True enough, Hunt reports serious and unexposed crime. And true enough it has to be exposed. But what is wrong with society's regular machinery for that? Why wasn't this same Henry Ruth doing what he was charged with doing about it, as his predecessors Jaworski and Cox had not? Indeed, why had Bittman not been indicated rather than along with Nixon being designated no more than an "undicted co-conspirator?" Why did Ruth not rush to the grand jury with this memo that could have been had at any time if anybody had really wanted it, Hunt having signalled its existence, and charge Bittman, if only with obstructing justice and misprison of a felony for withholding the memo?

Hunt was one of legal history's most frequent witnesses. He appeared before grand juries countless times, before a number of committees of the Congress, and as a witness in trials. Indeed, Ruth had had him testify in that very trial just a few days earlier, the trial of these "senior White House officials."

Why had Hunt not been questioned about these serious, undisclosed crimes? By Ruth? If not earlier then the moment Hogan & Hartson's needs required the disgorging of a copy of this memory-holed memo? Could Braden not think of this?

6B

had no
Hunt ~~was~~ Constitutional protection, having been immunized. If he had or pretended one, the problem was easily solved and Ruth had the power: immunize him all over again. If Hunt refused to testify to what he claimed to know and said "can be

