

note at Stans NY acquittal

After prolonged plea-bargaining, on 3/12/75 Stans entered
pleas of guilty to five counts of illegal activities. He could
have been sentenced to a total of 5 years in jail and \$5,000 in
fines for these offenses admitted, ^{They are} ~~and certainly~~ less than what he
could have been charged with. On leaving the courthouse he was as
pious ~~and~~ Elmer Gantry in proclaiming his admission of guilt was
proof of his innocence. ("...no guilty involvement...")

The man who funded The Watergate, the third of Nixon's criminal
cabinet officers to admit guilt or be convinced, described his crimes
as "not willful" and "not believed to be" criminal when he committed
them. (WxPost 3/13/73)

Can one imagine what a judge would do to a black or a Chicano
~~who~~ or a member of an/unpopular political minority who sought to
defend himself in this manner?

Stans, too, resorted to semantics and special emphasis in how
to said what he said. He did not dare claim he was not involved in
The Watergate. He ~~funded~~ funded it. Thus he said "I had no guilty
involvement" in the break-in and other illegal acts. And the
"charges" against him? Once he admitted criminal acts these charges
became "baseless."

And what was the fate of the moneybags of The Watergate, the
man who blackjacked that tremendous Nixon boodlebag from corporations
and their executives? On _____ he was
sentenced to _____