

JDW- Non-progress reports and note to self for future on The Unimpeachment: 3/6/75

One of the most depressing stacks on my desk has been the conclusions of this book. The 20+ pages plus footnotes and material for footnotes has been there, with the materials accumulating, since the period immediately prior to the Ray evidentiary hearing, as I recall, about last September! In all the time since I have been too busy on too many other things that had to be done to do any real work on the draft.

Now there appear to be so many other imminent needs that while I've cleaned much up it appears also to be unlikely that working on the conclusions any further ~~is a possibility~~ is the first need when I can return to this book.

Despite all that has come out, most of the contents are not known, if most also come from cited public sources.

So, I've decided that the first thing to do when I can pick this up again is to cut the hell out of the opening. That was written when many explanations were required. They no longer are.

Fortunately, I ~~now~~ have a separate place for this book, separate files for its backing, and have each chapter in a separate folder, with a dupe out of my possession, begun with the reported ripoff.

And by the time I have read, cut and edited the draft I'll probably have a better grasp than memory can give of what really should be in the conclusions. Its doctrine is that in time of crisis the protective institutions always fail society and in this case did.

The way my non-publishing history has gone, by the time I can return to that point an ~~ending~~ epilogue will seem appropriate!

(A fairly large percentage of my readers understand the situation and approve this. Yesterday's mail was limited to institutional orders and two delayed ones from Canada. But the day before's, all non-<sup>ins</sup>stitutional orders included raves about the past work and thanks for its continuation in all but one. By institutional I mean libraries, colleges and several law schools. The accompanying slips reveal the most indirect sources of knowledge of the existence of WWIV. In filling the order for the Univ of Va. law school library I had to correct even the title of the dupe of their catalogue clip enclosed. All the rest except my name and address was completely inaccurate!)

Meanwhile, aside from his desire to get Post Mortem printed, Lesar is pushing me to return to Agent Oswald, the last writing on which was probably about four years ago, if not more. I've loaned him a carbon of what I'd written.

How I can expect to get any writing done....

To clean the stack of draft I had to start at 4 a.m.!!! HW



2A

For all the world~~s~~ as though it had~~n~~ not just happened~~/~~ all over again, and buried in the "Style" section as a rview, the Post itself printed this <sup>criticism</sup> of ~~the Nixon's~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~press~~ <sup>the</sup> press of the Post. And about Nixon. Richard J. Walton <sup>fnote</sup> ~~is the~~ (Author of Cold War and Counterrevolution: The Foreign Policy of John F. Kennedy) and other serious <sup>works</sup> of foreign policy. He reviewed <sup>Herblock Special Report</sup> a collection of cartoons on Richard Nixon <sup>covering</sup> his ~~entire political career~~ by <sup>the</sup> brilliant satirist ~~Herblock~~ <sup>Herbert Block</sup> ~~who had~~ <sup>gained</sup> ~~the Post's staff~~ <sup>the Post's</sup> ~~in time to observe~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~all of Nixon's political life~~ <sup>the</sup> noted cartoonist Herbert Block's "unique perception of Richard M<sup>r</sup>. Nixon" going back to the beginning of Nixon's career. Then,

"Good reporters also recognized that Nixon was a disreputable man who would do <sup>able, even</sup> ~~disreputable~~ 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....Indded, if the press had not been so handicapped by its own genitlity, 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,

fnote 1 On 12/18/74

The courts?

It is <sup>because</sup> as the bureaucracies ~~of~~ of the intelligences services saw their survival needs and as individuals among the guilty sought to serve their own that what did come out about The Watergate cozed up out of the <sup>stinking</sup> 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 <sup>5/21/c</sup> 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 <sup>even</sup> the most elemental standard of serving self-interest. <sup>intelligently</sup> Not the press, not the Congress, not the courts or the system of justice. INSERT 2A

~~Imaging~~ 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

BA

on 31

"Sentenced" Kleindienst

~~Kleindienst footnote on p~~

By Chief federal district court judge George Hart, who succeeded Sirica when Sirica reach<sup>ed</sup> 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 ~~repetitive~~ 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<sup>d</sup> 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 <sup>or a bottle of milk.</sup> 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. <sup>and a quart of milk then just 20 cents.</sup> ~~a loaf of bread~~ 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 <sup>one of</sup> the town's richest and <sup>and a</sup> most ~~un~~respected 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. <sup>who absolved criminals while committing my serious crimes himself.</sup>

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 ~~at~~ single stiff sentence. The crooked corporate executives paid what for them and their corporations <sup>were</sup> insignificant fines <sup>remained</sup> and were free and respected. Kleindinst not only was praised, <sup>(Post 6/8/74)</sup> he didn't even lose his license to practise law. <sup>(Post 8/3/74)</sup> And soon the papers were reporting his successful beginning of a profitable <sup>new</sup> career, <sup>a single</sup> one client paying him \$120,000 a year. (Post 11/11/74)

34  
The more repentant the Watergate offended, the longer his sentence. This is the way "justice" worked. Kleindinst and others were free. The rich and the influential did not spend a day in jail. John Dean, whose <sup>one</sup> 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. <sup>was</sup> (post 2/7/74), Dean <sup>ed</sup> sentencing and Kleindinst <sup>was</sup> ~~not being disbarred~~ <sup>on</sup> the same day.

And Nixon? He and his wife ~~will receive~~ <sup>"retired"</sup> 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. <sup>nonetheless,</sup> 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 <sup>main</sup> Building is engraved, "The Place of Justice Is a Hallowed Place." That of the Supreme Court reads "Equal Justice Under Law."

That Whallowed" 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 <sup>moral and ethical principles?</sup> ~~the lessons they are to learn?~~

All society's protections<sup>their</sup> having failed, those responsible perpetuated ~~the~~ 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 fourth paragraph~~ 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 ~~pr~~ proved." (NYTimes 11/4/74)

Nixon was apprised and did <sup>more than</sup> agree <sup>to blackmail,</sup> 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 <sup>it</sup> 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 <sup>(Post 11/20/74) A</sup> that he had "rejected" the contents. <sup>all about</sup> He could defend his client without knowing ~~what~~ these other "undisclosed crimes" that are "a number of highly illegal conspiracies"?

~~SECRET~~

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.)

*earlier hit*

(In fact, the conspiracy-case prosecutors <sup>earlier hit</sup> 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)

~~SA~~ job

5) *suppose every man were a spy with participating in or aiding some conspiracy*  
(conspiracies?) "Could Dittman be ignorant of them and still defend his client?"

Hunt's knowledge of them was in itself criminal, not less than misprison of a felony.

"Maximum John"

But this is the testimony for which Judge Sirica sat still, the testimony that was not

followed by blasts of editorial outrage.

*This "number of highly illegal conspiracies" remained unreported, unpunished.*

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 in the *Saturday Evening Post* by thanking God that the CIA did violate the law and the Constitution.

~~(Sat Eve Post)~~ 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.

So Braden addressed himself in ~~outrage~~ <sup>outrage</sup> 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 <sup>according to Braden,</sup> was Ruth going to "solve" this "last big" Watergate "mystery?"

By calling Nixon as a witness, to testify against himself! <sup>When Braden wrote this self-induced complication.</sup> (phlebitis condition). There was then

no doubt that for medical reasons alone Nixon would not be able to travel and take the witness stand for months, as a panel of doctors Sirica had dispatched told him before

Braden's column appeared. (Post 11/30/74) <sup>this</sup> and as Nixon's own doctors had said long and loudly enough.

But "If Nixon's

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

~~But he had never said,~~ <sup>even claimed</sup> "I am not a liar."

~~But~~ <sup>saying</sup> 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<sup>or</sup> in the media bludgeon or entice Schlesinger's or explanations from him? Not even after Schlesinger's reminder of Braden's ~~gillies~~ covering up?

"If Mr. Nixon's health improves, and Judge Sirica grants Ruth the latitude he 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.

GA - 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 ~~engaged~~ engaged in these unexposed conspiracies. *including Nixon*

Beginning with his old CIA cronies and 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~~ <sup>had</sup> signalled its existence, ~~and~~ <sup>Ruth could have</sup> charged Bittman, ~~if only~~ with obstructing justice and misprison of a felony for <sup>only</sup> withholding the memo?

Hunt <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>of</sup> 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 - Hunt ~~could not take the~~ <sup>had no</sup> Constitutional protection, having been immunized. If he <sup>to have immunity</sup> had or pretended ~~one~~, the problem was easily solved and Ruth had the power: immunize him <sup>then still</sup> all over again. If Hunt refused to testify to what he claimed to know and said "can be



(H) at bottom p?

Supposed "liberal" Braden, non-stop defender of the CIA no matter what it did, had other complications in his life besides his own illegal domestic operations for the CIA. These are not uncommon among columnists. And while Nixon and his partisans bewailed the alleged anti-Nixon bias they claimed existed in the Republican-owned press, the fact is that the bias was for, not against Nixon and the Republicans and Nixon's hand-picked successor, Ford. *INSOFT 1*

Charles R. Seib, an associated editor of the WxPost then and formerly an executive of the WxStar, addressed <sup>*columnists' complications*</sup> ~~this~~ in ~~an~~ editorial article of press self-criticism. However, it was long, long after the fact, long after it made any difference in what the people could know so that representative society could function. It was a sort of "New Year's resolution, published 1/2/75. It fell short of telling all the complications and conflicts of three of the well-paid syndicated columnists whose writing figured in the story of The Watergate:

"Tom Braden, who writes on public affairs from Washington, strongly supported Newlson Rockefeller during the [vice-presidential confirmation] hearings on Rockefeller's financial largess. It wasn't until later ~~xxxxxxx~~ that he revealed - with some reluctance - that he had received over \$100,000 in loans from Rockefeller back in the 1950s to finance purchase of a newspaper."

No mention of Braden's CIA career Nor of William Buckley's:

"William F. Buckley, also a public affairs columnist, defended Rockefeller in the matter of the campaign book about Rockefeller's gubernatorial opponent, Arthur Goldberg. But Buckley did not tell ~~himself~~ his readers that he was chairman of the firm that published the book for the Rockefellers."

That unnamed firm was the right-wing Arlington House, ~~unnamed~~. It did not merely publish the Rockefeller-financed smear disguised as a normal publication, it did it on a deal in which the Rockefellers paid them a guaranteed profit for the political service.

*IND 2*  
Later Seib did not mention that the author of this ax-job on a Democrat was a professional Kennedy-hater, author to two similar books against JFK and Bobby:

"Victor Lasky, best known as the author of the Goldberg book mentioned above, received \$20,000 from Richard Nixon's Committee to Re-elect the President while writing a syndicated column. The \$20,000 deal was a secret until it came out in Watergate testimony. And nine months ~~later~~ then passed before Lasky's syndicated notified editors of it."

All three claimed no conflict of interest. Lasky went even farther, claiming "he had every right to make an undisclosed deal with CRP...earned \$20,000 by writing speeches... CRP connection didn't influence his views, which were pro-Nixon in the first place."

Nixon always campaigned against the press, regardless of the pro-Nixon bias of its ownership. "It is very important in terms of the final campaign that the media be effectively discredited," he declared <sup>(Parade 2/23/75)</sup> toward the end of the 1972 campaign in which as close as possible to 100% of the press supported him.

Add 2: Actually, Mrs. Braden is a former executive assistant to Rockefeller and the two ~~large~~ borrowings, of \$80,000 and \$50,000, were to buy the later-sold Blade-Tribune, of Oceanside, California, in 1954. Braden sold the paper in 1967 (Parade 12/29/74), the year his subverting of the youth and the foundations for the CIA was exposed. He was simultaneously spook and newspaper owner. Simultaneously a Democrat and a Rockefeller man and Rockefeller beneficiary.

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, *who knew of earlier surveillance 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 of Tennessee 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 <sup>long</sup> Nashville Tennessean roundup story published ~~12/11/74~~ 11/10/74 that, <sup>public</sup> when among the new testimony and the first testimony by James Earl Ray were his unequivocal denial of being the murdered and his proffer of proof that he was elsewhere when the crime was committed she wrote he testified to nothing new. When Jim Lesar and I <sup>d</sup> dredged the swamps of official secrecy and came up with documentary proof that Ray's Constitutional rights had been violated beyond remedy <sup>she portrayed</sup> we <sup>we presented in court</sup> portrayed as playing tricks. <sup>and copying by the prosecutor</sup> The documents that officially ordered the interception of all <sup>the</sup> Ray's ~~only~~ communications, including with his lawyers; <sup>and</sup> copies of this correspondence and his letters to <sup>the</sup> a judge - even copies of his notes for his own defense stolen from his cell while he slept by the guards <sup>prosecutor's office</sup> supposed to keep him from being killed - all of which we <sup>all these unprecedented transgressions and many others</sup> forced the ~~prosecution~~ to surrender <sup>were to her</sup> without meaning or legal significance. <sup>It</sup> ~~And that~~ the defense, not the system of justice of those who conspired to defraud it, she told her readers <sup>was</sup> "on trial." John Sieganthal, her publisher, had been a high U.S. Department of Justice functionary and had written a book, <sup>about political assassinations</sup> misnamed The Search for Truth, <sup>It said</sup> saying justice doesn't work except in the papers. So also did <sup>at</sup> Welch write. Nobody learned from The Watergat in Tenn. See.

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,  
*(The Parloined Letter)*  
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 <sup>all</sup> those old enough to <sup>comprehend</sup> read this there is another on history's  
endless precedents from which society's institutions did not learn when they then and  
since ~~had~~ committed and perpetuated the same failures.

When John Fitzgerald Kennedy was shot down in broad daylight on the ~~streets~~  
streets of a major American city and questions about his assassination could <sup>and did</sup> remain  
unasked and unanswered, could it be expected that anyone would ever be safe, <sup>especially</sup> ~~more~~  
any political leader, <sup>more particularly</sup> ~~and no more than that, any~~ one who, like JFK, had determined to  
reorder national priorities around the needs of the people rather than <sup>around</sup> ~~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. ~~was~~ <sup>As</sup> reported  
in the fourth of the Whitewash series, its most conservative member, the late Senator  
Richard B. Russell, <sup>didn't. He</sup> encouraged my quest for further proof that the <sup>Report</sup> 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, Jr.,  
and then had been intimidated into pleading guilty by his own lawyer, the country's

most famous criminal lawyer, Percy Foreman. <sup>footnote</sup>  
<sup>the government</sup> I had sued for <sup>the</sup> ~~an~~ improperly and illegally <sup>suppressed</sup> transcript of the Warren Commission's <sup>January</sup>  
<sup>as I learned, will be by</sup> executive session at which, among other "seamy" disclosures, ~~there was that~~ of the former

7, 1964

Where this transcript they had just studied proved the official intent was not to investi-  
 gate and to cover up and/disproves the ~~Commission's factual~~ <sup>when it</sup> conclusions, that net ~~con-~~ <sup>wrk</sup>  
 memorated the 11th anniversary of that assassination by rerunning the ~~(endorsement of~~ <sup>glaring rave.)</sup>  
 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~~ <sup>in</sup> their major or "A" wires. <sup>nationwide</sup> 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.~~ <sup>copies to sell.</sup>  
~~and~~ All the indications are that the ~~couple~~ <sup>two wholesalers</sup> who had the book in stock had not put ~~it out~~ <sup>a single copy</sup>  
 in a single store. Not TV not newscast reported the unprecedented admissions  
 of the policy and practice of ~~investigation~~ intelligence and police dishonesty  
 and perfidy, genuine questions of the "National Security"

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.

9 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 <sup>verbatim</sup> stenographic transcript of the <sup>exact words of</sup> members themselves - and there was no <sup>deep</sup> major-media interest. ~~facts~~ 9X

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

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

9 Then ~~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 <sup>picked</sup> 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~~ <sup>not</sup> been even the formality of a rejection. ~~(note) There never was.~~ <sup>The disclosures were not to be reported to their audience</sup>

Yet in some ways that transcript is "seamier" 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~~ <sup>It</sup> is not a gathering of politicians seeking political advantage.

It is the deliberations of the most respected, the most eminent, <sup>my</sup> 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~~ <sup>about</sup> 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. <sup>They really</sup> ~~worked out how to~~ <sup>how they would</sup> get around their duties and obligations at the very outset - the month before they called their first witness. <sup>+</sup> ~~(Appropriately, that also in secrecy, as they~~ <sup>(They also took all testimony in secrecy)</sup> ~~heard all their witnesses.)~~ <sup>not a portrait</sup>

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

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 <sup>L</sup>arkinson, 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 <sup>watched</sup> ~~who read both the Post and The New York Times~~ and the reports of both major wire services <sup>for me</sup> ~~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 <sup>to incorporate any new disclosures,</sup> 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~~ <sup>d/</sup> require editing, as all do, more in this case because of all the many interruptions, But ~~it will require~~ <sup>There is</sup> no rewriting to include major new disclosures of the trial. This is written <sup>first legal</sup> ~~the day after the papers required to be filed in the Memphis court were mailed by~~ <sup>after presentation of the prosecution's case in chief during the beginning of the defense,</sup> ~~in 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 another example. If one can hardly talk of ~~acts~~ <sup>acts and crimes as the Watergate,</sup> 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 <sup>other</sup> 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 <sup>y/</sup>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 ~~en~~ <sup>enthroned atop</sup> enshrined on the rot of all the earlier corruption by all the <sup>crooks, authoritarians and</sup> ~~earlier~~ incompetents so many of whom remain in the same high stations while the world rushes <sup>madly</sup> wildly to hell, destroying wealth and the value of money in the predictable economic disaster. <sup>that also predictably is deprecated.</sup>

The new emperor wears the same clothes to the ooohing and aaahing of those who influence and ~~control~~ <sup>one of a series that had and</sup> control what the people may know. As this is written he has just returned from a major <sup>self-</sup>promotion, ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> could have served no other purpose, ~~and had~~ <sup>existed he</sup> he the capability of dealing with the crisis he had finally had to acknowledge/was at best delayed in ~~that~~ <sup>he</sup> dealing with it and ~~in~~ <sup>he</sup> actually was ~~was~~ pretending it didn't exist and if ignored long enough would finally go away. So he was off to Japan, <sup>There</sup> everyone knew his meeting with the prime minister was all that delayed the ousting of <sup>over</sup> ~~corruption charges - his Watergates~~ <sup>Ford's visit</sup> that prime minister ~~and~~ <sup>legitimate</sup> This made the ~~visit~~ impossible of purpose and meaning. He <sup>then</sup> 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. <sup>Next was Vladivostok</sup> ~~and~~ the touted <sup>it</sup> 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-  
already  
zation or to decrease nuclear rocketry or stockpiles. Both countries/possessed the capability  
times  
of ending all life many ~~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~~ <sup>the</sup> guarantee than in both countries urgent needs would not  
and could not be met.

was exactly the opposite of what it was supposed to have been and meant. 114

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.

<sup>Say</sup> And the peoples of both nations bleed and need while <sup>their</sup> leaders, incapable of solving the world's problems, publicize themselves <sup>to keep them selves in power to be able to con-</sup> in the hope of helping preserve ~~themselves in power thereby.~~ <sup>finme to able not to solve these acute problems</sup>

Crisis spawned new crises, all coexisting and ~~re~~ producing still more crises but nothing else changed.

This is the history of The Watergate and the ~~last~~ 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 <sup>they</sup> grown men running <sup>the</sup> world play with hot irons and the innocent alone are burned.

Anyone following the secret developments of ~~There~~ 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 <sup>want to</sup> before it had a chance to dare be free <sup>what</sup> (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 <sup>them</sup> it had the same purpose, to defend those ~~reading data~~ seeking the defense and direct and control what would and would not be <sup>known and</sup> done.

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

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

In all this time there has been no <sup>significant</sup> 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 <sup>much of</sup> 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 <sup>to</sup> a decent <sup>man</sup> society even more, the destruction of popular faith in  
government or society and the destruction of any reason to impose faith in either. <sup>It</sup> The  
<sup>ruin</sup> 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 <sup>power</sup> 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 of 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. <sup>like such is</sup> This  
<sup>Barych</sup> ~~ranges from the Rabbi~~ (Korffs who sought to equate a single/<sup>flawed</sup> 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 <sup>of</sup> Nixonian  
evil - authentic <sup>u</sup> hart 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 <sup>constructive</sup> ~~operative~~ use of that vast authority, <sup>assailed</sup> ~~assailed~~  
<sup>ures</sup>  
the basic struct/or both government and society. The foundations were seriously undermined  
before his own crimes, corruption and <sup>s/</sup> ~~always-false~~ account forced him out <sup>beneficiary of</sup> ~~in~~ a shabby series  
of deals that preserved all ~~his~~ the extremely valuable perquisites of honorable service  
for him and simultaneously <sup>2nd</sup> ~~immunity~~ him for all crimes committed as well as those ~~both~~  
unexposed and unknown.

While all ~~the~~ systems malfunctioned he was busily engaged in <sup>e</sup> working the country  
into his own paranoid authoritarian image and digging <sup>footing for</sup> (the foundations of authoritarianism  
<sup>Authoritarianism is</sup>  
yet to come, (the only answer those unfit ~~to~~ to lead have for problems they do not begin  
to understand and then cannot begin/ to address, <sup>They will solve anything.</sup> ~~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 <sup>two</sup> years for the  
political cowards of the cumbersome machinery to set it into slow motion, more before he  
saw and siezed the alternatives that these same cowards were too cowardly to ~~frustrate~~  
frustrate and instead also siezed upon to hide them <sup>themselves</sup> <sup>paralyzing</sup> from their own (terror of doing their  
sworn duty. It is not enough to say that individuals were brave and persevered to do well.  
~~They~~ were the minority whose good intent was as puissant as the body vapors of a colicky  
infant broken into the howl of the ~~swirling~~ swirling political tornado. The havoc wreaked  
by those more than two years of storm may never been repaired. Patches are not yet  
visible and patchers not at hand.

It is not enough to say that the <sup>stories</sup> exposures of The ~~Was~~ Washington Post were a great public service, ~~which they provided with their better moments~~ <sup>and</sup> 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 ~~Whatix~~ were indictments and convictions, that <sup>and crimes</sup> some crimes (were, if only slightly, punished.

What is much more important is that these fine services to society were much less than each institution 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 <sup>news accounts</sup> carried this significantly further. ~~Actually, with the press,~~ <sup>on its part,</sup> they saw to it that other <sup>specific</sup> 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 <sup>get out</sup> leak what served its interest or directed attention away from him or it and toward <sup>him or</sup> others, reporters were leaked to. As a result the institutional failures remain neither exposed nor understood and <sup>malfunction</sup> 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~~<sup>it</sup> 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. If 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 ~~travels~~ 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 Liddy'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 Nixons 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 38 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 <sup>public</sup> 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 ~~is~~ instead "commended" me for my "diligence in this matter." <sup>his</sup> ~~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. <sup>He</sup> ~~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 ~~transport these~~

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 onix 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 wás supposed to be the exposed became the supressor, 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 slight Democratic center, had no choice but to subpoena Nixon's tapes, Nixon fired him. This "saturday Night Massacre" kicked back harded 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 ~~general~~ 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 ~~to publish~~ that published the report. Not surprisingly, that ~~the~~ 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

narrow self-interest to end suppression. It had had a copy all along and 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 ~~my~~ 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 ~~what~~ 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.

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.