There is virtually nothing about anything he is not capable of saying and hasn't said at one time or another. No matter what he says, he says it with conviction. No matter how improbable it is, he says it in a way that persuades many people he believes it. No matter how false - and during his wark career he has told many palpable lies - he never looks like he knows he is lying.

Although he resented it, and waying it hurt his 1972 opponent George McGovern, warly m his political life Mixim be adopted Hitler's philosophy about the lie: it has to be a whopper or you can't pull it off.

There has probably never been a more sanctimonious liar is the incredible catalogue of the liars in The United States' political past now 200 years long.

A catalogue of Nixon's lies was complied when he ran for re-election as Dwight

on Experienced reports, wrote the both

Eisenhower's running mate. William Costello had been anchor man on the CBS 11 p.m.

news in the days before TV. When he was writing the book and I knew and saw him weekly,

he was Mutual Radio's White House correspondent. It was titled The Facts About Richard It made no de Aperines Dun and time has been hypothem.

Nixon: An unauthorized biography. Before Bill completed his manuscript, he was steeped in Nixon's political prevarication as no one else. Each time he'd document a new one,

Bill seemed to be incredulous that there was no end to them.

Nixon reminds me of a young man I once knew who, perversely, consciously petterned himself after the bad men of Grade B Western movies. This young man made much trouble for others and did much harm before he himself got into trouble. Psychiatrists could de mothingual for him. The police could only, eventually, keep him from shooting more people. The difference is that in doing all the bad things with which his areer is studded, Nixon did them with the mien of a messiah, and an increasing number of people graducally came to believe that he actually was.

By the time of The Watergate, which is a prime example of his non-stop uttering of So pious falsehoods, he had learned to qualify them so that the could later twist the meaning of what he had actually said. The President, of course, can speak without uttering a word. The institution of press secretary or official spokesman takes care of this.

From the beginning he and them let it be know that they would say no more, having said

all that needed saying, always adding up to his innocence and purity. Yet with each ravelling of the fabric, another denial had to be made. When enough of the fabric had come apart for those involved to be talking, when some of their private notes and memoranda finally were available, it was explicit that the constantly-shifting positions, the mutually-contradictory statements, each in its days presented as the given word, had been based on the exalted principle of deniability, as had the crimes, which had been designed to seem to be separated from the White House.

For a while some papers printed excerpts from these self-contradictory statements, in chronological order. The list grew too long, and everybody was too polite to say out loud, "We've got a later in the White House." And by the time the list of lies grew to this proportion, it was more than apparent that falsehood was the lesser of White House evils.

Nixon's security on semantics, the way he told the people he was pure and seemed

Watergate
to reassure himself on this score is illustrated by one of these statements.

insert on &A

Bill Costello's collection of Nixon versus Nixon was an ideal campaign aid for all who thereafter ran for any office with Nixon as his opponent. Wixon was an ideal campaign aid for all who thereafter ran for any office with Nixon as his opponent. Wixon with the profession is the nature of United States politics that all candidates pretend the profession is pure. Nobody ever made Richard Nixon face Richard Nixon. Nobody every called him the liar he is. It is not just that he is that lucky. It is that the higher the office, the more it is revered. This special attitude approaches the monarchical with the presidences.

The need was for disassociation as completely as possible. The fact os that it was an imposibility because the criminal activity originated in the White "ouse. The pretense by then was that the Nixon personal campaign machine was somehow separate and distinct from Nixon, them not us. The most basic lie and a never-ended pretense was that the break-in at Democratic headquarters was the only criminal act. If it was not apparent from taxual reading or hearing of the statements, it was the crux of all.

Mixon finally announced that a definitive investigation had kennum been made for

2.27 27

75,31

(Originally I had planned to tabulate the false, contradictory and ever-chaffing statements, each an improvisation to overcome an immediate problem or address a new incriminating bit of/evidence. By a year after the June 17, 1972 break-in, this file had grown to a two-inch thickness of statement and counter-statement, a bulk that defies full treatment in a book. In itself it would make a fine study of government by propaganda and of White House integrity in its messages to the people.)

141

him and it proved that the "hite House and his entire administration were guiltless.

The press dutifully reported the exact words, without interpretation. This the White news stories

House wordsmiths knew they could depend upon. It is the tradition that the pupers

report, not interpret. Examined carefully, however, the key words do not say this.

The contingency of later deniability was built into these words.

Mixon's October \$4, 1972 proclamation of innocence of all his associates - all statements presumed his was without question - said that "No one on the White House staff, mnno one in this administration presently employed..." was involved in any way.

Beginning with the understanding that this related to the break-in only, the least of the trimes if a felony, the misrepresentations become clear on analysis.

By then it was public knowledge that two of the seven indicted <u>had</u> been White House <u>mad</u> and three <u>had</u> been administration employees. These are Hunt, Liddy and McCord, the first and last retired from the federal payroll.

The statement was designed to be taken and was taken as a statement that "no one now working in the White House" was in any way involved, then or at the time of the break-in.

This is false with regard to Hunt, who was on the White House staff at the time of the break-in and continued working on a contract with a federal agency for a short period afterward. If it was a public secret, it was also a known fact that when Hunt needed an excuse to flee without being subject to the charge, this is the device he used.

It was fix false because there were a series of related and unreported crimes.

It was false because all the detected and provable crimes had not been charge, not unnatural when Nixon controlled the prosecution, which, perforce, was by his own Department of Justice, which had pre-empted it from that of the District of Columbia, which was Nixon's in any event, there being no self-government in the capital city.

It was false because there were Nixon applintees in federal post; whow were involved in the related crimes and in aspects of the small proportion charged.

It was false because both the White House and the administration had before then justice. begun a series of related crimes the most obvious of which is the obstructing of jutsice.

Pat Gray's personal burning of the Hunt evidence from his White House safe, already noted,

was known in the White House. He says the White House directed it. White House silence on Gray's crime is still another White House crime, more than a single crime under the code.

If whese facts about the Watergate and attendant offices White House mendacity were not known that at the time the crime was reported throughout the world, they are in no way a departure from Nixon's record or his "game plan." They are, in fact, vintage Nixon.

marked part 7, bottom, fols.

Extra space