

Gordon Liddy had been officially transferred to the Committee to Re-elect the President. He was no longer on the White House payroll. Shipping him to the committee was really for him to establish a private spy and dirty-work department there, outside the White House. Because he was also a lawyer, if entirely without experience in political laws, the "cover" used was for him to be counsel on these laws, first to this committee and then, when his personality conflicts became acute, by shifting him to another of the multitudinous Nixon political committees, The Finance Committee to Re-elect the President.

So, when it became established fact a few days after the arrest that Liddy had been part of the initial crime, the one detected June 17, the pretense of Nixon's separation from it was preserved with regard to Liddy by the fact that he was not then on the White House staff. It took a little longer for it to become known that he had been a Nixon personal staffer. Only because of the new American attitude toward President's could this fiction be credited. It made little difference where Liddy worked. His crimes were for Nixon and for Nixon alone.

With Hunt a White House secret agent at the time of the crime, the problem of preserving the fiction of Nixon separation was not difficult. First it was accomplished by the Clawson deception, then by hiding the fact. The nature of Hunt's payroll status made doctoring the records easy. His direct employment by the White House - and he did simultaneously have unexposed indirect employment - was as a consultant, paid \$100 for each day he worked. His paydays were irregular. So, it was a simple matter not to pay him or not to pay him directly for the days he worked after March 29. Had he not worked for the White House after March 29, all Dean need have written me is that he had not worked after that day. If he were not still on the payroll at the time of his caught crime, Dean could, without any problem at all, have provided the records.

Although it was intended for no such clandestine and subversive purposes, ^{traditionally} ~~usually~~ with which all appropriations originate, ~~years~~ the Congress had been providing presidents with what is called "special project" funds. These were almost unknown to the general public. This allocation is generally part of other legislation. In 1973 it was included in a \$4.8 billion appropriation for several government departments and for the White House. It totals \$1,500,000 in special

[Harry Robbins Haldeman, Nixon's chief of staff, referred to the precise language of Nixon's August 29 statement in reading his opening statement to the Ervin committee the afternoon of July 30, 1973. As Haldeman read it, the words mean that no one then employed in the administration and no one ever employed in the White House had anything to do with the sordid project. He took a pause to punctuate after "White House" and raced, without pause, between "administration" and "presently employed." Deliberate or otherwise, this is a definite statement and a false one the falsity of which he could not but have known at the time of spoke these words under oath.]

~~(Haldeman is generally known as and referred to as "H.R." Among friends he is known as "Bob.")~~

moneys the president can spend any way he wants to. (In July 1973 the House of Representatives, for the first time in 15 years, ~~skintakabtkkxprssaktkbfunkx~~ denied this special fund to Nixon when its appropriation committee was not satisfied with the response of Nixon's chief of the Office ~~and~~ of Manpower and the Budget to the question, had any of these funds been used in The Watergate.)

Hunt

Hunt was paid from these funds. His criminal activities for Nixon, more later to be exposed, were financed by the United States Treasury.

Because Hunt was not paid in the regular manner, hiding the fact of his presence on Nixon's personal staff was easy and it was done. The fact is that he was ^{officially} fired after the break-in, an unnecessary act if he was not working. One can't fire a non-employee.

Hunt's White House employment

When Ehrlichman was asked about ~~him~~ on July 26, 1973, as a witness before the Senate select committee, he said it was "vague" and in a long, rambling non-response, just didn't answer. ^{that day,} Later, in a different context, he gave a false answer, not uncommon when the crime of perjury was not uncommon.

"Nobody

He appropriated a Nixon lie from the beginning of the time Nixon could no longer maintain the pretense of detachment. They Nixon has said "nobody at the White House" had been connected with the crime, keeping this from being a direct lie by adding the qualification cooked up by John Dean, "presently employed," a qualification that went little noticed.

Ehrlichman simply swore falsely that "nobody at the White House had anything to do with the planning or the break-in".

73A Paralleling this was a drumbeat of claims by all top Republican spokesmen that the burglars were "self-starters", that is, a band of men acting entirely on their own. Once the stupidity and futility of the crime were exposed, there was nothing to be lost by saying it as it was. So, Republican spokesmen described the venture as stupid and pointless thus pretending, naturally, that because it was a foolishness their ~~lack~~ and the President's lack of connection with it could be assumed.

Where there was no personal involvement, where there was no love of country, no

longing to believe that no president and no political party could be engaged in such dastardly doings, thinking was more dispassionate.

As development after development made complete detachment from the crime more and more impossible, the Nixon/Republican posture was forced to change. By the time the Senate's hearings were underway the position was that this was an act by the re-elect committee, with a contrived uncertainty as to whether or not it had been authorized. At that committee, it is certain that a special dirty-works unit of this kind had been established under Liddy. The lowest figure for its financing is \$250,000. One White House record that escaped what Orwell calls "The Memory Hole" puts it at \$300,000.

With their informality of Republican financing in Nixon's re-election, a looseness with ~~the~~ money that was repeatedly criminal and designed to circumvent the law and all accountings, there is no way of knowing how much ~~the~~ Nixon's minions spent in spying and robbery and other dirty tricks for him. His personal lawyer, Herbert Kalmbach, of Newport Beach, California, held more than a million dollars left over from the campaign of 1968. He paid a spy and dirty-works network under a young lawyer, Donald Segretti that was seemingly cut off from the White House by funding through the President's lawyer. However, there were direct links between Segretti and the White House, through conferences, reports and earlier friendships, which led to Segretti's recruiting. He was ~~unnamed~~ the first indicted after The Watergate criminals.

(Kalmbach also dispensed more than a third of a million dollars in unaccounted hush money, to keep The Watergate criminals silent in the guise of humanitarian consideration for heir families.)

Before the switch of guilt to the re-election committee could be accomplished, foreign analysts had to assess what they knew and what was in their files to answer the questions and the possibilities with which they were confronted. Most important of these was the question of Nixon's personal, criminal involvement. In the United States, when this possibility could no longer be avoided, his direct connection with the criminal activity was simplified to whether he had known of the coering-up. In itself this is a series of crimes, ~~but~~ the most apparent of which is obstructing justice, but by

semantics, the way of the United States ~~governor~~ administrations of recent years - not a Nixonian invention - this was made to seem less reprehensible. If they both mean the same criminal thing, obstructing justice is recognized as a crime while covering up is not/ to the general public.

Much more serious would be the added constipation of crimes from personal involvement, anything from conceiving them to just knowing of them in advance.

The analyst addressing this possibility, in the absence of fact, turns to Nixon's past, in the special kind of slang he introduced into the White House, his "track record."

While initially the burglary was described as a "caper", a sort of prankish minor, ~~and~~ over-exuberant excess, it was, in fact, a very serious matter. Had it not been a series of serious crimes, ~~or~~ only some of which were charged in the ^{Nixon-delayed} September indictment, it would still have been a serious matter during an election campaign. There is no ~~governor~~ ~~non-dictatorial~~ non-dictatorial government in the Western world that could have survived such a scandal. It is not probable that in any other country, the government would not have called an election after being caught in such a series of acts. Had it not, it would have fallen. A comparison, one of many readily available, is the Profumo case, in Great Britain, where the association of a member of the government with a call girl, Christine Keeler, was in itself enough to cause ~~the~~ the fall of the government of which he was part.

Even if the reality were the falsity that this was only a CREEP criminality, ~~not~~ one in which the White House was involved, the actuality is that Nixon was responsible. CREEP was his personal creation, his personal property, as he was to claim through a Creep official on July 27, 1973. It would have been difficult to disassociate him from responsibility had he not abandoned two centuries of tradition and had an organization completely independent of the party's. It was impossible when CREEP was his and his alone.

CREEP still had almost \$5,000,000 on hand thirteen months after The Watergate, eight months after the election. This is more than entire presidential elections cost earlier in my life. When asked what CREEP was going to do with this fortune that still remained after the considerable legal and other costs, its spokesman, DeVan Shumway said he did not know, that the money had been contributed to Nixon, not the Republican Party, and

it was thus Nixon's money.

This amounted to the CREEP claim that Nixon had paid for the Watergate because it had been financed by his money.

(The question of what would happen with the five million dollars came up because for eight months the regular party leaders had been trying unsuccessfully to have the money transferred to the Republican treasury. It was so hard pressed because Nixon had bled it for his personal use that it had had to cut its staff by 25%.) (UE

~~XXXX~~ Nixon responsible at least in the sense of having to assume responsibility, whether or not he had directed or even wanted these criminal acts. There is a parallel with his enemy, John Kennedy. Kennedy had not engineered the ~~six~~ fiasco of the Bay of Cuba, the disaster of the invasion of Cuba in April, 1961. It was the scheme of the Eisenhower administration. In it, as we shall see, Richard Nixon personally played a major role. When the Bay of Pigs turned out to be an immediate and total failure, with the capture of so many -- most -- of the Cuban-exile invaders, Kennedy did not say what he could honestly have said, that Eisenhower and Nixon had trapped him into this. He took full responsibility. Except with Nixon, this is traditional. The concept did not originate with Kennedy. It was aptly put by Nixon's other enemy, President Harry Truman, who had on his desk the motto, "The buck stops here."

With the president, as with the head of every other state, the ultimate responsibility is a personal, inescapable responsibility, for every act committed in his name.

The question with The Watergate was not of Nixon's responsibility. It was of his role, if any. Until fuller fact was available, which really meant until more was known and the falsifications and deceptions were separated from truth, the initial, perhaps tentative answer, had to come from assessments of Nixon. This meant of Nixon's history, his past.

The Old Nixon and the New Nixon Are One, The Watergating Nixon

Understanding Richard Nixon and his political career and personal advancement is made easier with full appreciation of the ancient lawyers' maxim, "Penis erectus sciam non habet" (an erect penis has no conscience).

Nixon is and always has been a copier. He is and always has been an improviser. He had and has no program or long-range plans of his own, except for the general ambition to get ahead, however he could and as fast as he could. There is virtually nothing he has ever said or done that can't be traced to another, earlier source. With John Kennedy his mortal enemy, Nixon seem to take particular delight in plagiarizing from ~~the country's~~ his assassinated predecessor. Nixon's career is an endless plagiarism. He added an unparalleled lack of scruple and a total absence of principle.

6A ~~This is what made him President, as it is what led to his downfall. One can get away with these kinds of things only so long. Even Richard Nixon, even the President.~~

Perhaps the best of countless examples of Nixon's literary thievery is his ~~misuse of JFK's well-known phrase from his inaugural address. JFK then intoned, "Ask not what~~ ~~country's~~ ~~misuse of JFK's well-known phrase from his inaugural address. JFK then intoned, "Ask not what~~

Nixon's rendition came out,"

On camera, one could, in Nixon's face, believe he felt like the cat who'd swallowed the canary. He appeared to get particular pleasure from this newest abuse of his long-dead adversary.

~~The same is true of government policy under Nixon. There were no bold new initiatives, no long-range programs, only the turning back of the clock, only the enrichment of those who had made his ~~high~~ succession possible. He spent the national wealth as the nation's wealthiest wanted for their further enrichment. He spent it at the cost of the country's political, social and economic health and at the cost of the poor, the long denied.~~

accommodation with
The one seeming exception, a move toward the major Communist powers, was not

77A
Perhaps the best of countless examples of Nixon's literary thievery is his taking and reworking of the famous quotation from John Kennedy's inaugural address, "As not what your country can do for you. Ask, rather, what you can do for your country." At a time when he was busily engaged in cutting down on services to and help for the needy while busily engaged in feathering his own nest, as will become apparent, Nixon ~~it~~ pontificated to the majority not in need and concerned about taxes and the steadily increasing cost of living, "ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for yourself."

~~The~~ On camera, one could, in Nixon's face, see the content of the cat that had swallowed the canary. He appeared to derive particular pleasure from this newest abuse of his long-dead former adversary.

Nixon was unconcerned about the support of the needy. He assumed he didn't have it anyway. He pretended that the major drain on the public treasury was the cost of helping the needy, which it wasn't. In cutting this cost, he made a direct appeal to the selfish interest of the majority as he misrepresented it. And it was, of course, still another way of enticing political contributions from the wealthy, who ~~would~~ prefer the spending of public moneys in ways that will yield profit for industry, not in helping those in need of help, or rebuilding the rotting hearts of all the cities, which can't be done in factories.

Save for cutting back on public services, which would seem inappropriate as a bold, new initiative, his administration was characterized by a lack of those he claimed.

original with him and was more possible for him because he, personally and symbolically, had prevented it for JFK, who had taken the initiative after the Cuba Missile Crisis of October 1962^(I had been) and ~~was~~ carried forward to the degree he dared against Nixonian opposition by Lyndon B. Johnson.

We Americans, pretending fidelity to the anti-royalist concepts of our Revolution, have developed our own royalist ~~an~~ attitude toward the President, whoever he may at any time be. As we have become more and more the conscious and subliminal creatures of the advertising-man's era this attitude has become more fixed and less questioned. If it has not yet reached the point where the President is conceded the ancient right of kings to taken whatever maiden attracted ^A his eye and satisfied ^L his lust, the major-media reporting and absence of editorializing about the Watergating President's personal involvement in even that limited part of his own dirty-workings when it was first exposed and his involvement was beyond reasonable question illustrates this new reality of American political life.

Perhaps because Nixon has always been so ~~is~~ uninhibited in his viciousness against those who criticized him, his copying, stealing, improvisations, backward-looking policies and assorted other dishonesties and character flaws have never been put together by the major media. What he was caught up in when McCord and Hunt's revanchist Cuban disciples were ~~was~~ nabbed in the Democrats' offices is not the first time he was caught red-handed. His pants have been down all his political life, ^{always has been} but he ~~was~~ treated like the emperor of the fable of the "New Clothes". And ^{has been} in the major media there ~~was~~ no little boy to ~~say~~ cry, "Naked"! (Extra space)

FBI 1570

Tracing ^{Nixon's} his political career, if only superficially, shows no ~~such~~ deviation from the foregoing. It begins in his college days. So does his getting away with anything.

While in the Duke university law school and when worried about his grades, Nixon and two roommates broke into the Dean's office to find out where they stood. As with the espionage against the ^{Demcorats} Democrats in the 1972 campaign, this was a crime without real purpose. There was no need for it. The Norfolk, Virginia lawyer, Fred Alrbink, confirmed this college-days breaki-in to Jack Anderson, who published the story May 16,

8

79

1973, identifying Albrink and one "Bill Perdue" described as "a corporate executive in New York City", as Nixon's companions. If this minor crime of youth can be excused as youthful inability to resist temptation, it is hardly consistent with all the political posturings of the man pretending life-long dedication to "law and order". Characteristically, Nixon could have been expelled over this purposeless affair, and he'd not have been a lawyer, a man of wealth and influence - President. But he did get away with it.

Miami reporter Hank Messick, in his expose of the crime syndicate titled Lansky (Berkeley edition, pp. 189ff), infers a less than completely honest relationship between Nixon, then a government lawyer, and Charles G. (Bebe) Rebozo, beginning before Nixon's Navy service in World War II and ripening into the one close relationship Nixon seems to have. Nixon was an attorney in "in the tire rationing section of the Office of Price Administration", which controlled tire recapping, and the mysterious "Rebozo" made his fortune recapping tires during the war and invested it in real estate".

Being born into a Quaker family has been valuable political coin for Nixon. He seems never to have been active in the Quaker church or to have practised its beliefs. In retelling the well-known but not often reported story of how Rebozo got hold of a fortune in stolen securities worth a small fortune and also getting away with it - a real Mafia story - Messick recounts several non-Quakerly examples from the early life of the real Richard Nixon: "his work as a barker for the wheel of chance at the 'Slippery Gulch Rodeo' in Prescott, Arizona"; and his making of "considerable money/- despite ^{playing poker} his Quaker background - during the war . . . enough to make possible the down-payment on a house upon his return to civilian life."

SA While Nixon awaited discharge from the Navy, according to the same Anderson story, "He was a Navy lawyer renegotiating Navy contracts in Baltimore. He was so eager for a crack at Congress that he borrowed \$150 from the manager of the Erco Co. whose naval contract he was negotiating, for the plane fare to California. Nixon won the Republican nomination and the Erco Co. got a refund from the Navy."

It was easy for Nixon to get that nomination because the ¹⁹⁴⁶ Democratic incumbent was

The Long Island, New York, newspaper Newsday later assigned a crew of investigative reporters to a definitive exploration of Rebozo's career, extending it to include former Florida Senator George Smathers and Nixon. The result was a definitive series of the most thoroughly documented articles. The first appeared between October 6 and 13,

1971, when they were also syndicated to other newspapers. Then they were reprinted in a tabloid-sized "special report". Nixon, ever of elephantine memory when he saw an "enemy", never forgot. He took his vengeance, as will be reported later.

They raised and documented questions of financial probity by all involved, questions that could not possibly have remained unanswered in court were Nixon then not President, with the power to control what breached the courts.

Returning to the same Anderson column, while Nixon awaited discharge from the Navy,

popular Jerry Voorhis, ^{as a liberal Democrat who was} considered a certain winner. Voorhis, when I knew him, before this campaign, was the wishy-washy liberal who had been put on the old Dies UnAmerican Committee to curb its gross excesses. He was a decent, humanitarian type, a man whose pleasant face almost always reflected agonizing over some issue or problem or another, a man with an almost pathological fear and hatred of "Communists" almost none of whom were, a ~~wealthy~~ man born wealthy who regarded cooperatives as The Answer and devoted much of the rest of his life to the cooperative movement.

Nixon's campaign centered around the slogan, "A vote for Nixon is a vote against the Communist-dominated PAC with its gigantic slush fund." The PAC was the Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organization, then separate from the American Federation of Labor. It was founded by a man renowned for his anti-Communism, the late United Mines Workers' Union president John L. Lewis. He was succeeded by the practising Catholic, also anti-Communist, the late Phillip Murray.

Typically, every part of this successful Nixon libel was false. That was the day of "Moscow Gold" fictions. Voorhis had not even been endorsed by the PAC. He had not sought its support, either. ~~(W&P 5/29)~~

This type of political slime did not originate with Nixon. It was well-practised in California. He merely carried it to a more completely dishonest height. Thirteen years earlier it had been used to defeat Upton Sinclair, the author, a wild socialist and a vegetarian, who had won the Democratic nomination for United States Senator. Nixon's Republican predecessor had labelled Sinclair "an anarchist, a free-lover, an agent of Moscow, an anti-Christ".

With the absence of restraint ^{and} ~~in his~~ ^{demonstrated in this post,} successful campaign against Voorhis, Nixon was a natural for the UnAmerican committee. There he built

The Communists, actually, opposed Sinclair. But it made no difference. ^{to California} ^{Republican} his career with needless attacks on those he called "red". There was nothing new in ^{the excesses of} it. If it was difficult to exceed ^{the excesses of} Martin Dies, who found even the child actress Shirley Temple ^{to be a} (in her maturity a Nixonian Republican) "red", Nixon accomplished that.

④ Dies was not the Congressional inventor of the red-hunt. He, in turn, had merely

done what Nixon copied, reduced the restraints self-imposed by Sam Dickstein, the New York City ^{NYC} congressman who began it all. ~~He~~ ^I knew Dies and Dickstein fairly well. Dies went on to become a John Birch Society functionary, Dickstein to be a New York City ~~judge~~ judge. Dies and I were on a first-name basis by the time I got ^{his} ~~an~~ agent, ~~the~~ ^{the} Dies committee, ~~him~~ who had tried to entrap me when I was writing a book about ~~him~~ convicted of two crimes. *(no scandal in the papers)*

^{Congressman} What Nixon did ^{Senator} (Joe McCarthy later copied, in fact and in manner. Nixon decided to switch his hunt ~~for~~ reds from union organizers and people from the arts to the top levels of government, then controlled by the ^{HSS} Democrats. He selected Alger Hiss as his main target and painted him as a Moscow agent who, when high in the State Department and a counsellor at the Yalta conference, somehow sold this country out to Stalin.

If the facts do not bear out the allegation, that also is typical of the Nixon method.

~~Whittaker Chambers~~ Whittaker Chambers, who said he was ^{has been} a Communist, also said Hiss had given him ~~secret~~ State Department papers. Hiss, obviously, was not the only possible source. Chambers was a sleazy character whose word would not be taken against that of the respectable Hiss. Two of the main items of evidence were an old Woodstock typewriter and ^{copies of} these secret papers, which came to be known as "The Pumpkin Papers".

It later turned out that the typewriter could have been counterfeited, despite the folklore of the detective stories, and after Hiss was convicted, his defense actually ^{There was a} ^(West) did it. And that ^{papers} ^a Madison Avenue ^{touch} in retrieving these secrets from the pumpkin on Chambers' farm near Westminster, Maryland? That also was contrived. Chambers had put them ^{IN IT} ^{taking Nixon there} there just before ~~retrieving them~~ ~~from~~ for the Hallowe'en extravaganza.

The jury hung in the first Hiss trial. Nixon's Congressional and political allies raised a hue and cry against the judge, who was promptly and thoroughly intimidated.

There was a retrial and Hiss was convicted, ^{of perjury, not spying} ^{because} ^{Senator} ^{Congresswoman} meanwhile, erstwhile ^{Senator} ^{Congresswoman} nobody Nixon was a household word, a political omer, and he became the Republican ^{Senator} ^{Congresswoman} opponent of California's ^{Democratic} ^{Senator} ^{Congresswoman} Helen ~~Marg~~ ^{Marg} Cahagan Douglas, wife of the actor, Melvyn Douglas. Both were liberals. That was in 1950, when Nixon was 37.

Manufacture "press" duplicate

10 A 100

who accurately exposed wrongdoing made not the wrongdoers but the truth^{ful} exposers of the wrongdoing the guilty. They~~had made the good guys look like the bad guys~~ bad guys made the good guys look like the bad guys. The press uncritically practised what it calls "objectivity" without which there could be no Chitiner style and method in modern United States politics. It reported each Nixonian dishonesty as fact simply by accurately quoting each spokesman, without analysis of what he said. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Understanding Chotiner and Nixon's undeviating adherence to this method made it possible for me to accurately forecast what Nixon would say/before he said it, how he would say it, even the precise moment he would counter-attack. It was as easy as reading a simply book, Chotiner's book. Even who would be made to appear to be the villains who made Nixon the "victim." For Nixon there is always ^{an enemy.} ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ There is no exception in his political life, no matter what he did or how bad he was or what he did.

To this, in 1950, there was added a merchandizing technique indistinguishable from that used in selling deodorants.

WA m 84
(Extra space)

Marcantonio was not a Communist. He was the Congressional radical of his day, as he was an authentic popular leader of his people and Congressional District. He is the first man to win election to the Congress ~~without an election fight and~~ without an election fight and with victories in the primaries of three major parties, in that district then the Democrats, the Republicans and the American Labor Party. Marcantonio began as a Republican, successor to Fiorello La Guardia, whose Congressional campaign the young Marcantonio, a former assistant district attorney, had managed.

What was then radical is today accepted. What he proposed legislatively is today largely the law and practise. Among these things are fair employment practises and the other rights of minorities. I go into this because Nixon was then doing more than waging a dirty fight against a humanitarian opponent. He was the running dog of economic and political repression and backwardness, of racism and sweat-shop working conditions, waging also a campaign on behalf of those Roosevelt termed "malefactors of great wealth", the overly-rich and overly-powerful whose riches were swollen by denials of the poor, and the working poor and underpaid, organized labor.

I got to know Marcantonio well when Dies tried to frame me. His subsequent exposures of Dies and his committee on the floor of the House of representatives were based on my investigations. I partied with him and his colleagues, drove him and them around. On many occasion I drove him to the White House for appointments with FDR. I knew what FDR had said and promised as soon as their meetings were over.

World War II's "Fair Employment Practises Commission" was FDR's compromise when Marcantonio was pushing the same concept legislatively. When he accepted the compromise, Marcantonio averted for FDR what FDR wanted very much to avert, a major legislative squabble during a war with entrenched reaction and racism in the Congress.

In religion, Marcantonio was a Catholic. One of his interests was the canonization of Mother ~~EXXEX~~ Cabrini.

He was one of the most brilliant parliamentarians, and was consulted in the revision of the Rules of the House by their reviser, Congressman Cannon of Missouri, who I also

Knew, but not well.

Marcantonio was liked and respected by many of his more conservative colleagues. He drank and played poken with them, sometimes well into the early morning. They trusted him, sought his advice and used him for gambits they themselves feared. ~~Successfully~~ examples In the days right before Pearl Harbor had to do with some of EDR's twisting, if not violating, of law and the Constitution, becoming a partisan in the war without a declaration of war. Here his and their views coincided. Joe Martin, then Republican House leader - the leader of Nixon's, not Marcantonio's party (he sat as American Labor), asked Marcantonio to make a speech attacking Roosevelt for a deal in which military aircraft were given to Great Britain. I was there when Martin gave him the proof.

Nixon's party, through its assistant leader, Wadsworth, also offered Marcantonio, the radical, a deal to become a sitting Republican and to run on that ticket only as an alternative to their joining the Democrats to legislate him out of office by prohibiting candidates from running on more than one ticket. Wadsworth also asked my wife to join his staff.

There have been few more violent editorial denunciations of anyone that the Communist Daily Worker aimed at Marcantonio. He was an independent, a man ahead of his ~~time~~ day, not a Communist. Accomplishing what he fought for on behalf of the ill-fed and ill-housed would have cost money for Nixon's real constituency, the overly-rich. He and Nixon were natural opponents. Despite this and despite Nixon's campaign slogans, there were a number of issues on which Nixon and Marcantonio also ~~voted~~ "voted hand-in-hand."

~~By this time Nixon was in the hands of the Murray Chotiners who thereafter merchandized had a property to manage. They managed Nixon as Madison Avenue does deodorants.~~

The ~~smear~~ campaign against the mild, decent woman was a vicious, ~~and~~ debased and debasing rerun of the defamation of the innocent Voorhis. The key slogan is typified by this line:

6443B "Mrs. Douglas has voted hand-in-hand with the notorious Communist party-liner, Vito Marcantonio of New York...on issues affecting American security."

Mrs. Douglas was no less staunchly anti-Communist than Jerry Voorhis. ~~Her~~ ~~husband~~ ~~himself~~ Nixon himself described his campaign tactics as "fighting, rocking, socking". Adlai Stevenson, one of Nixon's victims when Stevenson opposed Eisenhower the year Nixon became vice president, used more pointed if still understated description, "...slander and scare, of sly innuendo, of a poison pen, the anonymous phone call and hustling, pushing and shoving ...smash and grab and anything to win."

This is closer to the later advice of Nixon, as President, to a cabinet member, complete with gestures:

"After you get the knife in, you wti twist it."

There was no moderation of the Nixon personal and political viciousness because Helen Douglas was a woman. Chotiner provided the ^{Nixon} Madison Avenue touch. She became "the pink lady" and the ^{Nixon} libels were printed on pink paper.

As Senator Nixon was financially crooked. He got caught taking money under the table, in violation of law. The sum he got caught taking, from wealthy business partisans, was relatively small, about \$18,000. Ike almost kicked him off the ticket. Chotiner to the rescue again, this time with what became the "Checkers Speech", a brazen, irrelevant, false emotional appeal that worked. Ike, who was about to kick Nixon off his ticket, pushed his own stomach back in place and let Nixon stay on, to become vice president.

When the late Drew Pearson, whose Merry-Go-Round column went to his then-associate Jack Anderson on Pearson's death, was about to publicize this Nixon financial irregularity, Nixon actually threatened Pearson with what Anderson describes as "the Red smear brush." Anderson says the threat

72

train. I passed on the message yo Pearson, who replied quickly, ' All right. I'll change the story. I'll make it stronger.

85

Among Nixon critics and opponents, Rogers, formerly Republican Attorney General, is regarded as one of the more decent men around Nixon and in his administration.

Even Nixon's critics, who forget over the years, consider that he has been above questionable financial dealing. However, beginning with the small stuff of Erco's \$150, they are pervasive in his career. They and his Checkers speech will interest us more.

When Spiro Agnew began his direct assault on the First Amendment, his public attacks on the major elements of the press the lingering effects of which were obvious after the Watergate arrests, when most of the press was silent and even the valorous Washington Post was super-cautious, some wag's dubbed him "Nixon's Nixon". This was the ~~remembrance~~ remembrance of a thing past but never to be forgotten, Nixon as axe-man for the amuncular Eisenhower. Then Nixon had laced the land, stridently, fraudulently and knowingly falsely claiming that under the Democrats there had been

"Twenty Years of Treason":

Roosevelt and Truman traitors? Only a Nixon would dare ~~suggest~~ suggest it.

Without Ike, Nixon couldn't make it or, in his phrase, "hack it alone". He was soundly whipped when, after loosing to John Kennedy in 1960, he ran for governor in California, seeking not a job but a power base from which to make another assault on the Presidency. He failed, ~~loosing~~ loosing to ~~Edmund~~ Edmund "Pat" Brown. Only the assassination of John Kennedy made another attempt possible. In turn, this leads to provocative Watergate connections that, for some reason, all of the press elected to ignore when the story first broke. The loosing campaign against Brown holds strong Watergate parallels. The courts held Nixon, personally, guilty of exactly that which was part of the overall Watergate story, the part suppressed by the Nixon administration and brought to light only because of the diligence of the very elements of the Press Nixon's Nixon had failed.

Pick up with 1962 decision, flash back to Checkers, and then go to property deals. New chapter, "Clean As a Hound's Tooth", begins with Checkers speech.

In that 1962 campaign, as ~~much~~ 10 years earlier, Nixon was caught in financial irregularities, taking money from the rich, and in political dirty-works that he faithfully duplicated on a much larger scale in what is known by the generic The Watergate.

Governor Edmund "Pat" Brown beat Nixon in that gubernatorial race, as John Kennedy also beat him in 1960's presidential election. In 1960 and in 1962 Nixon was caught in funny-business with money. He learned how to get away with it in 1952 but not that trying to can be costly.

Other aspects of the 1960 campaign will interest us in a special context. Here it suffices to tell the story of Howard Hughes \$205,000. (Howard Hughes, the eccentric ^bmillionaire, also figures in the motivation for some of the planned Watergate crime.) This Hughes money was an issue in 1962 also. Hughes loot went not to Richard but to his brother F. Donald, whose son Donald A and ~~his~~ the third Nixon brother, Edward, both figure in the handling of crooked money for the 1972 re-election campaign.

F. Donald started a chain of eateries specializing in ~~what~~ what he called the "Nixonburger." The business was in trouble, so being the brother of Richard, for whom Howard Hughes had ambitions, ^{in 1956} he latched onto that \$205,000. That is \$1,000 more than what F. Donald said he owed creditors when he filed for bankruptcy in 1961. By then he was sales manager of the Carnation Company a major element of the dairy industry. Dairy also, as it happens, is a major part of the dubious-money story of the 1972 campaign.

The Hughes transaction was handled by Noah Dietrich, Hughes long-time lawyer and arranger. ~~arranger~~. He tells about it in his book Howard, the Amazing Mr. Hughes. Dietrich says that in December, 1956, he went to the office of then Vice President Nixon to discuss his apprehensions over the loan:

"...Hughes has authorized it, and Donald can have it. I realize that it involves a loan to your brother and not to you. But I feel compelled to tell you what's on my mind. If this loan becomes public information; it could mean the end of your political career, and I don't believe it can be kept quiet."

In response to this warning, the Vice President said, nobly, that "I have to put my relatives ahead of my career."

In his Six Crises Nixon also refers to this "loan" Donald as ^{Seying} "with his voice" ₁

Governor Edmund "Pat" Brown beat Nixon in that gubernatorial race, as John Kennedy also beat him in 1960's presidential election. In 1960 and in 1962 Nixon was caught in funny-business with money. He learned how to get away with it in 1952 but not that trying to can be costly.

Other aspects of the 1960 campaign will interest us in a special context. Here it suffices to tell the story of Howard Hughes \$205,000. (Howard Hughes, the eccentric ^b multimillionaire, also figures in the motivation for some of the planned Watergate crime.) This Hughes money was an issue in 1962 also. Hughes loot went not to Richard but to his brother F. Donald, whose son Donald A and his the third Nixon brother, Edward, both figure in the handling of crooked money for the 1972 re-election campaign.

F. Donald started a chain of eateries specializing in what he called the "Nixonburger." The business was in trouble, so being the brother of Richard, for whom Howard Hughes had ambitions, ^{in 1956} he latched onto that \$205,000. That is \$1,000 more than what F. Donald said he owed creditors when he filed for bankruptcy in 1961. By then he was sales manager of the Carnation Company a major element of the dairy industry. Dairy also, as it happens, is a major part of the dubious-money story of the 1972 campaign.

The Hughes transaction was handled by Noah Dietrich, Hughes long-time lawyer and arranger. He tells about it in his book Howard, the Amazing Mr. Hughes. Dietrich says that in December, 1956, he went to the office of then Vice President Nixon to discuss his apprehensions over the loan:

"...Hughes has authorized it, and Donald can have it. I realize that it involves a loan to your brother and not to you. But I feel compelled to tell you what's on my mind, if this loan becomes public information; it could mean the end of your political career, and I don't believe it can be kept quiet."

In response to this warning, the Vice President said, nobly, that "I have to put my relatives ahead of my career."

^{saying}
* In his Six Crises Nixon also refers to this "loan" Donald as "with his voice"
1

"I hope I haven't been responsible for losing the election" to Kennedy. Naturally, Richard says he reassured F. Donald.

Beverly Hills is a swank part of Los Angeles, as every movie fan knows. In 1961 Nixon bought a lot there. The one next to it was valued at almost three times the \$35,000 he paid for it, \$99,000 as compared with \$35,000. And the \$35,000 was \$7,000 less than what the developer had mortgaged that lot for in borrowing \$4,000,000 from the teamsters' union pension fund, then controlled by Jimmy Hoffa. The Texas wheeler-dealers and oil operators, the Hurcheson brothers, were partners in the development.

When on September 27th of that year Nixon held a news conference to announce his candidacy as governor, he was asked, how he "managed to buy a piece of property for \$35,000 which had a \$42,000 mortgage on it. Was this a gift?"

Nixon came back with the typical politicians "I'm glad you asked that question" routine, pretended to answer it but never did.

"Nobody could argue with his belief, "I think it was a reasonable price." By then he had learned and practised his Chotiner well. He warmed up, typically, attacking instead of answering and holding everybody else, ~~responsibility~~ not he, did wrong:

"Nobody is going to frighten me out of this ~~xxxx~~ contest and that as far as this kind of smear is concerned, and that is exactly what it is, I intend no longer to take it lying down."

in July 1963

He didn't. He was either standing up or sitting down when he closed a deal for about \$86,000. roughly a 250% profit.

Nixon lost the election but learned a lesson about how well he could do with property, a lesson I suspect he had also learned earlier.

What also helped beat him was a fraud he, Haldeman, Chotiner, Herbert Kalmbach, who was his personal lawyer at the time of The Watergate and Maurice Stans, later The Watergating chairman of The Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President were all caught in pulling. It might be described as a trial run for The Watergate.

The California Democratic Council was the rank-and-file backbone of the party. By more Nixon's standards it was liberal than the party's leadership. So, this gang and a few others, one of whom, Herb Klein, ~~was~~ later was Nixon's White House Director of Communications, organized what they called the "Committee for the Preservation of the Democratic Party in California." Of course, their names didn't figure publicly in this dedication to the welfare of the opposition. Not until two years later, when it had worked its tortuous way through the courts, did the truth become known.

Nixon and Haldeman personally were found by the judge to be party to the fraud. No smear, it was a Republican judge, Byron Arnold, and he used other language all meaning dishonest in intent and in execution. It was a civil action. By the time of decision, filed October 30, 1964, Nixon, Haldeman and company has spent all but \$368.50 of the money they had collected claiming to be the authentic Democrats. This Judge Arnold ordered them to pay to the Democrats.

In his 19-page decision, the judge found that Nixon and Haldeman had "approved the plan and project," "had agreed that the Nixon campaign committee would finance the project," and that the ~~revised~~ text of a postcard used in a phoney "poll" was "revised, amended and finally approved by Mr. Nixon personally."

Those whose memories need not be long who remember the Nixon of the 1972 re-election campaign and the ublushing President when The Watergate heated up and led into the White House may wonder about the language Nixon personally "revised, amended and finally approved" for that "poll." He portrayed the incumbent as the captive of the "ultra liberal" CDC, over which, this Nixon postcard said, most Democrats were "frankly revolted."

Among those recommended policies so revolting to the Nixon of 1962 were "admitting ~~the~~ Red Chinax into the United Nations", "Moratorium on U.S. nuclear testing," and "Foreign Aid to countries with Communist governments." ~~These are the ideas as this is the propaganda of the~~ UnAmerican committee Nixon, the Nixon of the cry of "Twenty Years of Treason" in the

1952 campaign. They are also the ideas copied by Nixon the desperate President who, when he implemented them, made them his claim to fame as The Watergating President. He saw "Red" China into the UN, boasted long and often of his Limited Test Ban Agreement, and rendered such aid to Communist governments it was a domestic disaster of once unimaginable economic and political proportions.

The fourth major point of his "poll" was allowing "subversives" on campus. On this is was consistent, this consistency also figuring in The Watergate.

Also consistent was Nixon's plea for the Democratic vote, attached to the "poll" card. It gave his word, "This is not a plea for any candidate."

Financing of this effort to save the Democrats from themselves was by Nixon. ~~That judge found that Nixon instructed Haldeman to~~ In a deposition in the case, Haldeman admitted under oath that he had paid out \$70,000 of Nixon's campaign money to finance this "poll."

This "plea" allegedly "not...for any candidate" in the words of the decision, "purported to express the concern of genuine Democrats...that the party would be destroyed if candidates supported by the California Democratic ^(CDC) Council, primarily Governor Brown, were elected... It appealed for the support and money of Democrats in fighting the CDC and certain policies attributed to it and cast aspersions on the Democratic candidates endorsed by it."

Rather than sending the "poll" to Democrats across the board, those of all segments of the party, the fake poll rigged for fake results assured them further by limited those to whom it was sent to what the judge found to be ^{900,000} ~~only~~ "conservative Democrats."

Despite Nixon's word to the contrary, the judge found that all the ^{activities} ~~functions~~ of the fake committee of "Democrats" and its fake poll, "were instigated, financed, implemented, supervised and executed" by Nixon, Haldeman et al with the "paramount purpose to obtain from registered Democrats votes and money for the campaign of Richard M. Nixon."

~~(Post 10/27-NYNYG/23/73; SEP 4/29/73; SEP 1/29/73)~~

Ethel Spae

1952 campaign. They are also the ideas copied by Nixon the desperate President who, when he implemented them, made them his claim to fame as The Watergating President. He saw "Red" China into the UN, boasted long and often of his Limited West Ban Agreement, and rendered such aid to Commanist governments it was a domestic disaster of once unimaginable economic and political proportions.

The fourth major point of his "poll" was allowing "subversives" on campus. On this is was consistent, this consistency also figuring in The Watergate.

Also consistent was Nixon's plea for the Democratic vote, attached to the "poll" card. It gave his word, "This is not a plea for any candidate."

Financing of this effort to save the "emocrats from themselves was by Nixon. ~~Fauzjadigzafenuixthax"imixtathaxnaxixmzfaxtyx~~ In a deposition in the case, Haldeman admitted under oath that he had paid out \$70,000 of Nixon's campaign money to finance this "poll."

This "plea" allegedly "not...for any candidate" in the words of the decision, "purported to express the concern of genuine "emocrats...that the party would be destroyed if candidates supported by the California Democratic ^(CDC) Council, primarily Governor Brown, were elected...X It appealed for the support and money of Democrats in fighting the CDC and certain policies attributed to it and cast aspersions on the "Democratic candidates endorsed by it."

Rather than sending the "poll" to "emocrats accross the board, those of all segments of the party, the fake poll rigged for fake results assured them further by limiting those to whom it was sent to what the judge found to be ^{900,000} only "conservative Democrats."

"Despite Nixon's word to the contrary, the judge found that all the ~~functions~~ ^{activities} of the fake committee of "Democrats" and its fake poll, "were instigated, financed, implemented, supervised and executed" by Nixon, Haldeman et al with the "paramount purposeX to obtain from registered "emocrats votes and money for the capmaign of Richard M. Nixon."

(Post 10/27; NY 16/23/73; SFD 4/29/73; SFC 4/29/73)

11/2/73

Extra Max

This relevant bit of the past of Nixon and those of The Watergate so close to him was forgotten, as Nixon could depend upon. At the time of the decision, which was exactly two years after this earlier criminal activity, it got virtually no attention. A canvass of major California papers showed that none played the story. After the National Observer brought it to light toward the end of 1972, it still got scant attention. Nor was the very obvious ~~fact~~ parallel with The Watergate ~~given~~ given the attention it warranted.

Saturday, October 28, for example, The New York Times had a modest story headed, "1962 Nixon Tactic Was Held Illegal." The San Francisco Chronicle downplayed more with the head, "Sabotage Try By Nixon in '62 Charged." It succeeded, so it was not a mere "try", and a judicial decision is more than an unsubstantiated "charge." When the San Francisco Examiner got around to it five months later, after the November election, it was further numbed with the meaningless headline, "Memories of '62 Campaign." The Washington Post of October 27, 1972 had the longest and best story, written by Sanford J. Ungar, beginning on the front page ~~(XXXXX)~~ ("Democrats Tricked By Nixon in '62 Race").

While he waited until May of 1973 to address it, Conservative Columnist Bruce Biosat began his column, "The 1962 Nixon-Haldeman phoney mailing caper in California, which might be styled a small prototype of the Watergate, has recently [sic] been publicized yet not really well spelled out. ...especially in light of the President's expressed lofty distaste for the Watergate maneuvers [sic] and resigned aide H.R. Haldeman's public assurances that he has been adhering to the "high standards I've always set for myself." Biosat's conclusion to his repetition of the tale of fraud and deceit hits this harder, quoting Nixon's personal and unnecessary endorsement of Haldeman after The Watergate forced him out, "finest public servant..."

When Haldeman appeared before the Ervin committee he had seen the Nixonian light about those "revolting" policies he and Nixon had attributed to the CDC and bragged not about Nixon's stealing them but about his consummate ~~statesmanship~~ statesmanship in making them a reality. Haldeman was careful to use the new designation, not "Red China"

anymore. Now it is "the People's Republic of China."

Senator Sam Ervin, not for the reason given, cut this information and more, the finer details, off from the American people by refusing to let Hawaii's Senator Daniel Inoye question the pure soul of these "high standards", that "finest public servant." Inoye had barely started when Waldeman's counsel/John Wilson, protested.

"Have you ever been cited by any court in the United States for illegal or unethical campaign activities?" he asked. Waldeman stalled by saying he wasn't sure what "cited" means, whereupon Inoye began to read Waldeman's own deposition. "ere Wilson interrupted to allege irrelevance. It was, of course, because of the subject of the committee's investigation as it was to test Waldeman's credibility. Ervin cut it off saying, "I don't believe we ought to go back that far." This was not consistent with his practise when Republican members alleged that John Dean had been fired from a law firm for "unethical" conduct, a charge proven false before it was made.

To an analyst, this was a sure sign that the committee leadership may have decided to pull the punches, especially those that could hit Nixon. With Waldeman had been the second of Nixon's two main "defense" witnesses, the other his associate John Ehrlichman. Theirs was the most dubious testimony, their claims to failure of recollection the most common and disputed by the alleged sharpness of what Nixon wanted said was recalled, theirs the intended major assault on Dean, to then the major source of anti-Nixon testimony. Impartiality demanded an effort to test Waldeman's credibility, his truthfulness, and particularly his special, Nixonian dictionary.

It was also a sign to the Nixon camp.

Extra space. Can be new chapter

For sheer daring, if steeled by desperation, that "Checkers" speech is without peer in United States political history, as it was in a political class by itself until The Watergate. The actuality is so difficult to credit it is best approached with the partial, later record of the same Richard Nixon whose career hung by the slightest fragile threat that night in late September 1952 when he was in danger of being dumped by

the embarrassed Eisenhower. After it was all over and the emotional reaction set in, the fatherly-appearing Ike called him "my boy" and ordained he was "clean as a hound's tooth." Until the reaction was clear, Ike must have been gagging. It was that kind of excessive, dishonest 30 minutes that only the most assiduous and unquestioning Nixonian can fail to have doubts about. It was cloyingly sick stuff below soap-opera logical contact with reality, one of the ingredients of its success.

That was the night Nixon sold the Brooklyn ~~Bridge~~^{Bridge} with a gilt-edge title, tears welling from his eyes, he was that sincere. Skeptics may be more inclined to attribute the wet eyes to fear, but sincere Nixon appears to be, no what what he says.

For Nixon all that counted was Nixon. For Eisenhower more than the unheard of, tossing the vice-presidential candidate away about six weeks for the election, was the worry. It was Eisenhower's prospects and those of the party.

American politics have been pretty raunchy, but there had never been anything like this, as there also had never been anything like The Watergate.

It is in this sense only that Nixon has ever been an innovator.

No analyst who heard, saw or read that speech can ever forget it. Recollection is assisted by my files and, among many good sources, the least dependable of which is Richard Nixon, in his Six Crises, a book by a political scientist of fine credentials, Dr. David A. Fried. His study is titled Conflict of Interest in the Eisenhower Administration. It was published in 1969 by Iowa State University Press and reprinted as a Pelican Book the next year. The third chapter is on Nixon and the Checkers speech. Drawing upon the gest of wags when Nixon presented himself as a poor man and the soap-opera quality in TV, he titled it The Poor Richard Show.

At that moment it was also a rather poor Eisenhower show for the campaign had not been going at all well when The New York Post broke the story the morning of September 18. It reported that a millionaires club had given him between \$16,000 and \$17,000 under the table while he was Senator. It was actually more than \$18,000.

(Here again The Watergating Nixon's repetition is stark. He then had another rich-

men's club backing him, ~~The~~ exclusive and reactionary "Lincoln Club based in Southern California's Orange County, where Nixon bought his San Clemente spread. They like to boast that without them he'd never be President. Their enthusiasm for him was undiminished a year after The Watergate, when Everett R. Holler ~~wrote~~ wrote an article on them for The New York Times of June 19. Some of them contributed what ran, ultimately, into the millions beginning with his 1946 campaign.)

Eisenhower, who had never been active in politics and had no known political affiliation, was an unknown colonel when the Democrats lifted him above many higher in rank for his World War II honors. After the war, after getting rich by special enactments which saved him taxes on the vast sum he was paid for his memoirs, which weren't worth it, Ike decided to accept the "Republican nomination, ~~perhaps~~ perhaps because he believed the Democrats were crooked and the Republicans were not.

His lackluster campaign was "running like a dry creek," as the staunchly "Republican New York papers of that day, The World Telegram and Sun, said August 25, 1952. So, while Nixon was declaiming about those "Twenty Years of Treason", Ike took after after "the mess in Washington." He alleged blundering, confusion, a muddle and a botch to the Democrats. Soon he was calling them fear-mongers, then looters and robbers.

(His special ~~benefits~~ ^{boodle}, the cost of which to the Treasury had to be made up by all other taxpayers, including the poor, was legal because it was legislated.)

As he lambasted that demon corruption much as a tub-thumping, bible-belt preacher whaled the demon run he kept enlarging on this theme. The first week of September he was claiming that for each exposed "human scandal there were 10 needing exposure. As he barnstormed with this message, the ~~Survey~~ Gallup poll gave him a clear lead by the middle of the month.

It was at this juncture, with the campaign picking up, with the ticket in the lead, and with corruption the issue, that the Post's story appeared.

Pasadena fat-cat Dana C. Smith conceded the accuracy of the story. He claimed only that Nixon had made no personal profit ~~from~~ from it, that all of it had ~~gone to his~~

gone to Nixon personally. It has been used for running his office. That did not make it right. It was still wrong. All it meant was that Nixon, allegedly, had not pocketed any of it.

They were sort of paying him for being "the outstanding salesman for ~~free~~ private enterprise ~~integrity~~ and integrity in government. "Dick did just what we wanted him to do," Frier quotes this spokesman for the special interests, those opposed to public housing, labor legislation, rent controls and closing tax loopholes, especially the oil-depletion allowance, as saying.

The first break Eisenhower and Nixon got was the reluctance of other papers to carry the story. The Post did release it for use. About 10% did. ~~xxxx~~ The Associated Press delayed it so long that it printed Nixon's defense without having printed what he was defending himself against.

That same week and Editor & Publisher poll quoted by Frier ~~he~~ showed that for every newspaper printed with an endorsement of the "democrats about nine copies endorsed the Eisenhower ticket.

Nixon tried to ignore the story when he first heard of it, calling the Post "partisan." Then he issued a statement admitting taking the money and claiming he had used it for "political expenses which I believe should not be charged to the Federal Government." (Smith explained some uses as exactly those for which all members of both houses receive regular allotments none of which are or are expected to be returned. Nixon's travel was another item included.

On the morning of September 19th, Nixon lost his cool when needled about this money. He attributed the story to "Communists" and "left-wingers" who "have been fighting me with every smear. ... What I was doing was saving you money." Among the picket signs he faced that day was a pal play on a mink-coat gift to the wife of a [^]ruman aide, "No Mink Coast for Nixon - Only Cold Cash." (There were soon other coats and other scandals under Eisenhower, vicuna coats.) Nixon's extemporaneous rejoinder to that one was that his wife Pat "ears a good ^{^^}epublican cloth coat." When they started pitching pennies

at him. Nixon had to know how bad the situation really was.

It may well be that his phobia about any kind of demonstrators derives from these ~~with~~ painful experiences.

Immediately the tide turned. Leading Republican papers were demanding that he remove himself from the ticket. It all caught up with Ike in the mid-west, where he was lambasting those "mossbacks, cronies, crooks and the disloyal" in Washington. It had grown to where he was ~~finding it too~~ finding it too uncomfortable, too dangerous to continue saying nothing.

There was a very real problem. What could he say? The patriotic hero had selected that paragon of Americanism for his running mate based only on the attention he had gotten in self-proclaimed loyalty, which was no more and no less than a campaign against those he called "Red" and, ipso facto, "UnAmerican." And his hot little fingers confirmedly were in the pick men's pockets.

After 24 hours, according to Frier, Ike expressed faith in Nixon as "an honest man" and said they would talk "at the earliest time we can reach each other by telephone." Off the record, after this less than thorough-going endorsement, Ike said, "I'm taking my time on this."

This was obvious. He could have used the phone before speaking - and after.

Nixon and his own backers read Ike's indecision clearly. They did the one thing they could, pre-empted it. According to Emmet John Hughes, Ike's chief speechwriter, "Events...were to outrace an Eisenhower decision. Suddenly and dramatically, Nixon, from Los Angeles, was telecasting his apologia to the nation."

Frier encapsulated what happened well." The Nixon telecast was at once horribly corny and immediately successful. The more sophisticated viewers generally regarded The Vice Presidential candidate's ad hincem approach as simply atrocious....Variety ...asserted that the performance was 'in the best tradition of American soap opera. It was a slick production...parlaying all the schmalz and human interest of 'Just Plain Bill' - 'Our Gal Sunday' genre of weepers. [Two of the more sentimental radio

sending a destroyer all the way back to Alaska for his pet Fala, allegedly forgotten there. His "kids love the dog", Nixon said, "and I just want to say this right now, that regardless of what they say about it, we're going to keep it."

The irrelevancy struck a responsive chord in Dog Lovers United. For weeks dog blankets, collars and an enormous supply of food p~~u~~ poured into the Nixon home. Washington's Tail Waggers Club even made Checkers a life member!

Of this fund so secret neither Eisenhower nor anyone on his staff knew about it Nixon insisted "it was not a secret fund." From here he went on to make a vague claim that in taking this money under the table he had somehow saved the taxpayers the more than \$18,000. There was no way this could have happened. "Like all other Senators, Nixon given free mail privileges and was ~~given~~ \$60,000 for office expenses with no legal way of extending it.

Lying was no sin in this kind of speech. Nixon, who had been using his mail fraud for other than Senatorial purposes, for a "poll" on ~~taxpayers~~ his constituents' preference for Republican presidential candidate, actually claimed that he would never abuse this Senatorial privilege because "the taxpayers shouldn't be required to finance items which are not official business."

His seeming clinchers on his personal integrity were the production of statements from his own "impartial" experts, in accounting to ~~be~~ certify that he "did not obtain any financial gain" for the money he took and in law to attest that he "did not violate any federal or state law by reason of the operation of the fund." The "operation" was irrelevant, the taking was not.

In his ~~first~~ expose The Facts about Nixon, the experienced reporter and news commentator William Costello describes the Nixon method as the debating technique known as tu quoque. In plain English this means, literally, "you're another." It is to accuse the accuser, and that Nixon also did, saying the Democrats also had secret funds and, if they did not admit this, it would mean "they have something to hide."

At no time in this speech did he ever face the issue. This became his trademark. Whatever wrong he thereafter did was not wrong but exposing it was wrong.

The whole thing was so raw that even Nixon didn't believe he had pulled it off when he finished the telecast. He quotes himself, in Six Crises, as telling his wife "at least we got the dog vote." Earl Maza, Nixon's biographer and partisan, reports in his book Richard Nixon that Hollywood tycoon Darryl Zanuck phoned Nixon shortly after he got back to his hotel to describe this "Poor Richard Show" as "the most tremendous performance I have ever seen."

It was that.

It even inspired Eisenhower to telegraph him "magnificent!" However, in the outpouring of teleggrams, Ike's was lost temporarily and Nixon was dejected, even complained that he wouldn't "crawl" to him.

When the Republican newspapers, which is most of those in the country, saw the emotional response, they joined in it with endless adjectives, all of praise.

Eisenhower, ^{as President was} who ~~was~~ to respond to the question what did Nixon do to help him by saying that if given a couple of weeks he might think of something, then hailed Nixon as "my boy."

The Eisenhower administration was a plagued with ~~be~~ minor and major graft as any other, despite his and Nixon's ~~maxi~~ campaign sanctimony. When his assistant Sherman Adams was caught up in such scandals, Adams tried to pull a "Checkers", but he wasn't up to it and Ike had to let him go.

In assessing a crime, lawyers ask themselves qui bono, which means "who benefited"?

In assessing The Watergate and Nixon's part in it, if any, analyst as the same question and another, if Nixon's record is consistent with his having had a part in it.

It is entirely consistent with Nixon's record.

In assessing Nixon's and what he would do and say after the arrests and the Watergate, keeping in mind the quote from Richard Nixon with which Frier opens his Checkers chapter provides dependable guidance:

"I had recognized from the time I became a member of the Committee on Un-American activities, and particularly after my participation in the Hiss case, that it [was] essential for me to maintain a standard of conduct which would not give my political opponents any solid ground for attack."

From Checkers onward, Nixon advance from tu quoque. As he was not again content with \$18,000 pittance, so also was he not content to attack critics as "you're another." Thenceforth, no matter what Nixon did, he was always right. No matter how wrong he really was, those who exposed him became the villains. He saw to it. He practised Chotiner's Law without deviation, never answering, always attacking.

If he is never seen at a "waker meeting, Nixon successfully commercialized his being born into a Wuaker home. He presents himself as a moralist, if awkwardly, always on some lofty plane. He is never embarrassed by his own record and never addresses the reality of it.

If Americans tend to resent any comparison with the hated Hitler, and his reference to ~~Hitler~~ the Nazi dictator was hurtful to the Mc^Uovern campaign in 1972, ~~as~~ it is impossible to find ~~such~~ ^{as} exemplary a rendition of Hitler's dictum, that unless a lie is made monstrously big it will not be believed, as Nixon's record provides.