

Your 11/12/74 memo on the WG conspiracy trial testimony being a replay of the Ervin committee hearings. Necessarily yes. Little new. We agree that the essence of the facts brought out by the Ervin committee already had been leaked, and that this accomplished the leakers' purposes. What we would add about the Ervin committee is this: The leaks came out piecemeal, were reported in a confused and startled way and in such haste that the proper interrelationships among them were not discerned and pointed out as they should have been. Only people like yourself, and to a much less extent, we, who were a priori interested and viewed through experience or predilection toward a questioning perspective had any chance of making the necessary connections of the fragmented parts into a coherent whole. The average person had neither incentive nor the means of doing anything of the kind. Most people were shocked and horrified, something that cannot be said of either of our two cases. We expected no better, in fact expected and still suspected much worse if anything. Not so with Mrs. People. They reacted at many of the revelations for which they had no preparation, made little if any of the automatic deductions we did, and in many many cases were dragged unwillingly along by the various stories and would have much preferred to forget the whole sordid business. Many did. Then came the Ervin hearings, which presented on national TV a coherent if watered down picture that was reasonably complete in the public mind and as a matter of fact much more complete than much of the public would have liked. That was followed somewhat later by the House Judiciary Committee report on impeachment which did a sort of update job on what the Ervin committee had produced, again on readily understandable TV, and whether we think either of these jobs was good, they combined to convince most of the yokels that Nixon had to go. Otherwise we would not have gone, and enough of the yokels would have risen to Rabbi Koff's emotional bait about the presidency to have made it possible for him to survive. As usual, the right thing happened for the wrong reasons, but it happened, however incompletely and half-heartedly it was made to happen.

Add to your impressions of the conspiracy trial: We note that alone of the defendants, Waldman is cheerful and brash. The rest glum. Indicates Halieman still has some real or fancied control over Nixon. We'll see.

We dissent on Ehrlichman. We too noted his lawyer's puzzling act in going after Nixon. Expected in a lawyer who served as a straw man in the wind we haven't been able to nail down. We heard that he had visited Nixon ~~soon~~ soon after the trial and was with Jim Elmore. But no word of Bebe since then. I'll believe it when I see it. I'll believe it when I see it. I am prepared to.

Your 11/12/74 memo on the WG conspiracy trial testimony. I have read it carefully and saw nothing which was not carried by the Ervin committee.

Waldman's case. Waldman used to work for them and I have no doubt still does when the need arises. His attack on Holtzman certainly. This is not his first lapse from what is usually a stand one can identify with a normal, reasoning, liberal man.

Only one clip enclosed, out of the past but still interesting.

Apologies for this choppy, garbled letter. As I said, we both are trying to catch up somewhat with things that have been neglected for years.