

The questioning was vigorous (Schoumaker and Donaldson), with the questions he had declined to answer or parried repeated despite awareness of his desire not to answer them. More than on Today (other side, same tape), Jaworski came across as a tough, shrewd, sensitive man not easily booby-trapped, crossed up or persuaded to change his mind. He is diplomatic (as in saying nice things about Ford, who he actually called a liar) and about Scott, of whom he said Scott didn't know what he was talking about).

Watching him reminded me of what I had told Barry Sussman after the Post had not used the documents from my files it had obtained: Jaworski is an Establishmentarian, not somebody's creature, whether or not he serves the interests of others. His primary purpose is to serve the interest of the Establishment as he at any time sees it. If he believes this means protecting Nixon, that I think he would do. If it means doing a thorough job, then I think he would do that. He also had a very serious problem he inherited and about which he can do nothing: an informed staff that would not sit by in silence if he tried to pull something. So, what Cox was into he can't abort and probably won't try to except where there may be a close question and the importance he sees to justify the risk. What he goes into that Cox had not started is a different matter, and there he has more flexibility and more arguments.

As I remember it Jaworski, asked about Ford's statement on ~~Face the Nation~~ Face the Nation today (I missed it), that the White House had given Jaworski more tapes than he had asked for, he said he understood Ford to be referring to materials and the answer was that it had not. Asked suppose Ford did say tapes, answer still no. And he has asked for what he has not gotten and tomorrow something is to eventuate on this. Oh, politely, Ford is a lying propagandist.

Scott has <sup>ed</sup>calimed Dean is a perjurer. Jaworski was press hard on this and Dean as a felon. He was, in return, quite firm: no reason to believe Dean committed perjury and no reason to believe he is even a liar. The import is that he believes Dean was truthful and will be and is a dependable witness.

There was scant protection for Scott in his saying he did not know what Scott had seen. He said that nothing he has seen from the WH or any other source casts any doubt on Dean and the truth. Further, if he had any reason to doubt, Dean or any other witness, he would not use him. This is pretty strong stuff and more than clobbering Scott, seems to forecast taking Nixon on head-on. Whether or not in the end he does, it should please his staff. And this, as everything else he has done of which I know, is earning him the high regard of all the ~~media~~ media. He comes across solidly, strongly, as an honest, dedicated man.

Ford has needs and serves them. His apparent need is to serve Nixon, which would seem to presage an end to any ambitions he might have. So, his crappy behavior does not lead to the interesting conjectures that should follow any assesement of what the hell Scott is or can be up to and why.

Besides, Ford is really that kind of guy. He is not the defent man he has been made out to be nor is he responsible, honest or anything else praiseworthy. He is a political whore with a long record proving it.

Scott has wavered over the long months of the disclosures, beginning as a Nixon apologist and then pretending otherwise. However, he recently has taken a firm position from which he seems to have little escape. It is a hazardous position for his future as it is for his ability to lead his own party in the Senate. On the face it is an untenable position and there seems to be no need for him to ~~run~~ run the risks.

Scott was answered firmly and directly and in court when he said Dean was proven to be a perjurer in what he had seen. Now Scott is not only a lawyer. He was Philadelphia's DA when he was first elected to the House. So, he knows to begin with that he was making a judgement of evidence; would be known to be doing this whereas he said the opposite, pretending it wasnot merely his opinion; and on the basis of much less than others had in their possession. It is apparent that he did not have full and complete transcripts if he had any, not just selections and paraphrases. In itself the situation is too hazardous for any experienced politician to run this kind of high risk. Why? It can't be merely party or personal loyalty. If I don't know the answer, it would seem an obvious possibility that he is himself in some kind of bind where Nixon holds the wrench on the screwheads. GSA contracts?