



# The Alternative to Mr. Nixon's Guilt

Joseph Alsop

IT IS early days yet for so many people to be talking and writing, often with venomous self-righteousness, about "the guilt of Mr. Nixon." Common sense ought to forbid holding Presidents guilty of undoubted crimes until all the evidence is in.

God knows, later evidence may show that the President had full knowledge and complicity in all that mattered in the Watergate horror. Anything seems possible nowadays. But while awaiting the final verdict, it is worth examining the other possibility.

★ ★ ★

SOME TIME AGO, this reporter was one of a large group attending an awards ceremony in the President's Oval Office in the White House. It is a room on which every previous President always put the strongest kind of personal mark.

Yet President Nixon's Oval Office looks as if it had just come from the hands of an expensive, but rather second-rate decorator. It is totally impersonal, and it seems never to have been used at all.

John Ehrlichman was asked why the President prefers his hideaway in the Executive Office Building to this lovely, sunny oval room with a garden view.

"It's odd," said Ehrlichman in reply. "But the truth is that the President hates to work with a window behind his desk."

As it happens, hating to work with a window behind your desk is a classic symptom of mild agoraphobia. Agoraphobia, of course, is the opposite of claustrophobia, being an obsessive dislike of large crowds and wide open spaces.

That is the kind of President we now have, as is also proven by Richard M. Nixon's extreme reclusiveness and many other signs as well.

Yet if the President is indeed not guilty of any of the worst of the Watergate horror, it is also true that his mild agoraphobia has led to dreadful results. It caused him, first of all, to cut himself off almost totally from all but five men: H. R. Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Charles Colson, Murice Stans and John Mitchell.

Consider, then, the situation that resulted when the Watergate break-in first occurred. When the news of this piece of folly reached the President, he is known to have been all but uncontainably furious.

He was coldly angry when he called in Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, and told him emphatically, "The matter should be thoroughly investigated; let the chips fall where they may."

Consider, further, the situation of the men around the President, who had vast power and loved it, yet were deeply implicated in the Watergate break-in according to all present evidence.

How did they reply when he asked them: "What Goddam fool did this? All they valued most might have been lost to them if they had said, "Mr. President, we did it."

★ ★ ★

EVERYTHING that happened thereafter would have flowed quite naturally from that first untruth by these men whom the President trusted absolutely, who also controlled all access to him, who further had authority to give orders in his name.

Alas, however, saying it could have happened this way is altogether different from saying it really did happen in this way. This is why the President's role needs immediate clearing up.