

COPYRIGHTED - ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
Credit line required as follows:
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ST. LOUIS
Archive & Manuscript Div.

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Daniel Schorr
CBS News Commentator

Speaks on

WATERGATE

Wednesday, April 18
12:40 P.M.
118 SSBE

Sponsored by the University Program Board
Financed with Student Activity Funds

Introduction by Dwight Williams, Assistant Professor of Speech, English Dept.:
For twenty years, Mr. Schorr has been a leading foreign and national correspondent for CBS News. His most recent assignment has been the coverage of the Watergate Trial. (testing microphones)

WILLIAMS: Ladies and Gentlemen: Good afternoon and welcome to our assembly. Perhaps you are like I was earlier today, wondering if our speaker would even be able to show up, in view of the very fast breaking events in the Watergate story in the last couple of days. And I am told by our speaker that as soon as he got off the plane here in St. Louis, he had a phone call immediately asking, begging, him to turn around and go back...not begging?...(laughter), okay! But, anyway, I think it is a measure of his esteem for us that he decided to stay. So, I think we are all especially grateful for that. Certainly the most disturbing story to come out of the 1972 Presidential Campaign was the one concerning the series of events which has come to be known as the "Watergate Affair." Indeed, the major news story of the last twenty-four or forty-eight hours has been a series of fast breaking developments relating

to Watergate. Several years ago, Richard Nixon wrote a book entitled, "Six Crises." Today, President Nixon seems to be swirling in the middle of his seventh crisis, or eighth or ninth, depending on whether you have been keeping score, I guess. This crisis, however, raises a number of questions which trouble scholar, layman, candidates, voters, Democrats and Republicans alike. Just how high up in the administration did knowledge and direction of this operation go? What was the extent of the espionage against the Democrats? Has the President been deliberately deceived by his most trusted lieutenants? Are political espionage and campaign sabotage now accepted practices in the way of democracy? Why did so few voters in 1972 indicate any particular concern over Watergate? Is it true, as many believe, that, "Oh, well, that's politics!"...or, that, "The Democrats must be doing the same thing, but were just too smart to get caught at it!" Can free speech, free political assembly, and free election campaigns survive such assaults? Indeed, is there any security from such practices in an age when electronic mass media are the primary means of election campaigning? It will probably be many weeks or months yet before we have complete answers to these questions. In the meantime, we'll be kept abreast of the latest developments in this case by today's guest speaker. And I am sure that when the full story is finally known, it will have been in great part primarily due to his persistent digging for the facts in one of the major news stories of our time. Our guest is Mr. Daniel Schorr, correspondent for CBS News. Actually, he established a firm journalistic reputation before entering broadcasting by serving as a European correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor and the New York Times. CBS sent him to Moscow in 1955 to reopen their news bureau there which had been closed by Joseph Stalin. Mr. Schorr was on hand to cover some of the crucial events during the next few years. The emergence of Khrushchev, the purge of Khrushchev's enemies, space ventures, and the anti-Communist uprisings in the satellites.

They scored a historic scope with Khrushchev's first television interview, which appeared on "Face the Nation" in 1957. The next ten years, Mr. Schorr covered major news events at home and abroad. He spent six of those years as head of CBS News in Germany and Eastern Europe. Since 1966, however, Mr. Schorr has been covering major stories here in the United States. His special interest is what he calls "people" problems, pollution, poverty, health, welfare. He has developed a reputation in Washington of being a tough-minded persistent digger for facts beneath the surface in analyzing these major problems. This quality so endeared him to the Administration that they had him investigated by the FBI reportedly as a prelude to offering him a job. I understand that he is still waiting for that job offer! At CBS News, he has been the principal investigator covering the Watergate story, and it is his close knowledge of this story and his tough-minded persistence as a journalist which make his observations and his insights on the Watergate Affair so valuable to us today.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great privilege for me to present our distinguished guest, Mr. Daniel Schorr: (applause)...

SCHORR: I'd like to take home with me a picture of this occasion. I want to show it to Vice-President Agnew. (laughter) And tell him that it isn't true that we television people are always talking down to people! (laughter) A week ago, I heard from the University asking me if I could provide an advance copy...advanced text...of what I was going to say. (laughter) I said that I don't deal very much in advanced texts. They tend to get sometimes out-dated. (laughter) I'm glad that you could all be here today in such large numbers to hear my important lecture on pollution in the environment! (laughter) The timing was pretty good, wasn't it? You have some pretty good people arranging your lectures. I guess I'm going to have to tell you today what I really should be saying on television. I had some misgivings about

whether I should really leave Washington after last night. After Eastern Airlines went on strike and cancelled my flight, I had more misgivings. (laughter) But, I got up at dawn and got on a plane and did fly out here. When I got here, I talked to my Bureau chief in Washington who wanted to know (it isn't what you call "begging" me!)"... "What in hell are you doing in St. Louis?" (laughter). I told him that in fifteen years of occasionally doing selected lectures, I had never missed one and didn't want to break my record. It didn't particularly impress him. (laughter) In any event, I do like to keep commitments to people that I have made, I don't like to stand people up, and I did take the chance of coming here with the idea that, as soon as possible thereafter, I would be on my way back to Washington today. But it leaves me in the strange position, after what happened yesterday, of thinking some thoughts and sharing with you the thoughts that perhaps I might be sharing with a less select audience if I were back in Washington. But all that is just talk. This is not a prepared lecture. This is reflections after the fall.

Yesterday, President Nixon came out and said in effect that what he had been denying and what his administration had been denying these past months and what many of us in the news media had been trying to tell the American people, that, yes, it was, after all, basically true. He hadn't known it. He began to find out on March 21. March 21, he undertook his own investigation, brought in the Justice Department, sidelined the White House staff, and, as a result of his own investigation, he had found out some shocking things! (laughter) He found out that people in the White House, people close to him, ...they had been involved not only in the Watergate conspiracy, which he might have forgiven, (laughter) but then, in keeping the facts from him (laughter) ... I guess it is a terrible temptation for me today to stand here at what is really a moment of triumph for those who had to endure some very nasty mail and telephone calls last fall charging us with inventing the Watergate

case, using some very commonplace political hanky-panky for a partisan attack on President Nixon. Charles Colson of the White House then called CBS where we were in the midst of doing our too-long explanation of Water-gate to say it was an abuse of the airways to spend that much time talking about an inconsequential matter, and now that President Nixon has said that there are major developments, and that persons in major positions will not be immune to indictment and prosecution, I suppose it would be a terrible temptation to come and stand here today and say, "I told you so." That doesn't interest me very much, because it would be true even if President Nixon had not talked about it yesterday. It was true before he decided (after Senator Goldwater told him that there had been difficulty raising money for Republican dinners and the country was beginning to perceive this as a major scandal...that the Party and the Administration were being hurt) ...that...the time had come to come clean. And if none of that had happened, we are still where we were last fall...lonely voices crying in a wilderness of apathy...it would be no less true. We do not rely on the confirmation of the Administration, or even the President of the United States, to know that what we have found out, is true...(although when that confirmation comes, you take a certain satisfaction in it.) It is tough today gathering news in Washington. It is tough, and it is becoming tougher. I am not a crybaby about news. I am not one of those who thinks that the government owes it to us to hand us news on a silver platter. I worked too long at this and I am aware of an inevitable and, perhaps, even desirable adversary relationship between those who want to tell you what is going on and the government people who want you to know what is going on, as much as they want you to know, at the time they want you to know, and the way they want you to know. It is the business of government, or part of the business of government, to let the information come out in a way that will suit the Administration. It is the business of newsmen to get

that, yes...

and cover that, yes...

and find out what else is going on...

what is not being said,

what is being saved to be said...at some other time. And I don't mind that.

It is a part of the rules of the game. It is adversary and will always be adversary. Institutions are there to protect themselves, ...the press is

there to open them to the light of day. Their interests are not always the same. There will be friction, sometimes friendly...and, sometimes, bitter.

It is a part of the separation of powers and a part of the separation of

functions in a democracy. But some of the atmosphere in Washington reminds

me a little too much...a little bit...don't get this line wrong...but, it

reminds me a little bit of the atmosphere of living in Moscow, a country be-

hind the Iron Curtain...at certain times...only in a limited way...that you

feel on the outside, dealing with a government that profoundly distrusts you,

profoundly disrespects you, and regards you..almost neurotically...as a part

of the enemy. It was rough back there in Russian days, even though I had a

rather bantering friendly relationship with Khrushchev when he was at his

highest. I was subject to censorship of everything that I wrote for broad-

cast, and if I tried to say...as I did...things on the air which had been banned

by the censors, I would be cut off the air. And yet the censorship of my

script didn't matter in those days as much as the censorship of news at its

source. You couldn't get news. You could get communiques, you could get

Soviet News Agency, you could get what they wanted to announce, and the rest

of that country, the bureaucracy was almost a closed book. I'll give you one

example of news collecting in the Soviet Union.

In 1956, summer of 1956...

was a very tense time behind the Iron Curtain. That was a summer when the

negotiations were going on over the Suez, which was going through a crisis

which was going to lead to a war over Suez. At the same time, things were becoming unstuck in the Communist camp. There had been riots in Poland and East Germany and soon there would be a great blood bath of anti-Communist uprising in Hungary. And in September of that year, Khrushchev, who had spent most of the summer away from Moscow, showed up on the scene amid rumors that there was going to be a special meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. To have known whether the Central Committee was meeting would, in itself, have been of some importance to us. The Central Committee is the highest organ of the Communist Party, the Communist Party rules the Communist country, the government is merely an agent and organ of it...the Central Committee meets in regular session about once a year and rarely meets in special session...and, if it were true and, if we could ascertain the Central Committee was meeting in special session... well, then...you could assume crisis, or important reversal of policy. Where do you go in Moscow to find out if the Central Committee is meeting? Even if you live in the National Hotel, facing the Kremlin, you cannot find out what is happening behind those walls. You call up the only office that we are supposed to call up, the press department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, the answer inevitably is, "When we have something to announce, you will read it in Pravda." And some of my friends said to me, "Since you seem to have such a great relationship with Khrushchev, why don't you try to find out directly from him the next time he's at a diplomatic reception?" I said, "I'll try." Two days later, there was Khrushchev at a reception. And I walked...it was the first time that I had seen him since his return from summer vacation. He had been...gone off...on a hunting trip with President Tito of Yugoslavia in Yugoslavia, and then, he had brought Tito back to do some (walking/talking?) in the Crimea, and now here he was, tan and bronzed, with a champagne glass in his hand, and I walked up to him with another champagne glass, we clinked glasses, we went through some of the heavy-handed

banter that goes on on those occasions, we talked about his hunting trip, how many deer he had shot...(he had shot more deer than Tito!)...(laughter). And finally, I said, "Mr. Khrushchev, it must be beautiful this time of year hunting in the Crimea. Do you think that I could go down there on a hunting trip, perhaps?"

And he said, "Of course!"

And he began to wave his hand at someone to arrange a trip for this joker. (laughter)

I interrupted him and said, "But I have a special problem...maybe you could help me with it. Actually, I was thinking of taking two weeks off, maybe starting tomorrow, go down to the Crimea, maybe, for a trip. But, my capitalist bosses back in New York, CBS, they cabled me saying I wasn't to leave Moscow unless I could assure them that I wouldn't be missing something important while I was away." (laughter)

And I don't know what to tell them in view of the rumors about a meeting of your Central Committee."

He said, "Uh-huh." Great old ham that he was, having now perceived where the whole conversation was leading, he took a very confidential attitude and leaned towards me in the midst of this crowded reception and said, "Mr. Schorr, let me see if I understand your problem. You'd like to leave tomorrow?"

"Yes."

"For about two weeks?"

"Yes."

"And you're afraid that you might miss a meeting of the Central Committee, right?"

"Right."

"You can go on your trip."

I said, "You mean I can go on my trip? There isn't going to be any meeting?"

"No," he said, "don't worry! If necessary, we'll have the meeting without you!" (laughter)

That was the lighter side!

The heavier side of trying to cover news was sitting there, day after day, with a copy of Pravda in your hands, and nothing else. No real statistical reports. No explanations of how policies were arrived at, surprises being thrown at you all the time, and trying to ferret out by a very careful reading of the Pravda editorial (three or four times) whether they were hinting at some change in policy or some trouble that they were in.

Then, in 1966, after all my years abroad, I came home.

To America.

To be re-Americanized...

A decision which, after twenty years as a foreign correspondent...

You come home and catch up with your own country...or...

The danger is that you are going to become a permanent ex-patriot.

Well...

I was going to be an American.

I came home.

And you get some vivid impressions those first few days...professional impressions. The starkest and biggest impression I got my first day at the CBS office in Washington was...the mountain of information that passed across my desk, unasked for.

Every department of the government pouring out reports.

Press offices calling up and inviting you to press conference, "We want to tell you about coal production."

"We want to tell you about what we are doing in the environment."

"We want to tell you about our new social program."

"We want to show you how far we are going to help desegregate the schools... about new statistics being collected."

And it was, in a way, almost like a POW with his first steak and banana-split after a meager diet in a prison camp.

I didn't know what to do with all the material on my desk.

Too much information.

Too rich for my blood.

It took me about three weeks to wake up to something.

The Russians with their psychosis for secrecy, tell you nothing, nothing.

The telephone book is secret in Moscow! (laughter)

It is! You can't get a telephone book in Moscow.

They tell you nothing.

You're an American capitalist spy. Don't tell him anything. It might be dangerous.

Back in America...

Pour it out! Fill them up with information!

And the outcome was that you begin to realize that between virtually no information and a flood of information...

Somehow, both were serving the same purpose...

To keep you from getting at the truth!

It's just that American public relations is somewhat more sophisticated.

You are kept busy with a lot of information...most of it useful and, yet, you are left feeling that you don't really know what is going on, what's really going on.

I mean, it was true during the Johnson Administration...which I covered.

And it was hard...

And you have to dig and you have to talk to people.

And you find out that the government isn't monolithic.

The White House thinks one way about something and may impose its view...

But over at HEW, they disagree...

Think that shouldn't have happened.

And if you talk to both sides, it becomes a little bit more bifocal, and you get some better idea of how policies develop, what the conflicts are and what the issues are.

And that began to become very difficult in the Nixon Administration. It began to become most difficult when it came to Watergate.

Watergate, starting last June and now almost a year ago, developed a kind of defensive psychosis which really began to remind me somewhat of the Russians...

Where they felt that any question you asked about it was meant to trap them! There was a defensiveness that made it almost impossible to conduct a normal and civilized conversation.

So, how do we find out about Watergate?

Well, first of all, you know that police found five people...red-handed... in Watergate...Democratic headquarters.

But, from then on, the strategy of the Administration apparently was, "Okay, we can't deny that five people were arrested."

And, later, I revealed, based on FBI information, that two others, Howard Hunt and Gordon Liddy, had escaped arrest on that occasion but were nearby, and the strategy then was, "Those seven...we can't deny it. They fell into the hands of the police. Let justice take its course for them. But limit the conspiracy to the seven. Let's say, 'Gordon Liddy went off on a caper of his own.'"

A little hard to sustain...

A caper of his own with \$300,000 of money given to him by officials to Re-elect the President!

Well, you know, they didn't know what he was doing. They just gave him \$300,000...(laughter) and he organized a conspiracy.

However weird that may seem, that was the premise on which the prosecution based its case. The case ran from Gordon Liddy down to a Cuban-born lock-

smith and that was all there was to it.

How it was financed, who had ordered it, who had gotten the wiretap reports, how the wire reports were used...was not a part of the prosecution. The prosecutor, Earl Silver, bright, competent young man...

But...whose future lies...

Whose promotion lies...

In being in good with the Department of Justice...said that he had no reason to believe that the criminal conspiracy went beyond Gordon Liddy!

For three weeks, the case was conducted based that way.

It was a kind of Alice-in-Wonderland!

If you sat in the courtroom, Gordon Liddy, leader of the conspiracy and not even the judge could accept all that was being said. The judge wanted to know more, but he couldn't get more.

The witnesses, the accused, said, "We don't know anything. Gordon Liddy told Howard Hunt. Howard Hunt told Jim McCord, and so went in."

The FBI knew more.

The FBI had asked a lot of questions of a lot of people. The FBI had told the Department of Justice more...

And that ill-fated Navy Officer, Patrick Gray...

As Acting Director of the FBI, Patrick Gray, being the Navy Officer type, who thinks that when you've got some information and a superior ought to know, you ought to send it to him, had gone so far as to send a memorandum to President Nixon saying, "Hey, there's more to this than you may think, Mr. President!" (laughter)

"In fact, Mr. President, the funny thing is that we keep running, in our investigation, into people at the White House!"

That got Mr. Gray into trouble with powerful people at the White House.

For a while, he was left to sit there, as Acting Director of the FBI, and it was a serious question as to whether or not he was going to be nominated

as permanent director.

It went back and forth.

There were some against him...

There were some for him.

He finally was nominated and, then, they made a further mistake of cooperating with the Senate Judiciary Committee which had to recommend his confirmation!

He really is a very simple man, Mr. Gray.

When they asked him for FBI material on Watergate, he gave it to them.

He mentioned names like John Dean, Counselor for the President.

It was very embarrassing to the White House, and they told him to stop giving that information.

By that time, he was in trouble with the White House...

In trouble with the Judiciary...

And in trouble with Congress...

And in trouble with himself.

A very sorely perplexed man.

The White House basically withdrew its support for him.

They let him sink.

They were through with Pat Gray, but not with Watergate!

One other thing had happened, With Pat Gray pointing finers...FBI information.

Pat Gray was telling the Committee and the country officially not much more than the news media had been saying last fall, except now it was official.

Now, one more thing happened.

One of the convicted people talked. Jim McCord decided that he'd had enough.

Jim McCord, of all the defendants, was the least ideological. You have to understand about the Watergate. You had different kinds of people involved.

The five from Miami, Cuban-born, had one basic motive (aside from the fact that they were fairly well paid.) They had one basic motive.

They will never forgive the Democrats because President Kennedy did not go

all out in the Bay of Pigs operation.

He got scared. He pulled back air support, and they retained...the Cuban exile community...had retained a resentment, a hatred, of the Democrats. They think that if President Kennedy had stuck to an all-out invasion of Cuba, they would have been rid of Castro...

And they would have been back...

Happy...

In Cuba today.

And I'm not competent to judge that part of it...

I'm only saying that for the Cuban exile community, or at least the weider fringe of it, their great motive was, "The Democrats are our enemy...as exile Cubans." And they were ready for anything.

"Tell us where to go, as long as it's against the Democrats."

And they were told. They were fed stories about Senator McGovern...if he were elected, he would recognize Castro. Senator McGovern got campaign funds from Castro. That's all these five had to know. (laughter)

And then you had Howard Hunt.

Howard Hunt has written about thirty-three novels...all bad! (laughter)
Spy novels.

Howard Hunt, when he was sent out to interview _____ of ITT, puts on a red wig. (laughter)

He did! He put on a red wig, a very badly fitting red wig.

Howard Hunt cannot do anything without putting on a cloak and maybe getting a dagger! (laughter)

Howard Hunt lives in a world of "who-done-it?" He lives in the kind of novels that he wrote. And he used to work for the CIA, and he also has very strong feelings about Castro. He was a friend of these Cubans, and he also had very important work to do against the Democrats.

Gordon Liddy...

The most interesting one of the group...

And the one that we really know the least about.

Up-and-coming, bright, young lawyer, Assistant District Attorney for Poughkeepsie, New York...

Ran for Congress and lost....

Ran on a very right-wing platform...

Communist enemy...

"Watch for the Communists; they are all over!"

Very ambitious.

FBI background...They all had FBI background!

And CIA backgrounds!

People with the kind of mind bent to conspiracy tend to drift to investigative agencies. I mean...that's a wonderful home for them. (laughter)

Gordon Liddy was a lawyer, though.

He was very natty...

At times he wore a nice black moustache...

Anyway, nice suits...

And Gordon Liddy...

Liddy, who sold himself to some of the right-wing in the Republican party, was brought into the White House as a consultant.

He was consulted on matters like, "How do we find out where the New York Times got the Pentagon Papers?"...he came up with an idea. "Let's put a bug in the New York Times!" (laughter) He proposed bugging the New York Times hoping to hear the conversations about the Pentagon Papers!

He worked in the Treasury for a while...

Involved in looking for drug traffickers.

It isn't only political conspiracy. Sometimes you branch out into anything that involves undercover investigation.

...A lawyer with FBI background who likes anything with the smell of undercover!

(laughter)

And he became the counselor for the Committee to Re-elect the President!

And then, Counsel for the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President!

And he had an office in the White House and an office across the street in the Campaign Headquarters.

Those were the seven.

And it was testified in court that he drew up to \$300,000!

Hugh Sloan, Treasurer of the Committee, said that he gave him...gave it to him...because...

He didn't know what for, but he had been told by Jeb Magruder that it was all right for him to have it.

Jeb Magruder, Deputy Director of the Campaign Committee, said he didn't know what it was for. He understood that it was all right with John Mitchell.

John Mitchell said that he didn't know anything about it! (laughter)

It would be...

At the very least...

One of the cleverest "con" games ever practiced on a Campaign Committee which prided itself on efficient management!

In 1970, President Nixon said, after a campaign that wasn't run very well by some of the Republican candidates, President Nixon said publicly, "That was not my campaign. In 1972, it will be my campaign."

And it was true.

When the Committee to Re-elect the President was set up, it was set up by people delegated from the White House. All of us in Washington could see how it was being set up.

Jeb Magruder, who was on the White House staff, was sent over to this building across the street.

One after another...

They came over from the White House and...

The operation was a branch of the White House.

It's not even to be criticized when the President is running for re-election.

You would expect that he would have some influence on how the campaign committee is set up and run. You would be surprised if it were otherwise. But

it was set up, in management terms, with a President who prides himself...

Among all the things he prides himself on...

It is on efficient management and control.

And there were all the elements of control.

Every section of that headquarters had a weekly activity report which then went to the Campaign Director...who then assembled it all into a large activity report, centralizing the smaller ones, and went to the White House.

Everyone wanted to know what everyone else was doing.

But nobody knew why \$300,000 was given to Gordon Liddy!

Nobody knew that!

Yes, we traced where the money came from...

A man named, Vesco...

Involved with the Security Exchange Commission...

And now, with the prosecutor...in what may be a truly monumental fraud involving a \$120,000,000....

When he was under investigation, he was asked by Maurice Stans for a contribution in cash!

Lots of other people, in trouble, were being asked for contributions in cash

...

In cash!

The record of the Watergate case is full of hundred dollar bills!

All business...was done in hundred dollar bills.

The story didn't hang together.

It wasn't important, last fall, for the Administration that the story hang

together.

It was only important that they survive until November 7.

If it would be possible...

Deflect criticism, confuse people...

You just did not either deny or simply minimize...

The general strategy was, "Yeah, some things went on, but, you know, weird things, second-rate burglary."

The American public accepted that. Right?

Up until November 7.

I know...

Because when we tried to explain Watergate on the air, we were deluged with protests.

When I lectured to groups from Dallas to Boston, the general impression was ...boredom.

Couldn't get through...

There was one essential point that I was trying to get through.

One essential point that I was trying to get through all these remarks about, "Yeah, but politics is dirty. These were their dirty tricks."

One point I wanted to make, and now, maybe, the President has helped me to make it.

Watergate was different, different in its dimensions, and different in its quality, from any other kind of dirty trick played in any other campaign ever. And different in a way that represents a danger to democratic government.

To explain the difference...

Let me tell you about one man.

There was a man named Alfred Baldwin, III...

Former FBI agent...

Brought in by Jim McCord, as a man who sat in a Howard Johnson Motel across

from the Watergate and did the actual monitoring. He had on earphones and he...

The tacks were over there and it was being transmitted, and he was sitting there listening and taking notes...first by hand, and then by typewriter, and he wrote those logs.

Before then, he had had a job...

His first job was as bodyguard to Martha Mitchell. (laughter)

Then, they took him off that, and they gave him this job.

And he did it.

When I interviewed Baldwin, before the trial started, and we did an interview on camera which got me into possible trouble...

Which I will tell you about later...

But, then, we walked together on the beach up at New Haven where he lives.

And I said, "There's one thing that I am curious about, Al. (We had now become friendly.) Now, you look back on it, I mean, now you are the government star witness for this trial and you have been given immunity from prosecution by the government because you are the star witness. But, looking back on it, do you have any sense of doing something wrong?"

And he thought about that for a bit, and he said, "No, not really. But," he said, "how could I have?" He said, "You know, there I was, hired by Jim McCord, Security Co-ordinator for the Re-election Committee, and of the Republican National Committee. McCord told me that I was really working for John Mitchell, who was, after all, formerly Attorney General, the chief law man of the United States. In the room at that motel, I was surrounded by former CIA people and former FBI people." Fred LaRue, former White house Aide, now with the Committee, issued him a pistol. He said, "I can't take that pistol. I don't have any permit for it."

LaRue said, "When you're working for us, you don't have to worry about permits."

Baldwin said once when he wanted to fly home on a weekend to New Haven, it occurred to him that the pistol would show up on a jijack check. So, he said, "What do I do with this pistol, if anyone asks me?"

He was given a printed card by the Committee to Re-elect the President with a name and phone number. He said, "If you have any trouble with this or anything, tell whoever it is to call this number."

So he went to the Washington Airport, and went up to the desk and said, "I'm getting on this Allegheny plane to New Haven, and I'm carrying a weapon which will show up."

"Oh, you're a law enforcement officer?"

"No, not currently."

"Well, do you have a license to carry this pistol?"

"Well, no, I don't, but I'm told to give you this card." (laughter)

This story is hard to believe. And (laughter) he handed his card to the person and said, "Well, you call that number."

And Baldwin said that he, himself, didn't think that would work, but the passenger agent called that number and spent a couple of minutes on the phone, and said, "Okay, Mr. Baldwin, go abroad."

And handed him back the pistol.

"How could I," said Baldwin, "have any knowledge that I was doing something wrong when I was working for law enforcement people? When I was told that I was working for John Mitchell and, basically, the President of the United States? You know," he said, "I'm just an FBI man. I take orders. And I'm surrounded by all the majesty of government. So, what I was doing had to be right. You know, in the FBI and the CIA, you do things which are technically illegal, sometimes. But, basically, you are enforcing the law." And that was what I tried to get through and couldn't get through last fall, and maybe what I can begin to get through now...

That what made Watergate totally different from tricks by Republicans against

Democrats, or tricks by Democrats against Republicans, is that it was a conspiracy to break the law...which could only work if those involved in it were convinced by the presence and authority of government above them. That, in some way, they were enforcing the law. And when we reach the point in this country where those whom we entrust with the enforcement of laws become involved in confusing people about the line between legality and illegality, between law enforcement and law breaking, then, I think, we are in trouble.

But I didn't get through.

I didn't get through last fall, and it didn't affect the election, and I'm not sure if it had gotten through that anybody could have lost the election against Senator McGovern...the way things stood back then.

Maybe it wouldn't have been 61%.

And I tell you that I am not concerned, except as a matter of observation, with whether Senator McGovern, or President Nixon, was elected. I am not professionally concerned. You call the shots, and you give the information. The Nixon Administration thinks that I am part of some conspiracy, since they see everything as conspiracy...that I was part of some conspiracy against President Nixon.

I don't think that I will ever convince them that if anything like that had happened under a Johnson, or Kennedy Administration, that I would have been working just as hard to expose it.

But what mostly concerns me, beyond any president and beyond any Administration, are the free institutions in this country. I have lived too long in countries where they are not free to happily see the undermining of institutions of respect for law that we have spent an awful long time in this country to build up and to sustain.

And, now, we come to today.

And now, President Nixon...

Well, let me tell you, before that, I was not surprised at President Nixon's statement yesterday. Before the election, shortly before the election, a friend of mine who is a White House associate (yes, I still have a couple of friends in the White House) said to me, (I can't give you his name because I don't even give Grand Juries names of courses), but (laughter), he said to me, as we talked about Watergate, he said, "We know. We know, and we are dismayed. But don't expect the President to do anything about it before the election."

Right. Right. He wouldn't risk votes on this, would he?

"The President knows, and don't expect anything before the election."

The implication was, "After the election, watch!"

And, then, another White House source said to me (I'm going to have to be very careful saying "White House source", because a colleague of mine once on the air referred to a very well-informed "White Horse souse!") (laughter)... Another source recently said to me, "The President is going to move on this, because if there is anything the President dislikes, it's being embarrassed. He's been embarrassed by people in the White House and nearby, and they'll go."

And it's true. As this Administration began, you began to see a movement ...that everybody whose name had been connected with Watergate...Chuck Colson, who was the White-House-Man-In-Charge-of-Dirty-Tricks, (laughter) left to go into law practice. Dwight Chappin, Appointment Secretary, left to go to United Airlines in Chicago. One after another, you began to see every person whose name we've been concerned with, leaving the White House, one after the other...most of them. Few names remain of the names that had turned up in the FBI reports which, by the way, if you want to basically know...if you want to basically know what it was all based on, these reports that, mainly, the Washington Post, and some of the rest of us, were giving during August, September, October and November...basically, they were...we

didn't have that kind of investigative resources...basically, people in the FBI were outraged that the information they had dug up was not being given attention to. The leaks were the leaks of people, you might say, ...were whistle-blowers. I don't want to get anybody in the FBI into trouble, but I will tell you that there were a whole lot of little Daniel Elsberegs outraged by what they knew and what they country didn't know. And so, some of it leaked out. But, it wasn't believed. And it was neglected.

Now, we are asked to believe that the President, the President, who was predicted to me would do something after the election...a kind of scenario is written for it...

You're asked to believe...

If you really closely study the President's statement (and I read that the way I used to read statements by the Soviets, looking for meanings in between lines)...

And there are lots of little meanings.

It's all right there.

For example, he says, "I initiated an investigation on March 21 after receiving serious information, serious new charges. The investigation was conducted by the Justice Department. Last Sunday, I conferred in the Executive Office Building with Attorney General Kleindeinst and with Assistant Attorney General Peterson."

Now that line is very interesting. "Last Sunday, I conferred in the Executive Office Building..."

Why make a point in a statement of this importance of saying, "I conferred in the Executive Office Building...?"

You are saying, "I don't believe the people in the White House. I don't trust John Dean, my Counsel, anymore. I may not be trusting H.R. Haldemann,

my Chief of Staff."

This line, "I held a conference at the Executive Office Building..."

The Executive Office Building is an extension of the White House. It's a building right next door in which...if the White House doesn't have enough space...all the other assistants flow off into the EOB, as it is called. But, why make a point of saying that he (the President) had his meeting there, other than to say that he wanted to meet elsewhere than in the White House? Met with Kleindeinst and Assistant Attorney General Peterson. He didn't say that Peterson is in charge of criminal investigation! That's his job in the Justice Department. Where were the other people that he should have mentioned as having conferred with? Where was somebody representing the White House? Where was his Counselor, John Dean?...the Third?...

John Dean...

John Dean...well, you remember John Dean!

Last August 30, President Nixon said, "I have a report given to me by my Counselor, John Dean III, on the basis of which I can assure you that no one in this Administration, presently employed, was involved in the White House."

And, now, the President says that with major new information pointing to people who might be in the White House! Well, at that point, you got to get out of the White House. I mean, it's people who will bug Democratic Headquarters, and keep it a secret from the President, and write a report to the President which covers up the involvement of those people in the White House...at that point, you go to people in the Justice Department and say, "I need help! I'm surrounded by people who are pretty close to being traitors!"

That is the implication of the President's statement yesterday that we are asked to believe. And until March 21, he believed in good faith what his

White House people had told him...that whatever the Watergate was, it had not involved any Aides to him.

But that when Jim McCord went before the Grand Jury and the Judge and wrote a letter to Judge Sirica and said, "But, yes, they were involved!" And the President says, "Hey, what's this? I have to have a new investigation ordered...a new investigation ordered by the Justice Department. By-pass the White House!"

Last weekend, I had to...

Last weekend, I was home sitting out on the porch with my two children. It was a lovely day, Saturday, in Washington, and I got a call saying, "Hey, somebody, one of our reporters, Bernie Shaw, happened to be passing around the back entrance of the southwest gate of the White House, and, unless he's mistaken, he saw a car go in with John Mitchell in it."

And I said, "Wow!"

So, we put a watch on that car.

And the next call I got was..."It was John Mitchell. He's gotten back in the car and he's heading over to the airport."

So, I put on a jacket and I raced to the airport saying, "Let's see...3:10...that would be a 3:30 American flight back to New York, if he's going to New York. Send me a camera crew!"

And we all got there, simultaneously, at 3:29, and we piled on this American flight to New York, not knowing what we would find, but there was John Mitchell! (laughter)

And I couldn't help it, I said, "Mr. Mitchell, I presume?" (laughter)

And he looked up at me, and he said, "Don't bother me!" (laughter)

And the stewardess came along and said, "Will you take your seats, please? We are about to take off."

And I sat down and put on a seat belt in the coach section...he was in first-class...(laughter)...and the camera crew, and we took off. And

the seat belt sign went off. I came up to the first-class section again, and I said, "Mr. Mitchell, I have a plane load of CBS cameramen and people dying to poke a microphone in your face while you utter surley, 'No Comment', unable to escape!" (laughter)

"But," I said, "I don't think that's a civilized way to act, and I think it would really be an invasion of your privacy." (laughter)

And he said, "Yes, Dan, and you know something about invasion of privacy, don't you?" (laughter)

I said, "Okay. What I'm saying is this. Can we do this in a civilized way? Have a quiet ride to LaGuardia Airport, and would you then stand in front of my camera for a couple of minutes?"

He looked up at me, and he looked at the camera crew with their cameras on their shoulder blades, and he said, "Okay."

And we did an interview with John Mitchell, and I asked him, "Whom did you see?"

And he said, "I can't tell you."

And I said, "Well, you saw the President, I guess. You were in the White House."

He said, "I'm not supposed to say."

I said, "Well, Mr. Mitchell, when you were Attorney General, whatever... you may not comment on the substance of your conversations with the President, but you have never refused to say that you saw or didn't see the President."

"I can't tell you whom I saw."

Well, that seemed like a great mystery to me. Out of character for Mitchell not to say, "I dropped in on my old friend, Dick Nixon."

(laughter)

But, the mystery was cleared up yesterday.

The mystery was cleared up, because had he said on Saturday whom he had

seen, he would have revealed that his old cronies at the White House were no longer in this picture. He had seen Assistant Attorney General Peterson, the man in charge of Criminal Investigation. Now, how could he have said that without raising a lot of questions about it? About the White House? Well, when we already had this interview on film on Saturday, and we were calling the White House to ask whom Mitchell had seen, we were told that Mitchell was not in Washington by a White House press office which was apparently acting in good faith because they had not been told. There is now a split. There are two camps now.

If you may have been connected with Watergate, you are out of things. Now the Justice Department is taking over. You don't understand the situation the President has now created when he says that the investigation is now being conducted by the Justice Department. And heads will fall. And I can't tell you yet which heads will fall. Imagine how uneasy are all those heads! (laughter)

It is a weird, weird situation.

Now, I want to tell you one more thing.

One more important thing.

I have told you now a lot of things that you may want to hear. Now, I want you to hear one thing that I want you to know. This wouldn't have happened yesterday if it hadn't been for a press in this country that persisted in getting a lot more information than the government thought ought to be given.

And measures are being taken today which, if successful, would insure that you would not know...next time.

We are under attack, in Washington, from two sources, and from two basic directions. One, is from the courts. I don't want to indicate that this is a pincer attack, but I do not believe that the courts are necessarily acting in concert with the Administration.

But we are under two attacks from two flanks. The courts have said, indeed, the Supreme Court has said, that a reporter may be obliged to give confidential sources of information. Identify the sources! They may have to reveal the information required by a Grand Jury or a prosecutor or, indeed, by the defense in the case. Now, I understand that the courts have a problem, because while there is a freedom and the right to know in this country, there is also the right to a fair trial. And Grand Juries like to get all the information they can.

But, it has made our lives exceedingly difficult.

It has already begun to have a chilling effect on the kind and the amount of information that we can provide to you. It may be only 10% of the total information that is affected. But it is a vital 10%! The 10% that people don't want you to know!

Four people have gone to jail, because they would not reveal confidential sources. And more may.

It appeared to me, at one moment, that I was close to going to jail.

In the early stages of the Watergate trial, the defense wanted to have the full tape of an interview by the Los Angeles Times with Alfred Baldwin. And they...when they...refused to surrender it...I saw the Bureau Chief of the Los Angeles Times in Washington, Jack Lawrence, being led by marshals into jail, to spend an indefinite period. It turned out to be a few hours because Baldwin intervened and asked the L.A. Times to release the tape which released the Times from their confidential pledge to him and solved Mr. Lawrence's problem.

But not the general problem.

I had also done an interview with Baldwin, and the same defense lawyer who wanted to subpoena the other interview said, "Schorr, you're next! I want the out-takes of your film."

He never got around to it. He might have.

There are other ways in which we have suffered from the chilling effect of not being sure that we can protect confidences. I'll give you one small example.

On March 9, I put on the air a television program called, "What Are We Doing To Our Children?" I was interested in investigating the thesis that this society, which considers itself to be a child-centered society, really isn't.

In most of its public policies, it acts in ways which damage children. And it may be because children are the least able to defend themselves in this society. They lack votes and they lack power, and with all our hang-ups and frustrations, we end up...whether we know it or not...taking it out on these defenseless members of our society, the children.

And, trying to illustrate that, I tried to illustrate it through the juvenile court system and how it works. And I also wanted to illustrate it by showing the effects of welfare policy on children.

In many states, there is a "Man in the house" rule.

If there is a man in the house, you don't get welfare.

So, if you want public assistance...even if you are happily married...the husband must go.

In Georgia, I talked to an intelligent woman who was on quite good terms with her husband, and her husband was living with her in secrecy. He'd be away a lot of the time, and he'd come sneaking in at night for clandestine visits to his wife...they had three children.

And I said, "If you want to dramatize what it does to children to have the father paying secret visits and live in an atmosphere of surveillance and investigation constantly by the welfare authorities, ...what that does to children...would you do an interview? Talk about it and your family?"

She said that she would, but I could not identify her, because she'd lose her welfare check and be prosecuted for fraud by the Georgia authorities.

I said, "Well, we can film you in a shadow and you won't be seen. And we won't give your name."

And she said, "Well, what would you do if they ask you my name? If the authorities come to you and ask you my name, would you still protect me?"

"Why, sure," I said.

And then I thought of the Supreme Court...subpoena..."Can I protect her?"

So I called CBS and asked for a legal opinion. We wanted to do an interview with someone, but we must absolutely guarantee that we would not identify her if asked to, by a Grand Jury, or the welfare authorities.

They looked up all the cases, and said what I thought they would say.

"You can't give her that guarantee, under present law, under present Supreme Court rule."

"But," I said, "suppose I am willing to go to jail, if faced with subpoena and possible contempt?"

"Well, you may be willing to go to jail, but participating in that interview are also cameramen, sound men, lighting men, researcher and producer.

And you cannot speak for all of those. Don't do the interview."

What did you lose?

It would have been two or three minutes on the air. A dramatic few minutes of a black woman telling what welfare policy does to her children.

Not much.

Two or three minutes on television is not much time. There are other things on television.

But, it's only the beginning.

People who used to call up and say, "Let me give you the background on this," (which is a little bit different from the way it was put by the White House)...

don't call so often any more.

They are afraid.

We can't protect them.

That's the courts, and we are suffering from it.

But, I think, we will work it out. We will have to work it out. We'll have to find the balance between freedom to know and the right to a fair trial which is involved, too.

But, then, there is the attack by the Administration.

Phase One was during the first Administration.

Vice-President Agnew.

Discredit the press. Elitist. Eastern. A lot of cold words that would appeal to midwestern people or non-elitist people. Spoon feeding you our news.

First, undermine...

After all, a lot of people are pretty disturbed that the news is bad...

That those delivering it are messengers of bad news...

You have a strange feeling in the country that they don't like newsmen anymore, anyway, ...use that.

Discredit the press.

It was purely rhetorical and verbal.

The Second Administration...time for action.

Now the time has come when you can do things like offering television stations longer and safer license renewals if they will censor network television news programs.

Carrot-and-stick.

Now, comes along a proposal, a criminal code which has as one of its 600 pages...slipped in there somewhere...you can go to jail if you print or report anything that comes from a document that anyone has labeled

"Confidential."

It is in the Criminal Code, now before Congress, offered by the Administration.

An official Secrets Act!

We have never had one in this country.

Anything that comes from the paper that anyone has stamped "Confidential" may result in your going to jail!

There are twenty-eight hundred persons that we have counted, most recently, in Washington with the right to tamp things "Confidential."

At the Pentagon, they take newspaper clippings and stamp them "Confidential."

(laughter)

They do, believe me.

Well, am I talking about me? My life?

Us newmen?

I'm not.

What I am saying is that we may or may not go to jail...

That isn't the important thing. The important thing is that if we can't report information from confidential sources, confidential information, from people who will be willing to talk to us...

Then you have never known what was really happening at the Watergate, as you never would have known...

As I assure you that President Nixon would not have had yesterday to reverse his course and say that he is now going to take after the mystery and clean up the White House.

President Nixon, yesterday, was the result of the hard work of a free press, and so it is important to those who want to avoid that kind of embarrassment in the future to see that the press is less free.

It's my work, but it's your freedom that is involved!

It is not my right to report, but it is your right to know what is involved!

So, if you want to avoid future Watergates, or at least be sure that when they happen they are exposed, you address yourself to what seems to be our in-house question, freedom of the press.

I know that you all have classes. I could talk to you for hours, but I thank you. (applause)

William F. Buckley, Jr., August, 1973