

[return to updates](#)

Watergate unstoppered



by Miles Mathis

A lot of people have known for a long time that there was more to Watergate than we have been told in the mainstream press. Many bestseller books have hinted at this over the years, although I now assume those bestsellers were also misdirection. They have been spun, and were probably spun by the same people who spun Watergate. Still, to spin information they have to release some information, and so to get the true story all someone like me has to do is de-spin it. Since this is like trying to unwind a closet full of tangled coathangers, most people don't get very far into it. But since I have the time and the patience for such things—as well as some natural talent at seeing through walls—I tend to succeed where others fail. It also helps that I am a lone researcher. I can follow my nose, without anyone else's interference. We are taught that committees get more done in the way of research, but I have not found that to be the case. The greatest success is achieved by a single person with a good nose for the truth, and a great eye for a lie.

As it turns out, all the information I will use is already on the internet and is not seriously contested. There is no original research in this paper and I am not repeating any wild theories from the fringe. I am just compiling things admitted at places like Wikipedia, but unburying it, unspinning it, and putting it back into logical order.

I first read the book *Silent Coup* when it came out in 1992. I was 29 at the time and didn't know much about Watergate going in—which is what the authors of these books count on. That book is the one that scapegoats John Dean once again (which was the mainstream line from the beginning) as well as outing Alexander Haig as deepthroat. That outing has since been proved wrong, since William Mark Felt admitted to being deepthroat in 2008. So that has become the mainstream story since then. I will show that both assignments are false. Neither Haig nor Felt was deepthroat.

Although I knew even then that *Silent Coup* was misdirection, I didn't really know who or what it was misdirecting me away from. I didn't have a big enough picture to figure it out until recently. But that

book at least put into my head the idea that the mainstream story was a whitewash. Much more was going on with Watergate than we were told at the time, or than we are told now in encyclopedia entries.

The biggest clue getting me into this whole mess was a clue left out of *Silent Coup* and every other book on Watergate. In short, we are supposed to believe that Richard Nixon was keeping tapes of himself in the White House. We are supposed to believe that Nixon was bugging himself. Since that isn't believable, someone else must have been bugging him. Has any other President kept tapes of his private conversations? No. Why would he? It is just creating incriminating evidence when there is no need to. It makes no sense on any level, and I am surprised anyone would believe it. But even if he had been making tapes, he would have destroyed them as soon as the investigation began. There is no way those tapes would have survived to be turned over to Congress or any other body, subpoena or no subpoena. We are supposed to believe that Rosemary Woods was in the front office meticulously erasing snippets here and there, but why not just throw the whole lot into the incinerator? That takes what, five minutes? Once we understand that, we have a key that gets us into the wider scandal. We have to ask who had the power and the capability to bug Nixon's offices? Only two entities: the FBI or the CIA. Given the greater arc of the event, we should immediately suspect the CIA.

Another clue that is generally passed over is the investigation of the CIA after Watergate by Congress. The most high-profile investigation of the time was called the Church Committee hearings, but there were other hearings before and after that on the same subject: the CIA and its reach. Since according to the mainstream story the CIA wasn't at the center of the Watergate scandal, we should ask why Congress decided to investigate the CIA in the mid-70's. I will be told that it was due to Seymour Hersh's blowing the whistle on CHAOS and other programs in the *New York Times* in 1974, but it turns out that was misdirection itself. Although his article concerned "the family jewels" of the CIA and was sold as a major scoop, Hersh only leaked information about old foreign covert ops and domestic information gathering on peaceniks. Although many at the time (and now) think this was a major leak, it wasn't. It was damage control. Although your average citizen may not have known the extent of it, he knew the CIA was involved in foreign covert operations. That was the whole point of the CIA, after all. Beyond that, most people didn't know or care anything about Iran or Chile, Mosaddegh or Allende. For Americans, most of it was old news and not terribly interesting. The same can be said of CHAOS, and CIA spying on hippies and war protesters. The CIA and the FBI and the media had already killed the hippie movement by 1970, via infiltration and subversion, and the same can be said of the anti-war movement. By 1974 the war was mostly over and people were sick of hearing about it. Admitting that the CIA and FBI were involved in spying on hippies back in the 1960's didn't impress anyone in 1974 except the hippies themselves. Probably 95% of those reading Hersh's articles in 1974 just shrugged their shoulders. This is what Hersh and his handlers were counting on, because the leak was done on purpose to keep the public eye off the real prize.

Congress wasn't investigating the CIA beginning in 1974 because of CHAOS or foreign operations. Obviously, Congress was investigating the CIA in 1974 because of things the CIA had just done in 1972-73, and these things were much bigger than CHAOS or even the overthrow of Allende. That's right. The CIA had just overthrown Nixon, using Watergate as a cover, and most in Congress knew that. Congress couldn't *admit* it knew that, but Congress hoped that those watching would get the clue. We never did.

The authors of *Silent Coup* were partially right: there *had* been a coup in 1972-73, but it wasn't a coup by the Joint Chiefs or the Pentagon. Those entities may well have been involved, but they weren't the orchestrators. The main actors were CIA, and that was generally known in DC. They had both motive and ability, and all evidence pointed directly at them. In fact, Colodny and Gettlin, the authors of

Silent Coup, had to tie themselves in knots to keep the CIA out of their theory. In hindsight, it looks a lot like the knots Noam Chomsky gets himself into, trying to keep the CIA out of his “manufacturing consent” theories. Richard Helms hardly makes an appearance in *Silent Coup*. You are constantly being led away from him and toward Haig, Dean, Haldeman, Erlichman and the Pentagon. This omission tells us more about the book than anything else.

In all the books and investigations I have seen, Watergate is never put in any proper historical context. If a context is built, it is built quickly and with no logic. All the fundamental facts are suppressed or spun, and only the minor details are studied closely. For instance, another fact that is always suppressed or spun is J. Edgar Hoover's convenient demise in May of 1972. Hoover had been running the FBI with an iron fist since 1924, and he was only 76 in 1972—and not known to be in poor health. He supposedly died in his sleep of a heart attack, but he had no history of heart problems and had not had any previous attacks. Hoover was a staunch ally of Nixon and hated the CIA. Since this whole thing looks like a turf war between the CIA and FBI, it is amazing that no one has ever thought to investigate it as such. We know that the FBI and CIA had been at each other's throats for decades (since 1947, really) and that since 1968 the war had begun in earnest. Hoover [cut off all contact with the CIA](#) in 1970, and that is widely known. If you go to Richard Helm's page at Wikipedia, you get dozens of references to the war between the CIA and FBI in the early 1970's. That page is like a book itself, and you can almost build my theory from it alone (as we will see below).

Nixon disliked the CIA and—with Hoover—tried to redirect its work either to the FBI or to Nixon's own private intelligence operation centered on the NSC. *Silent Coup* admits this was the nut of the problem, since that book spends a lot of time showing how the Pentagon had been angered by Kissinger's heavy handedness in dealing with foreign and military matters. You probably can't even name Nixon's secretary of defense, since he was so overshadowed by Kissinger. It was Melvin Laird. Anyway, although this was a problem, it wasn't the Pentagon that was the main danger to Nixon, it was the CIA. The Pentagon wasn't in a turf war with Kissinger or Hoover, the CIA was. Nixon, Hoover, Kissinger, and most of Nixon's staff were purposely ostracizing the CIA in the early 70's, and they only found out later what a colossal mistake that was.

It is fantastically easy to confirm this reading of the facts just by looking at the progression of history since then. We know the CIA won this turf war because:

Hoover was gone by 1972

Nixon was powerless by 1973 and gone by 1974

The FBI has been in a tailspin ever since

and the CIA has taken over most of the exciting domestic duties of the FBI.

In addition, the CIA has grown exponentially since the early 1970's, and is now so big it can't even be weighed. It isn't just the 500 pound gorilla in the room, it is the ever-expanding blob, devouring the room, then the building, then the town, then the world. In a recent paper, I used published government numbers to estimate the total staff of Intelligence at over 6 million—which is twice as big as the entire military—and even that estimate may be low. After the CIA destroyed Nixon and Hoover, it then destroyed the committee investigating it in the Senate, and then the Senate. Congress has also been in a tailspin since the mid-70's, and it is now no more than a overpriced meeting of emeritus professors, paid to rubberstamp military and spy budgets.

We are told Nixon didn't trust anyone, and is it any wonder? He was looking at ever-increasing CIA expansion which he couldn't ultimately stem or even avoid himself, and he was looking at a new high-

tech world in which his own offices could be bugged without his knowledge. He was looking at a high-tech world in which the CIA owned heart-attack guns, and it is probable these guns were tested in the real world—on his pal J. Edgar Hoover. [The CIA brought one of these guns on the Senate floor in 1975](#), admitting the reality of it, so this is not a conspiracy theory. It is on film and can be viewed many places on the web.



That is Frank Church and John Tower, with Church holding the heart-attack gun. The Church Committee was named for Senator Church. Church lost his next re-election campaign and died three years later, at age 59. I wish I could say it was from a heart-attack gun, but they are a bit more clever than that.

This is also the reason Johnson didn't run for re-election in 1968. He already knew at that time that he was over-matched by Intelligence. Johnson didn't like being a pawn of greater forces, and he didn't wish to end up like Nixon. Nixon also knew what he was getting into, he just didn't quite realize the extent of it. He mistakenly believed he could maneuver his way around the CIA, as we can see from his feints in the first two years. But he was a poor chess player with too few pieces left on the board. Hoover was his queen, and once he lost Hoover, it was basically checkmate. He was surrounded by the knights, bishops and rooks of the CIA and had nowhere to run.

Beyond this turf war, Nixon dug his own grave by not fully supporting the Vietnam War. He had been put into office with the understanding that the war would last at least five more years, but he began caving to public and Congressional pressure after less than two. This takes us to the other fundamental fact always glossed over by books on Watergate: the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in January of 1971, which Nixon signed. This was a bold Congressional action, maybe the boldest we have seen in our lifetimes, and Nixon was blamed not only for allowing it to happen, but for actually supporting it and signing it. It removed Congressional approval for the war and gave the Pentagon no real authority to keep fighting. It also led inexorably to more bold moves by Congress, including the War Powers Act of 1973, which temporarily reversed the complete takeover of foreign policy by the executive branch. These things were far more important to the history of the US, and to the events of the time; and compared to them Watergate is just frosting. But if you look at the amount of press generated, there is no comparison. Everyone knows about Watergate, almost no one knows about the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. In this sense, Watergate was a diversion. It had a two-fold purpose: get rid of Nixon and divert the public eye away from the more important events. It succeeded admirably.

Also a problem for the rich families invested in armaments was Nixon's detente with Russia and China in 1972. Not only was Nixon failing to pursue the war in Vietnam to its full extent, he was pursuing peace with China and Russia. Detente signaled an end to the Cold War, which signaled an end to using the Cold War as an excuse to build newer and more expensive weapons. In more ways than one, Nixon was moving against the interests of his controllers. In short, Nixon made the crucial mistake of pursuing peace in an economy based on "defense" spending. Even [Obama admitted that recently](#), when he told *FOXnews'* Bill O'Reilly that Nixon had been a more liberal President than he is. Sadly, that is very true, and it isn't just due to Nixon's forming of the Environmental Protection Agency. Although Obama was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, he hasn't done anything to promote peace and everything to promote war. Obviously, Obama has learned the lesson that Watergate was meant to teach Presidents: *do what you are told*.

In short, the CIA could see that Nixon couldn't control public opinion or Congress, and couldn't or wouldn't promote the war economy to the fullest, so they had to step in themselves. In 1972, they got rid of Hoover. In 1974, they got rid of Nixon. And by 1976, they had gotten rid of Congress. You see, Watergate wasn't a scheme by Nixon, it was a scheme *against* Nixon. Nixon was framed by the CIA. Nixon had no reason to bug or burglarize the Democrats. In the 1972 election, Nixon was up against George McGovern, who ended up winning just one state. It was the most lopsided victory in modern history, even worse than Mondale's loss to Reagan in 1984. Nixon won by more than 23 percentage points. Reagan only won by 18. An election like this is won by being in control of the greater apparatus, so Nixon not only had it won going in, he *knew* he had it won going in. There was never any question he was going to win the election of 1972. Although it had apparently already been decided to torpedo Nixon, they couldn't torpedo him in the 1972 election since they didn't have time to re-manufacture the whole election apparatus. That requires nationwide machinations and buying thousands of electors and so on (or it did then: they can now do it all with computers). It was much easier to torpedo him with a quick false flag. The CIA burglarized the Democratic headquarters and then pinned it on Nixon (we will see a lot of evidence for this below). They then bugged Nixon talking about covering it up and the deal was done. Congress, flush with its recent successes in repealing the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and passing the War Powers Act was itching to strike again against the President, and could be counted on to accept any evidence offered at face value, without looking any deeper. Congress wanted Nixon as much as the CIA, not realizing they were next.

Nixon may have thought he could avoid the CIA in some policy matters, but he at least knew what he was up against. After all, he had been installed with their help, and had to have known it. But many in Congress appear to have been ignorant of the deeper workings of the government they fronted. This is the only way to explain their repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1971. That was the stroke that led to everything else, and if Congress had been aware of the true state of things, they would never have dared repeal it. In this way, the Church Committee hearings were more the idea of the CIA than of the Senate. The CIA needed to make Congress aware of the true state of things, letting them know who was really in charge. And so the hearings were actually an extended briefing of Congress by the CIA. If you study the transcripts, I think that is what you will find. That is why the heart-attack gun was shown on floor of Congress, among other things. Believe me, Congress got the message, and it hasn't been the same since. This is why I no longer bother to write letters to my representatives, or bother to blame them for anything. Their hands have been tied for a long time, and giving them low approval ratings is a waste of time. They are no longer anything but a decoy.

Which brings us back to deepthroat. I said above that neither Haig nor Felt was really deepthroat. So who was? No one. Deepthroat is more misdirection, another decoy. To accept the idea of a

deepthroat, you have to assume that someone is necessary as a go-between *from* those who have information in the government *to* the press. But of course the Church Committee proved that is false. In Congressional testimony in 1975-76, the CIA admitted it had been in control of large parts of the media since the early 1950's. In 1972, the CIA had people in major positions in the press, so no pipeline was necessary. Ben Bradlee at the *Washington Post* was either CIA or a CIA asset [see [Deborah Davis](#), *Katharine the Great*] so there was no need for any meeting in dark parking lots or anywhere else. Bradlee didn't need Woodward or Bernstein telling him anything. Those guys are just decoys. The CIA wires or phones in its stories to the executive editor directly, so reporters are just brightly colored pawns, placed to misdirect the most naïve readers. Deborah Davis has outed Woodward as a spook, and no doubt he did a lot of dirty work for the CIA, but as far as meeting secret sources, that is all Hollywood bullshit. Bradlee may have gotten his telephone calls on Watergate from Helms or one of his underlings—it doesn't really matter. What matters is that the phonecalls were coming from Langley.

In this way, we can see that the Pentagon Papers were also just more misdirection and damage control. All you have to do is follow the timing. They came out in June 1971, just a few months after Congress had repealed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. By February 1971, the Vietnam War should have been over. Once the resolution was repealed, the war was effectively illegal. It had always been illegal and undeclared, but once Congress removed its weak stamp of approval, the war hadn't a leg to stand on. So the government had keep people from coming to that realization. The government intended to spin the war out for another several years, legal or not, and to do that they had to keep the repeal off the front pages.

In fact, Congress was passing other important legislation that year as well, although you wouldn't know it by reading history. For instance, go to the Wikipedia page on [the 92nd Congress](#). I beg you to notice that no legislation is listed until December 18, 1971. Go to the section entitled “major legislation.” The first entry is dated December 18, 1971. But the 92nd Congress convened January 3, 1971. So Wiki is telling you no major legislation occurred in 1971 in 11.5 months, until almost Christmas? The Gulf of Tonkin resolution was repealed on January 14, 1971. Not major? The revised Cooper-Church Amendment was enacted on January 5, 1971, and it also restricted action in Vietnam. Not major? Beyond that, on April 23, 1971, half a million protesters marched in DC, and thousands of veterans tossed their medals. In May, over 12,000 people were arrested during war protests. The Pentagon Papers were published to take everyone's eyes off current events and put them back on the Johnson administration. The timeline of the Pentagon Papers was mostly 1955 to 1964, so they were taking your eyes off the present. Even so, Johnson is the goat of the Pentagon Papers, which is odd in itself. In that timeline, Johnson is responsible only for 1964, of course. You may ask yourself why Kennedy doesn't take more blame in the Pentagon Papers.

The Pentagon Papers also make a case *for* the war, explaining it as containment of China. Curiously, they also whitewash the war in many other ways. Again, what we are seeing is damage control, not a real leak. We can tell this just from the mode of publication. It is the *New York Times* that broke the Pentagon Papers, along with Ben Bradlee at the *Washington Post*. Since we learned from the Church Committee hearings that the CIA “owned” both papers, we should immediately be suspicious of the Pentagon Papers and Daniel Ellsberg. Remember, Ellsberg was a spook himself, with “an extremely high security clearance.” He worked for years for the RAND corporation, which is a major arm of military intelligence. And yet he was spun as a hero of the anti-war movement. How naïve do you have to be to take Ellsberg as a hero of the anti-war movement? The anti-war movement has always been far too trusting, which was its downfall. It was infiltrated over and over by obvious Intelligence people like Ellsberg, and they were never strongly outed. Ellsberg is still being sold as an anti-war guy

and is still infiltrating anti-government movements.

For more proof of this, we find all charges against Ellsberg being dropped in 1973, after the government claimed it had lost its records of wiretapping against Ellsberg. Right. The proceedings against Ellsberg are not believable in the least, since if what we were told about Ellsberg leaking information were true, he would have been prosecuted to the full extent of the law, and beyond. When the government really wants to prosecute someone, they don't let technicalities get in their way. If some evidence gets lost, they just re-create it. If the truth isn't enough to convict, they lie. If they didn't convict Ellsberg, it is because they didn't want to convict. He was their own guy, following orders.

He was part of opposition control. As I said, the war should have immediately ended in January of 1971, but because of opposition control, the front-page news was diverted to the Pentagon Papers and then Watergate. While everyone was discussing those things, the war dragged on *another four years*. Congress was still authorizing a billion a year to South Vietnam in 1974, and that money wasn't going for rebuilding infrastructure. Most of it was coming back to the US in the form of defense contracts.

So why had Congress continued to fund the war after repealing the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution? Because the CIA had already scared them. The CIA hadn't just jumped all over Hoover and Nixon in 1972, they had also jumped on Congress. The Church Committee hearings in 1975 were just the tail end of the CIA/Congress battle, but the Congress had been losing that battle since 1972, just like everyone else. In 1973, the Congress was still fighting back against the President, and had overridden Nixon's veto of the War Powers Act. But even then, Congress was still mostly rubberstamping the military and spy budgets. They could pass resolutions, but they didn't have the cojones to actually stop the money supply. They would have needed a large majority of voters behind them to do that, and—due to the CIA's control of the press—they never got it. Although there were large protests against the Vietnam War up to the end, the public never figured out the true reach of the CIA in the 1970's. It still hasn't figured it out.

For more evidence of tampering with history, you should look at the terminology used then and now. In 1973, the legislation was called the War Powers Act. Now it has been demoted to the War Powers Resolution. In 1984, the *New York Times* [was still referring to it as the War Powers Act](#) of 1973. When was it demoted, and by whom? We would assume by the CIA, and the reason was to make you think it was non-binding. Acts are never non-binding, but resolutions sometimes are. Although the War Powers Act has the status of a law, and no one disputes that, giving the title “Resolution” is small bit of misdirection. When combined with the spin we see at Wikipedia, it can cause confusion. There is a long section entitled “Questions regarding constitutionality [of the act]”. Although there is no question regarding the Constitutionality of the War Powers Act, they are still trying to create the idea that there is. Those trying to spread confusion *know* there is no question of constitutionality, since the question was never even thought worth putting before the Supreme Court. If there had been any question at all, they would have put it before the Supreme Court. But there was never any idea of doing that, since they didn't wanted to lose the vote 9-0. That would have prevented them from writing these ridiculous sections at Wiki, quoting from nobodies like Philip Bobbitt.

To show how desperate they are, and how little they have, let us look at Bobbitt's argument. He says that “The power to make war is not an enumerated power [in the Constitution], and the notion that to *declare* war is to *commence* war is a 'contemporary textual preconception'”. Can you believe these people? These “scholars” will make any argument they are paid to make, no matter how transparently stupid. Wikipedia will then publish it decades later, as if it has merit. Nothing is beneath these people.

But back to Watergate. Let us go to that Wikipedia page on Richard Helms, to see how easy it is to get useful information from the mainstream. I beg you first to notice that this bio has 812 footnotes and 50 subsections. Printed out it would be at least 40 pages long. Compare it to those of his predecessors as Director of Central Intelligence John McCone and William Raborn, whose Wiki pages could be printed on two pages. Someone is trying very hard to tell us something. Helms was one of the founding agents of the CIA, having been in OSS before 1947, and being in the CIA from its beginning in that year. One of the first things we are told is that Helms was skeptical about the usefulness of clandestine operations. Right. That's like saying the manager of the Yankees is skeptical about the usefulness of pitching. That's also interesting since he was the only CIA director convicted for lying to Congress. He was against clandestine operations, but not against lying to Congress. Wouldn't lying to Congress be considered a clandestine operation? For lying to Congress about the overthrow of Allende, Helms was given a suspended sentence and a \$2,000 fine. That's about what you get fined if your dog poops in Central Park. CIA didn't show Congress their heart-attack gun for no reason.

Helms' grandfather Gates McGarrah was a noted international banker, so don't tell me there aren't ties between the bankers and the CIA. Helms was class president and editor of the school paper at Williams College, "which encouraged his interest in journalism." More specifically, it encouraged his interest in taking over the national press and installing agents at TIME, Newsweek, the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and most other places. In 1941, Helms volunteered for the Navy, receiving officer training at Harvard. What? Officer training at Harvard? Since when is Harvard a military academy? Since we know he ended up OSS, his training at Harvard was obviously for Intelligence. That still begs the question, "since when is Harvard an Intelligence academy?" The answer: almost since the beginning. They tell you these things, but most people don't trip over the information. It just runs through the brain like beer through the bladder.

By 1946, Helms was already head of Counterintelligence in Europe, making him one of the top guys in OSS by age 33. In that capacity, he directed the search for German scientists to send back to the US. By 1951 he was Chief of Foreign Intelligence, with only two or three guys above him. At that time, CIA had already delegated to itself broad and undefined powers, so that it was basically beholden to no one. Wikipedia puts it this way:

Later, the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 provided a permanent and apparently legal method whereby the CIA could regularly exercise its newly enhanced covert operations power in the field. It was hurriedly passed by Congress, a supporter remarking at the time, "The less we say about this bill, the better off all of us will be."

Congress gave the agency the widest conceivable powers. ... The CIA was barred only from behaving like a secret police force inside the United States. The act gave the agency the ability to do almost anything it wanted, as long as Congress provide the money in an annual package. Approval of the secret budget by a small armed services subcommittee was understood by those in the know to constitute a legal authorization for all secret operations... If it's secret, it's legal, Richard M. Nixon [later] said. The CIA now had free rein: unvouchered funds—untraceable money buried under falsified items in the Pentagon's budget—meant unlimited license.

So you see, CIA didn't really need heart attack guns to blow by Congress. It had been doing that since the beginning. I guess threatening Senators wasn't considered a "clandestine operation." It was just business as usual.

This was the beginning of the end for any sort of Constitutional Republic in the US. They tell us that Eisenhower warned of it in the 1959, but even his warning was misdirection. He said to watch out for

the “military-industrial complex.” That is unnecessarily vague. We have had military and industry since before the Revolutionary war. What we haven't had is a CIA with unlimited and unchecked powers. Sometimes the CIA is working for the military and sometimes it isn't. Sometimes it is working for the bankers, sometimes it is working for the politicians, and sometimes it is working for the Rockefellers, [just helping sell their art](#).

Amazingly, Helms' bio confirms this reading. Robert Lovett and David Bruce wrote a report for Eisenhower in 1956, expressing alarm at the powers the CIA had shown in its recent overthrow of Mosaddegh in Iran. The authors—Lovett was Truman's Secretary of Defense—argued that CIA was too powerful, and argued for outside intervention. But it was already too late. CIA was already too powerful in 1956 for Eisenhower, Hoover, and Congress combined. Because it was controlled by hidden hands, it was *born* too powerful. Even in 1947, attacking the CIA was like attacking a ghost.

Helms' bio also gives us clues to the fate of Joseph McCarthy. Although McCarthy's fall in 1954 is generally attributed to the press (see Murrow's attacks on him) or to censure by Congress, it is really the CIA that got him. McCarthy made the mistake of going after the CIA. He told Dulles "that the CIA was neither sacrosanct nor immune from investigation." The Helms Wiki page admits CIA director Dulles ordered Angleton to plant disinformation on McCarthy, and to run a “down-and-dirty” covert operation against him. We can see that this operation included many planted stories in the press, which the CIA had direct access to. Murrow's *See it Now* report in March of 1954 was just one of many reports written and directed at the instigation of Dulles. Murrow had been in OSS himself, and had always been a willing ally of Intelligence.

In 1953 Helms began directing several nefarious and completely illegal projects, including MKUltra, Bluebird, Artichoke, and others which used various drugs in the effort to brainwash and control. So much for his opposition to clandestine ops. In answer to why Intelligence was involved in this stuff, Helms and others answered “The Russians were doing it first.” Even if it is true, it isn't much of an answer. It was also Helms who ordered the destruction of most documentation of these top secret projects in 1972—the time period of Watergate. Although Seymour Hersh gave us what little information we have about these projects in 1974, it isn't much. Since his articles were damage control, we may assume the truth is much deeper and darker than even he hinted at, and that the projects never actually ended. We were later told that a chastened CIA gave up its worst excesses after the Church Committee hearings, but we know that isn't true. George Bush, Sr., told the press that the CIA was no longer involved in all those bad things from the past, but no one over six years old believed it. The CIA didn't downsize after 1976, its budgets weren't cut, it wasn't subject to any oversight, and it didn't end any covert operations, either legal or illegal. In fact, it actually accelerated its expansion. Its smashing successes in the 1970's, including Watergate, convinced it that the sky was the limit. Not only had it taken down Nixon with almost no effort at all, it no longer had to worry about Hoover, either. Hoover had been the greatest counterbalance to CIA for decades, since his power was almost equal to theirs. With his demise, there was nothing to keep CIA from expanding both vertically and horizontally.

Funny, isn't it? Nixon and Hoover, looking sort of like good guys for once. I am not saying they *were* good guys, but in their efforts to control CIA, they do shine a bit. However, they hadn't a chance against the CIA. The real coup didn't happen in 1972. It happened decades earlier, and the die was cast before the war even ended. And I mean World War II.

At last we get to Watergate in Helms bio, and the first thing that jumps out at us is this:

Among those initially arrested (the "plumbers") were former CIA employees; there were loose ends with the agency.

Get that: *former* CIA employees. The only former CIA employees are dead CIA employees. We also find this:

It soon became apparent, however, that it was "impossible to prove anything to an inflamed national press corps already in full cry while daily leaks to the press kept pointing at CIA." Only later did Helms conclude that "the leaks were coming directly from the White House and that President Nixon was personally manipulating the administration's efforts to contain the scandal."

Right. The pointers to CIA were manufactured by Nixon? No. That is what you call a reversal. The truth is, the pointers to Nixon were manufactured by CIA. Nixon hated the CIA, as we have already established, so why would he have used CIA agents in his squad of burglars?

The first person to research is John Paisley, the "CIA liaison" in the White House burglars. Red flags all over this guy. The Senate Watergate Committee completely ignored Paisley, and Wikipedia admits that the CIA link was never investigated. We also learn:

An investigation "concluded the retirement [of Paisley in 1974] was a sham and the CIA was misrepresenting Paisley as a low-level analyst when in fact he was involved in numerous high-level clandestine operations.

We are told Paisley ended up being found dead floating in Chesapeake Bay in 1978. Although he had been shot multiple times and the body had been strapped and weighted down with heavy diving weights, the death was ruled a suicide. Do all coroners work for Intelligence? Probably. There is a strong possibility Paisley's death was faked. The best way to end a compromised mission is a faked death and relocation.

Watergate plumbers Eugenio Martinez, James McCord, Bernard Barker, Frank Sturgis, and G. Gordon Liddy were also tied strongly to the CIA. Some were called former CIA or recruits, but they were all simply hires, either permanent or contract.

E. Howard Hunt was also CIA, and that is admitted by everyone. Hunt had been station chief in Mexico City in 1950, where he supervised William F. Buckley, Jr. I tell people these things and they look at me like I am making it up, but [it is on Wikipedia](#), the most whitewashed mainstream source there is. Unless I have magic access to Wikipedia pages that other people can't get to, these things I am reporting are common knowledge. Hunt also told the Senate Watergate Committee he was CIA, and had been the Chief of Covert Actions for the Domestic Operations Division. Prior to Watergate, one of his long-term assignments (1962-1966) had dealt with "the manipulation of news and publishing organizations." Despite all that, the Committee *still* ignored the links to CIA.

To explain this, we are told Hunt retired "disillusioned" from the CIA in 1970. But in the very next sentence after that at Wiki, they admit that Hunt immediately went to work for the Robert R. Mullen Company, *which was a CIA front company*. Haldeman himself admitted it was a CIA company, and that information is again straight from Wiki. Hunt was still working for the company when he was hired in 1971 by Charles Colson to head the President's Special Investigations Unit. So where exactly did the retirement come in? Can you work for a CIA front company and retire from the CIA at the same time? I guess he got over his "disillusionment" after a couple of drinks.

That proves my thesis right there, without going any further. Hunt pulled the Watergate burglary and was convicted for it. He spent almost three years in jail for it (we are told). He was CIA at the time, being hired directly out of a CIA company. *Therefore*, the CIA pulled the Watergate burglary. I don't see the weak link there. What is difficult to understand in that short line of reasoning?

This may be why they ignored Charles Colson's testimony in June of 1974, which confirmed exactly what I have been saying. Colson had been Nixon's Special Counsel since 1968. He testified to Congress in June that the CIA was behind Watergate, not Nixon. Among many other things, Colson testified,

The CIA rather than the White House plumbers planned the break-ins at Watergate and the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

I am able to expose the fact that there was a major plot by the CIA and *they* were responsible for the cover-ups throughout the investigation.

The CIA enjoys extensive influence with the news media (particularly the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* and the *Los Angeles Times*) as well as a variety of private businesses. I'll tell you the thing that scares me the most – they're all over the place. The thing that really is frightening is that almost everywhere you go, should you turn, they have their tentacles.

If the CIA has infiltrated this country to the extent I think it has we ain't got a country left.

Colson further testified that Nixon was prevented early on from counter-attack against the CIA by “disloyal people around him,” naming Kissinger, Buzhardt and Haig as “CIA-men” involved.

This was first reported in the *Washington Star-News* on June 23, and picked up in garbled form by the *Washington Post* a day later, but most people now forget that. They forget it because, although those in Congress fully understood the import of Colson's testimony, that testimony didn't fit the story already decided upon the CIA, Congress, and the press. The reports of Colson's testimony therefore had to be buried and the impeachment process accelerated even more. Just five weeks later, Nixon would be forced to resign. In that five-week period, the press was instructed not to follow up on the testimony of Colson or the CIA involvement, but instead to concentrate on earlier testimony by others. In the press, Colson's testimony—when mentioned at all—was spun as a last-minute desperate attempt to pass the blame. And, given the fact that Nixon and his men waited so long to strongly counter-attack, Colson's testimony was easy to spin that way. Given the published arc of the event—controlled from the first by the CIA—Colson's June testimony did indeed look desperate. It *was* desperate and late, but that didn't make it false.

Colson's testimony is buried to this day. It isn't mentioned at Wikipedia or any other mainstream sources. The only thing we are told about Colson's Congressional testimony in June of 1974 is that he was convicted of obstruction of justice for defaming Daniel Ellsberg before the trial. Right. That just means he was convicted for trying to tell *the truth* about Ellsberg. Besides, they never proved he was lying about Ellsberg, which means they cannot have proved defamation, which means they cannot have used the defamation as part of the obstruction of justice conviction. The contemporary mainstream accounts are written for people who know nothing of the law. Those who do know something of the law can see Colson was railroaded just like Nixon. Colson spent seven months in a minimum security “country club” prison in Alabama, but he must have been broken there anyway because he came out a born-again Christian and evangelical prison reformer.

The Baker minority report in the Senate also fingered the CIA, and Colson said that “it raised an awful lot of questions” about CIA management of Watergate. It was this Baker report that contained the CIA's fronting of the Mullen Co., where Hunt worked, among others things. Unfortunately, the CIA had classified information in that Senate report, and that classification prevented it from being reported in the press until July, 1974. But some things were known of this report, including the fact that Robert Bennett, son of a current Senator and President of Mullen Co., was a CIA agent. This was reported by Jack Anderson in a June 25 column. Bennett admitted under oath that he was reporting everything he did to the CIA during Watergate. Mullen admitted under oath that Hunt was placed at Mullen Co. by Helms himself. The Baker report also tells us that Bennett coordinated the plumbers.

The Baker report was eventually released, but too late to do any good. We find that it “documented how the CIA might have known in advance of both the Fielding and Watergate break-ins. And it pointed to many instances in which the CIA had covered up its own involvements and awareness of the cover-up, including the deliberate destruction by Richard Helms of the CIA's own in-house tape recordings in January 1973.” [Emery, Fred. *Watergate*. p. 441] Note that the CIA destroys incriminating tapes, but Nixon doesn't seem to know how to do this with his own tapes? And that the CIA is not punished for doing it.

Testimony by Ehrlichman indicates the same early involvement of the CIA. On May 30, 1973, Ehrlichman testified that Deputy CIA Director Cushman called in 1971 to tell him that Hunt was on assignment from the Agency. Cushman wouldn't divulge what that assignment was, but implied the CIA was ending that assignment due to conflicting interests. Later events indicate no such end to Hunt's assignment: the phone call was a purposeful diversion, to make the White House think the CIA had ended any attachment to Hunt. Most likely, the White House had formed some suspicions, and the phone call was made to answer those suspicions. Ehrlichman indicates he had been fooled.

The FBI came to the same conclusion regarding the CIA being behind Watergate. In Senate testimony on August 3, 1973, FBI Director L. Patrick Gray admitted his first impression of Watergate was as a CIA covert operation. Before he was pushed away from the investigation, he said the FBI had found evidence of several CIA money chains, including most prominently one that led to plumber Bernard Barker.

Like most of the rest of the plumbers, Frank Sturgis was cleared of CIA ties by the Rockefeller Commission, who found that Sturgis had no ties to the CIA either before or after 1963. Knowing what we now know, we have to laugh. This finding tells us more about the Rockefeller Commission than about Sturgis.

To bury both the Colson testimony and the Baker report, the CIA purposely leaked a story in July, 1974, into the press about a WH (Western Hemisphere) Flap, concerning a drunken ex-agent who had leaked everything to the Soviets. *The New York Times* published several follow-ups and corrections to this story, to keep the public wanting more. This fake story successfully diverted attention away from CIA involvement in Watergate.

We have seen that Colson tried to out Kissinger as a CIA mole in June, 1974, to no effect. Is that outing believable? Completely, as it turns out. From FBI reports, we know that Kissinger is the one who had initiated “internal” bugging in the executive branch, having “ordered the bugging and surveillance of 17 government officials, newsmen, and his own personal aides as early as 1969.” This fact is extraordinary given the subsequent events, but it is never studied in context. If Kissinger was bugging the offices of his own aides, what was to prevent him from bugging the office of his boss? Of

course he didn't do the bugging personally, he "ordered it." Ordered it from whom? Not from the FBI, since they are the ones reporting it. They would not have bothered to report on themselves. Who else was capable of bugging the White House? The CIA. Those actually doing the bugging could bug one room just as easily as the next, right? All they needed was access. Kissinger had that access.

Now, if the CIA pulled Watergate, and if the CIA was in a turf war with FBI and Nixon, we should look at the possibility CIA framed Nixon, right? They had motive, they had ability, and their man Hunt was convicted of the crime. How is it that idea is never pursued? We must assume it is because CIA has been in control of the story since the beginning. It was in control of the story issued to the newspapers in 1972, and it was in control of the variants allowed to be published in books, and it is still in control of the story and all variants of it. You know what the CIA wants you to know. If you are told anything else—as in these clues I pull together from Wikipedia—you are told only to muddy the waters. They assume you aren't smart enough to put the pieces of the puzzle together, so they think they can tell you anything as long as they don't put the pieces together for you.

I have come to believe they have reached the point of just playing games. They have been so amazed by the gullibility and stupidity of *everyone*, they now test us by putting the real answers right out in the open, to see if anyone out there can think straight. I think they are just as disappointed in the intelligence and gumption of those studying the media as anyone, maybe moreso. As I have said before, it is no fun fooling fools, and CIA looks bored to me. They start to think that all their work to remain covert was just wasted. They didn't need to hide behind a beautifully camouflaged curtain, they could have hidden just as well behind a 2-by-4. Most people are so blind they don't see the CIA when the CIA is standing in an open field waving their arms. In short, CIA has lost all respect for its audience, which has led to its loss of respect for itself. These agents might hold their heads up if they could fool a Sherlock Holmes, but fooling the American public isn't even a challenge. They don't need CNN and green screens, they could fool the American public with Punch and Judy puppets. If they can propagandize America with Anderson Cooper, they could propagandize America even more cheaply with Shari Lewis and Lamb Chop.

