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The Legacies of the Watergate Scandal

For my MA project, I have selected to analyze the impact that the Watergate incident had on the Richard Nixon presidency as well as its impact on today’s political climate. The four areas that I have chosen to examine include Presidential/Media relations, the history and use of Executive Privilege, campaign finance reform, and how the tactics used by Nixon to impede the Watergate investigation contrasted with the tactics used by Bill Clinton during the investigation of his misdeeds. Although the Watergate incident occurred over thirty years ago, its impact is still felt in today’s political circles.

In addition to a historical literature, which examines the middle of Nixon’s first term in office and ends with his resignation from the office of the President, I will also develop lesson plans for high school age students so that they can fully understand the significance of the Watergate incident. These lesson plans will utilize various resources that include readings, film, political cartoons, and the analysis of primary source documents. My objective in showing how the impact of an event that occurred thirty years ago still has significance today will be at the forefront of all lessons that will be developed.

Research will be the primary route used to gain the information necessary to develop the narrative and the lesson plans. This research will be done on the internet and in the library. Books like *The Wars of Watergate* by Stanley Cutler and *All the
President's Men by Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein are important to this project because of their effectiveness in presenting important details in the Watergate incident.

Mark J. Rozell and Raoul Berger both do an excellent job of detailing the history of the use of executive privilege in their respective books, *Executive Privilege: The Dilemma of Secrecy and Democratic Accountability* and *Executive Privilege: A Constitutional Myth*.

In conclusion, by completing this project I will be able to successfully display how an event that occurred over thirty years ago still has relevance today; not only in the political arena, but also in the way the average citizen views the government and its institution.
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“I was born in a house my father built.”¹ This is how *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon* began when published in 1978. From humble beginnings rose this man who ultimately was forced to resign as President of the United States. Richard Nixon’s political career featured a sudden rise within the ranks of the Republican Party, due in large part to his work on the House Un-American Activities Committee. From there, Nixon unseated Helen Gahagan Douglas as a United States Senator from California. Nixon moved from his seat within the Senate to his presiding over the Senate when he took his place as Vice-President to Dwight Eisenhower. Nixon’s political fortunes suffered two setbacks during the early part of the 1960s. First, he lost a very close election to John F. Kennedy during the 1960 presidential campaign. Two years later, Nixon was defeated by Edmund G. “Pat” Brown for the governor’s chair in California. During his concession speech before reporters, Nixon uttered to reporters that they wouldn’t have “…Nixon to kick around anymore.”² Many wrote that people were witnessing the death of Nixon’s political career. However, after a few years of private law practice, Nixon ran for president again in 1968. This time he won a close race over the Democratic candidate, Hubert Humphrey, and third party upstart George Wallace.

After a busy first term, Nixon ran for re-election. During the month of June in 1972, five men armed with sophisticated eavesdropping devices broke into the Democratic National Committee’s headquarters located in the Watergate Hotel Complex in Washington D.C.. Over the course of the next two years, Americans would be shocked to learn that the Watergate incident, which was originally deemed a “third rate burglary” by the White House, may have had the approval of the President of the United States. Richard Nixon was ultimately forced to resign as president due to the Watergate scandal, the first time that a president had ever resigned in United States history.

Rightly or wrongly, the stigma of the Watergate scandal is ultimately what the Nixon presidency will be known for. The impact of Watergate and how it affected the office of president is still felt thirty years later. Campaign finance, executive privilege, and media relations have all been affected one way or another by Watergate. In addition, the presidents that have succeeded Nixon have seen every nook and cranny of their administration undergo immense scrutiny by an active Congress and media. According to Gerald Ford, the president that succeeded Richard Nixon upon his resignation, Watergate was “…our long national nightmare.” Although the United States and the office of the president survived Watergate, the impact of this event continues to be felt even today.

---


The Watergate Incident

Although historians will debate about the roles played by various individuals during the Watergate incident, there are a few facts that historians can agree upon about the event. Information such as the date, the number of burglars involved and what they were carrying when caught during the early morning hours of June 17th generally is the same no matter which book or which article one reads. Stanley Kutler’s book *The Wars of Watergate* not only contains the most basic of information about the Watergate break-in, but it also contains the reactions of retiring presidential aide, Harry Dent (“‘It’s all over’, he told his wife.”)\(^5\) and Leon Jaworski, president of the American Bar Association (not “particularly perturbed”)\(^6\). Kutler’s book also takes the reader behind the scenes as President Richard Nixon plots and plans with members of his inner circle on how to deal with the break-in. *The Wars of Watergate* successfully weaves the entire story of the Watergate break-in and subsequent resignation of Nixon. Kutler uses a variety of sources, including interviews with key figures involved in the Nixon Administration, to provide the most comprehensive look at the Watergate scandal.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Kutler’s work is that he does not devote a lot of time or attention to the two individuals who may have profited the most from the Watergate scandal. The two individuals in question are Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, two reporters for the *Washington Post*, whose book *All The President’s Men*

\(^5\) Kutler, p. 188.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 188.
was credited with bringing down Richard Nixon. Kutler only spends three paragraphs discussing how excerpts of *All The President’s Men* coincided with the publication of tape transcripts from the Oval Office. Kutler also goes on to point out that although the book received mostly positive reviews, some reviewers chose to criticize the detective novel style employed by Woodward and Bernstein, as well as the fact that throughout their investigation, the two reporters did not necessarily meet high ethical standards in pursuit of the truth. Despite this, *All The President’s Men* did become a nationwide best-seller and as Kutler puts it “…it undeniably gave an added impetus to the growing understanding and awareness of Watergate.”

In their book, *After the Fact: The Art of Historical Detection*, James West Davidson and Mark Hamilton Lytle sing the praises of Woodward and Bernstein’s work in *All The President’s Men* claiming that the book was popular not just because it was released at the heart of the Watergate investigation, but it was also an exciting well-written detective novel. In addition, Davidson and Lytle analyze the sequel to *All The President’s Men* called *The Final Days*. Examining the sequel from a historian’s perspective, Davidson and Lytle praise Woodward and Bernstein for the large number of sources that they used, not just relying on key figures in the Nixon Administration, but

---

7 Ibid., p. 458
8 Ibid., p. 458
9 Ibid., p. 459
also using those that worked beneath them as sources. Davidson and Lytle also commend Woodward and Bernstein for moving forth with a narrative style rather than trying to place Watergate within a historical framework. Davidson and Lytle feel this was the best route to go because “… contemporary observers are usually not particularly well-positioned to evaluate the larger issues of their day.”

Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein may have been the two people whose reputations and pocketbooks flourished the most following the Watergate scandal. However, that did not mean that they were the only two to profit from it. People intimately involved with the Nixon Administration at all levels also wrote books about their involvement.

White House counsel and chief Nixon whistle-blower John Dean weighed in his opinions with his book *Blind Ambition*, which was published by the same company, Simon and Schuster, who published *All The President’s Men* and *The Final Days*. Published in 1976, *Blind Ambition* takes the reader through John Dean’s reactions to the original break-in to his role in the cover-up and ultimately to his public testimony that undid the Nixon presidency. Initially, Dean knew that the break-in would have implications for the executive branch. Upon hearing from his assistant, Fred Fielding, about Watergate, Dean stated the “[a]ll that crazy screwing around has finally caught up with us. No one can help us now.”


---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{11}}\] Ibid., p. 349.
\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\] Ibid., p. 351.
President Nixon may have had some knowledge of the plans to bug the Democratic National Committee’s offices. During a meeting with one of the planners of the break-in, G. Gordon Liddy, Dean learns from Liddy that Gordon Strachan, an assistant to White House Chief of Staff, H.R. Haldeman, may have had some knowledge of the break-in, as well as other intelligence gathering operations being performed by Liddy and others. Dean felt that if Strachan knew about the bugging operation, then Haldeman knew, and if Haldeman knew then President Nixon knew.\(^\text{14}\) Dean also details a meeting with President Nixon in which it was determined that the Cuban burglars would take the blame for Watergate, that Liddy and Howard Hunt used re-election money for their own illegitimate purposes and that Nixon should just ignore and “stonewall” Watergate.\(^\text{15}\)

Dean sums up his original role in the cover-up with the following passage:

> I began my role in the cover-up as a fact-finder and worked my way up to idea man, and finally to desk officer. At the outset, I sensed no personal danger in what I was doing. In fact, I took considerable satisfaction from knowing that I had no criminal liability, and I consistently sought to keep it that way. I wanted to preserve my function as an ‘agent’ of my superiors, taking no initiatives, always acting on orders. In the process, I often found myself searching for alternatives that would keep me from taking dangerous steps.\(^\text{16}\)

Throughout *Blind Ambition*, Dean reveals names of key figures in the Nixon Administration and what their roles were throughout the cover-up. It should come as no surprise that some of those key figures would offer their own perspectives of what happened during Watergate. In his book, *The Ends of Power*, former Nixon Chief of

\(^{14}\) Ibid., pp. 96-97.
\(^{15}\) Ibid., pp. 120-121.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 121.
Staff, H.R. Haldeman shares his perspectives on who ordered the break-in of Watergate, the roles played by various members of the Nixon Administration, who the mysterious executive branch source for Bob Woodward was, and even some mistakes that Haldeman himself made while he was the Chief of Staff.

Haldeman recounts that his original reaction was to smile when he heard of the break-in. His rationale for that reaction was due to the fact that he felt that it was a “ludicrous” idea to wiretap the Democratic National Committee because nothing could be gained by doing so, that Nixon was leading his likely Democratic rival, George McGovern, by nineteen percentage points, and that the DNC was merely a “shell” in which no useful information could be found. Haldeman also reveals that based on the information about the break-in he received, White House special counsel Charles Colson could have been very well involved as he was considered the President’s personal “hit man”, involved in special projects for Nixon that ranged from “catching Senator Teddy Kennedy in bed with a woman not his wife, to more serious struggles such as the ITT antitrust ‘scandal.’ Haldeman’s fears were allayed when he did not receive any further news about the break-in from anybody in Washington D.C..

One interesting opinion that came out of The Ends of Power was that Haldeman felt that having John Dean handle the Watergate investigation was a big mistake, or as

18 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
19 Ibid., p. 8.
Haldeman states “a disaster”. Haldeman felt that Dean kept too much information on what he was doing hidden from the administration. Also, Haldeman makes the claim that as the pressure was mounting on Dean, Dean would remind Haldeman of a meeting they had in which they had made an agreement to turn off the “Liddy plan”. The only problem with this was that Haldeman could not find any evidence of ever having this meeting. Haldeman also goes on to discredit John Dean’s interpretation of who ordered the break-in. Dean’s version states that he had informed Nixon that the White House had set up an intelligence-gathering operation at the request of Haldeman and that those responsible for the intelligence-gathering were being pushed by Haldeman and Charles Colson to gather information, which precipitated the order to plant bugging devices at the Democratic National Committee. As those bugging devices did not work originally, a second break-in was ordered to fix them. This second attempt would be what is now commonly referred to as Watergate. Haldeman rebuts this by stating that the man thought to have ordered break-ins, campaign chairman John Mitchell, was one of the more cautious individuals in the Nixon camp and would never approve a break-in of the DNC. In addition, Haldeman repeats his earlier belief that there was no useful information to be gained from the DNC. Ultimately, Haldeman reveals that it is his opinion that it was Richard Nixon himself who ordered the break-in, due to an earlier

---

20 Ibid., p. 28.
21 Ibid., p. 28.
22 Ibid., pp. 125-127.
political controversy involving Nixon and DNC chairman Lawrence O'Brien.\textsuperscript{23} In fact Haldeman goes on to state that somehow those involved with the Democratic National Committee found out about the break-in plan and let it happen perhaps even going so far as planting the plain-clothes officers who arrested the burglars. In addition, the CIA was monitoring the burglars throughout. In the words of Haldeman, the operation was “deliberately sabotaged”.\textsuperscript{24}

Perhaps the most eagerly anticipated book was published in 1978. \textit{The Memoirs of Richard Nixon} was Nixon’s attempt to set the record straight on the Watergate scandal as well as a recording of his feelings as he lost control of his presidency. In his memoirs, Nixon’s explains his first thoughts on the Watergate break-in. On the night that the break-in occurred, Nixon was on a brief weekend vacation in the Bahamas. It was not until the next day that he first heard about the break-in in a small newspaper article. Nixon’s original thought was to dismiss it as some sort of prank and ultimately could not muster too much “moral outrage” as the practice of bugging was not uncommon in the world of politics.\textsuperscript{25} Nixon did not become too concerned until Chief of Staff H.R. Haldeman, informed him of the fact that the break-in may have involved someone on the payroll of the Campaign to Re-elect the President. Nixon notes that he hoped it did not involve someone from the CRP as the break-in was handled stupidly and there was no

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., p. 155.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., pp. 159-160.
\end{flushright}
reason to bug the DNC.\textsuperscript{26} In addition to news received by Haldeman, Nixon also became concerned when the \textit{Washington Post} ran a newspaper article about Howard Hunt, a man whose name appeared in the address books of two of the burglars. Hunt, it was discovered, had once been a consultant to Charles Colson, who himself was a member of Nixon’s inner circle of advisers.\textsuperscript{27} Within a couple of days, Nixon felt relief as it was determined by Haldeman and Colson that nobody in the White House appeared to be involved in the break-in and that G. Gordon Liddy would take the blame.\textsuperscript{28}

Following a decisive electoral victory over George McGovern, Nixon noted in his memoirs that some new Watergate problems were beginning to occur, such as finger-pointing among the White House staff. Examples of this finger-pointing included H.R. Haldeman commenting that Charles Colson may have been more aware of the Watergate situation than he let on and Colson informing Nixon that Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, Nixon’s assistant on domestic affairs, were more involved than they were letting on.\textsuperscript{29} Nixon also expounded on the increased role played by John Dean, expressing how pleased he is to be dealing directly with Dean, rather than Haldeman and Ehrlichman.\textsuperscript{30} Nixon also made note within his memoirs that it was John Dean who informed him of the level of involvement of various White House officials to Watergate when he spoke of a

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 627. \\
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p. 629. \\
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., pp. 634-635. \\
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., pp. 744-745. \\
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p. 780.}
“cancer” within the presidency. Ultimately, within the memoirs of Richard Nixon there are no earth-shattering revelations in regards to Watergate, but rather the perspective of the man whose presidency was ultimately brought down by an event that was once deemed a “third rate burglary”.

Presidential memoirs published within a few years after the last year a president was in office have become a certainty, much like death and taxes. Memoirs have become the ultimate opportunity for former presidents to set the record straight and shape how history will view their administrations. Historians and people in the media will often times offer their immediate analysis as to whether a former president has succeeded or failed and what issues will be focused upon. Because former presidents do not respond to these various analysis in the media, the memoir has become the tool in which ex-presidents can attempt to mold public opinion on how they wish to be viewed and how successful their respective presidencies were in regards to the major issues that were placed before them.

Movies have also portrayed the Watergate scandal differently. Both the film version of *All The President’s Men* and the Oliver Stone film *Nixon* portray the burglary much the way that it has been written in the history books with five burglars attempting to bug the offices of the Democratic National Committee and ultimately getting caught by security guards and police officers. In the movie *Forrest Gump*, the main character, who is staying in a room at the Watergate complex, reports to security seeing some

---

31 Ibid., p. 791.
people with flashlights maneuvering around in rooms across from where he is staying. The coincidence lies in the fact that Gump was staying in Washington D.C. because Nixon had invited him to visit the White House because Gump had just finished a tour of China as a goodwill ambassador playing ping pong. Finally, the movie *Dick* portrays two teenaged girls, one of whom lives in the Watergate complex, inadvertently tipping off security guards to some sort of break-in by themselves placing tape over a door lock as they sneak out of the apartment complex to mail a letter. Upon their return, they encounter G. Gordon Liddy in a stairwell which causes them to scream, alerting security.

A section of *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon* states that:

[i]t was already clear that there was not one truth about Watergate. There was the factual truth, which involved the literal description of what had occurred. But the factual truth could probably never be completely reconstructed, because each of us had become involved in different ways and no one’s knowledge at any given time exactly duplicated anyone else’s. There was the legal truth, which, as we now understood, would involve judgments about motive. There was the moral truth, which would involve opinions about whether what had been done represented an indictment of the ethics of the White House. And there was the political truth, which would be the sum of the impact that all the other truths would have on the American people and on their opinion of me and of my administration.\(^\text{32}\)

As stated previously, historians do not debate the actual facts, or the factual truth, of the break-in. The real debate lies in who ultimately authorized the break-in and what the reasons were to bug the Democratic Headquarters. Depending on which book one reads, one’s perspective is likely to be influenced by that author.

\[^{32}\text{Ibid., pp. 831-832.}\]
Executive Privilege

Perhaps the most significant outcome of the Watergate scandal was the definition of an inherent presidential power. The use of executive privilege by Richard Nixon to keep officials from testifying before the Senate Watergate committee, as well as to withhold the infamous White House tapes from the special prosecutor, brought this power to the forefront of the executive branch. Was executive privilege a constitutional right or was it a device used by Nixon illegally to hide criminal activity? Historians and scholars have debated over its usage.

In his book, Executive Privilege: A Constitutional Myth, Raoul Berger argues that executive privilege is an invalid use of presidential power. He states that it is a myth that was concocted by nineteenth century presidents who created precedents to fit their needs.33 Berger bases his arguments on the fact that there was no single utterance at either the Constitutional Convention or in The Federalist Papers about whether the executive should or can withhold information from Congress.34 In Federalist #51, James Madison wrote that in a republican form of government the legislature should “predominate”.35 According to Berger, Congress does have the right of oversight and in order to perform that function they must be well-informed. Since executive privilege is a power that only the president gets to exercise unchecked, the president gets to decide

34 Ibid., p. 13.
what to release and what to withhold, then Congress cannot effectively act as a coequal branch of government, thus violating the system of checks and balances. Berger also goes on to state that executive privilege is unpopular because it implies that the chief executive has something to hide. This type of secrecy leads to a loss in public confidence which ultimately leads to a credibility gap. It should be noted that Raoul Berger’s book was published in 1974, prior to Richard Nixon’s resignation, and although he does focus some of his work on Watergate, he uses the unpopular Vietnam War to highlight the need for Congressional oversight. Berger also uses history to show how various presidents, starting with George Washington, have used executive privilege to withhold information; a practice which Berger feels is unconstitutional.

Presidential historian, and committed liberal Democrat, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., supports Berger’s claims about executive privilege. In his book *The Imperial Presidency*, Schlesinger offers examples of how the executive branch is becoming more powerful at the expense of Congress. In regard to the use of executive privilege, Schlesinger also offers a history of its usage. More specifically, Schlesinger documents Nixon’s use, or misuse, of the power. According to Schlesinger, Nixon used executive privilege four times officially during his first term. However, Nixon used executive privilege informally on over twenty occasions, mostly by members of his administration or White House staff refusing to turn over documents or appear before Congress to give

testimony. In the aftermath of the Watergate break-in, Richard Nixon rejected any idea of making personal appearances before a Congressional committee or a grand jury based on the rationale that it was incompatible with presidential dignity and separation of powers. Schlesinger rejects this notion by using historical examples of Presidents such as George Washington and Abraham Lincoln appearing before Congress. Although Schlesinger is a Democrat, this should no way invalidate his views of Richard Nixon and the use of executive privilege.

Mark J. Rozell offers a different opinion on the use of executive privilege. In his book, *Executive Privilege: The Dilemma of Secrecy and Accountability*, Rozell rejects Raoul Berger’s claim that the use of executive privilege should not be considered valid. Rozell believes that people should not disregard the use of executive privilege just because of its abuses by Richard Nixon, much like the fact that people should not disregard the use of legislative inquiry because of the abuses of Senator Joe McCarthy during his communist witch hunts. Rozell notes that executive privilege must be used in cases of national security and the need for presidents to be able to receive candid advice. He states that it is important not to generalize from the abuses of one administration (Nixon’s), that all “secrecy in the operations of government is an abomination.”

---

38 Ibid., p. 269.
40 Ibid., p. 60.
In Stanley Kutler’s book *The Wars of Watergate*, it becomes fairly apparent that the Nixon administration was abusing this inherent power of executive privilege. One such example used by Kutler showed that Nixon had kept Charles Colson, one of the men who oversaw some of the dirty tricks being played by the administration, as a consultant in order to use executive privilege to keep Colson from ever having to testify before Congress or a grand jury.\(^{41}\) Nixon also felt that John Dean enjoyed the double protection of executive privilege and lawyer-client confidentiality.\(^{42}\) On March 12, 1973 Nixon issued a statement broadening the use of executive privilege stating that it was sanctioned by separation of powers and “…necessary to protect internal communications of the executive branch regarding vital national concerns.”\(^{43}\) Nixon felt that if communications within his administration were revealed it might affect the frank nature of the discussion and decision making. Later Nixon ordered John Ehrlichman and John Dean to check for precedents invoking executive privilege and had them inform Republican leaders and friendly columnists that executive privilege was not designed to cover up anything criminal.\(^{44}\)

As revelations of an elaborate White House taping system were revealed by presidential aide Alexander Butterfield before a congressional committee, the controversy over executive privilege intensified. Subpoenas were issued for the White House tapes. Richard Nixon claimed executive privilege to prevent the tapes from being turned over.

---

\(^{41}\) Kutler, p. 252.
\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 281.
\(^{43}\) Ibid., p. 272.
\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 348.
Ultimately the Supreme Court would have to decide the issue of executive privilege. Howard Ball addresses the issues and arguments placed before the Supreme Court in his book “We Have A Duty”: The Supreme Court and the Watergate Litigation. Ball points out that Nixon and his legal counsel took a position that executive privilege was absolute and that neither Congress nor the courts can tell a president what he must do with forms of communication within the executive branch. In response, the special prosecutor and his counsel argued that there did not exist a constitutional basis for executive privilege and that the federal courts had the responsibility to review the actions of the president, which they ultimately did.

Using copies of the legal briefs filed, Ball takes the reader through the process of how a case reaches the Supreme Court. He also goes into detail about how the justices ultimately arrived at their 8-0 decision that accomplished two things. The first thing that the decision did is order Nixon to turn over the tapes. Secondly, it did uphold and legitimate the doctrine of executive privilege. As Stanley Kutler wrote, “Executive privilege was a myth no more.”

Because of Nixon’s repeated abuses of the power, executive privilege now has a negative connotation attached to it. Later presidents have avoided using the term choosing to use phrases such as “internal department deliberations” or “sensitive law

---

46 Ibid., p. 62.
47 Kutler, p. 515.
enforcement materials”. However, if Nixon’s desired goal was to create legitimacy for the use of executive privilege, he got what he wanted. However, the price Nixon paid was pretty steep and that was his presidency.

Campaign Finance

If the presidential power of executive privilege was given credibility by the Supreme Court during the Watergate scandal, the issue of campaign finance was severely altered by both the Congress and the Supreme Court following Watergate. Because of the evidence that existed of a secret fund made up of campaign contributions to the Committee to Re-elect the President, Congress set forth to make adjustments to the amount of money that could be contributed and spent on campaigns. David Magleby and Candice J. Nelson discussed these changes in their book *The Money Chase*. In January 1972, amid reports that the Nixon campaign had raised millions of dollars from wealthy backers and millions more in illegal campaign contributions, Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to replace a previous attempt by Congress to regulate campaigns titled the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. The Act established uniform disclosure requirements for political committees and candidates for federal office. It also restricted the candidates’ use of their own money.

48 Rozell, p. 125.
It should be noted that for the 1972 presidential election, the Nixon campaign raised $63 million dollars. Jeffery Birnbaum notes in his book, *The Money Men: The Real Story of Fund-raising’s Influence on Political Power in America*, that some of that $63 million was raised improperly. Birnbaum writes that Nixon received $200,000 from Robert Vesco in an attaché case, that Howard Hughes contributed $100,000 via a safe-deposit box belonging to a friend of Richard Nixon, Bebe Rebozo. Clement Stone contributed $73,000 officially and another $2 million that went unreported. Finally, thirteen corporations and their foreign subsidies chipped in with $780,000 in illegal campaign contributions.

Magleby and Nelson also discuss in their book that further, more extensive attempts were made to regulate campaign finance following the Watergate scandal. Amendments to the FECA Act of 1971 set limits on campaign spending, established new limits on how much could be contributed by individual donors, political parties and Political Action Committees, limited independent expenditures, created partial public funding for presidential primary contests and created a new regulatory agency called the Federal Election Commission.

Much like the issue of executive privilege, many of the new regulations passed by Congress were put to the constitutional test before the Supreme Court. On January 30, 1976, the Court decided that money is considered a form of speech and spending it to

---

attain public office was protected by the 1st Amendment, thus any restrictions on spending were unconstitutional because they restricted free speech and that candidates could spend as much of their own money as they wanted to. The Court did, however, state that there could be limits on campaign spending if candidates accepted public funds.

In 1979, Congress added more amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act. These amendments allowed state and local political parties to spend unlimited amounts of money on voter registration drives, get-out-the vote drives and other “party building activities”.

Magleby and Nelson also discuss the overall impacts the Federal Election Campaign Act, its amendments, and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo have had on campaigns. Included in their discussion is the fact that because of the increased dependence of Political Action Committees, special interest groups may be influencing public policy. Magleby and Nelson also show that there has been a growth in independent expenditures by Political Action Committees, as well as an increase in the use of “soft money” towards political campaigns.

As mentioned earlier, Jeffrey Birnbaum also shows that the Federal Campaign Act has had some unfortunate consequences. Birnbaum does not necessarily feel that

---

54 Ibid., p. 15.
55 Ibid., p. 15.
56 Ibid., p. 16.
57 Ibid., p. 18.
58 Ibid., p. 18.
fund-raising is a function of greed and corruption, but rather pettiness and greed.\footnote{Birnbaum, pp. xi-xii.} He uses the example of a fisherman who uses chum to attract bigger fish. Instead of using cut up dead fish to attract possible contributors, a candidate may use cheesy souvenirs to attract the big donors, items like presidential cuff links.\footnote{Ibid., pp. xi-xii.}

Birnbaum also goes on to bemoan the fact that some of the big fund-raisers in Washington D.C. are involved in planning and implementing legislation.\footnote{Ibid., pp. xii.} He also makes the claim that the Federal Election Commission is the most ineffective agency in Washington because lawmakers have made it this way because they do not want a powerful regulator overseeing their elections.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 15-16.} The FEC, Birnbaum states, is made up of six members. Three of the members are Republican and three are Democrats, thus there are a lot of three to three ties when it comes to decision making. Birnbaum also goes on to state that George W. Bush opted to decline any matching federal funds for his presidential campaign which freed him from any type of federal regulation, thus the final nail in the coffin of the post-Watergate reforms.\footnote{Ibid., p. 47.}

In his book, \textit{Inside Campaign Finance: Myths and Realities}, Frank J. Sorauf is quick to point out that in addition to changes in campaign finance reform, the 1970s brought about a reduced power in the ability of political parties to run presidential campaigns. Candidates now use media consultants, polling experts, even tutors in using
television, all of which enables candidates to run their own campaigns and make their
own appeals. With the cost of advertising going up, so too will the cost of campaigns,
thus creating the need for candidates to raise enormous sums of money. During the 2004
presidential and congressional election, the total cost of running for office was four
billion dollars, with a single thirty second ad costing $100,000.

One can argue that since Watergate, there has not been any evidence of a slush
fund used to play political dirty tricks. This does not mean, however, that campaign
money has been raised in ethical ways. All three authors referenced in this section feel
that more reform is necessary. One such attempt at reform was a bipartisan bill produced
by Senators John McCain and Russ Feingold. Titled the Bipartisan Campaign Reform
Act of 2002, this bill, ultimately signed by President George W. Bush, placed a ban on
unlimited cash contributions to political parties called soft money. The bill also placed
restrictions on ads from outside groups that tout or criticize a candidate’s position on an
issue, but do not tell viewers to vote for or against that candidate. Opponents of the
McCain/Feingold bill argued that it violated the First Amendment guarantee of free
speech. The Supreme Court ultimately decided in a 5-4 decision that McCain/Feingold
was constitutional. However, it did not take long for groups to find loopholes as groups
were allowed to fund their own political advertising, so long as they do not coordinate
with the candidate. During the 2004 presidential election both John Kerry and George
Bush saw different groups run ads opposing them despite the fact that McCain/Feingold
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was supposed to put an end to this. Because it is both the president and Congress that benefit from campaign funding, the prospects for limiting the role of money in a campaign are not very good.

Presidential/Media Relations

Perhaps the greatest impact of the Watergate scandal on today’s political climate is felt in political reporting. Due to the success of *Washington Post* reporters, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, the way politics is reported has changed significantly. Larry J. Sabato analyzes this change in his book *Feeding Frenzy: Attack Journalism and American Politics*. He writes about how the Watergate scandal shifted journalism from what is happening, description, to prescription, which is setting the agenda for politicians by focusing on their shortcomings and certain social problems.65 Sabato also writes how Watergate began the “open season” by the press which allows for scrutiny into the most private areas of public officials lives.66 Ultimately the impact of Watergate has been that “…government scandals have paraded across the television set in a roll call so lengthy and numbing that they are inseparable in the public consciousness, all joined at the Achilles Heel.”67 Interestingly enough, Sabato notes that many reporters missed the significance of the Watergate break-in as less than three percent of the print stories and
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seventeen percent of network broadcasts during the 1972 general election campaign season mentioned Watergate.\(^{68}\)

E.J. Dionne supports the claims made by Larry Sabato by stating in his book *Why Americans Hate Politics* that Watergate encouraged an “increasingly adversarial journalism” which helps to undermine the government’s credibility.\(^{69}\) However, no friend of the Nixon Administration, Dionne is quick to give credit to both the press and the judiciary for unraveling the mystery of Watergate.

Richard Nixon did not do himself any favors when dealing with the press. One author points out that Nixon basically conducted virtual war against the press by ordering wiretaps and tax audits of certain journalists.\(^{70}\) If anybody should know the power that the press, especially television, had in creating a positive image it would have been Nixon. It took the first televised presidential debate with John F. Kennedy for Nixon to learn that hard lesson.

In Christopher Matthews’ book, *Kennedy and Nixon: The Rivalry That Shaped Postwar America*, it is noted that Nixon did not quite understand the power of television. This attitude was puzzling, according to Matthews, because Nixon had enjoyed success on television just a few years earlier with his famous “Checkers” speech.\(^{71}\) Matthews contrasts the approaches taken by Kennedy and Nixon leading up to the debate, such as

\(^{68}\) Ibid., p. 134.
Kennedy taking time out of his campaign schedule to prepare for the debate, as well as campaigning in the California sun, whereas Nixon kept campaigning, rested very little and resisted any make-up because he felt that “masochists” did not need make-up. Matthews also points out that following the debate in public opinion polls most people who watched the debate on television thought that Kennedy had emerged victorious, whereas most who tuned in on the radio gave the nod to Nixon. Unfortunately for Richard Nixon, this led to Kennedy winning the race for the White House.

Another book, titled Presidents and the Press, adds to the fact that Nixon also blamed the media for biased reporting during the 1960 presidential election. Nixon felt that many of the news reporters covering the campaign were unable to keep their bias out of what were to be straight news stories. This scenario repeated itself in 1962 when Nixon lost the race for California governor to Edmund G. “Pat” Brown. Again, Nixon chose to vent on the media and what he felt was their poor reporting. The author of Presidents and the Press, Joseph Spear, argues that Nixon was off base with his criticism of the media in the governor’s race. He points out that seventy percent of the California newspapers endorsed the former vice-president. He also notes that the reporters were the “model of objectivity” in that they merely wrote what the candidates said, but did not provide a lot of interpretation or background. Spear also states that for the 1968 presidential campaign, Nixon learned his lesson and hired public relations help and left
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the campaign in their hands. H.R. Haldeman advocated the extensive use of television advertising and the packaging of Richard Nixon like a “new soap or soda pop.” To help sell Nixon’s image, celebrities such as Art Linkletter, Connie Francis, Pat Boone, and John Wayne were brought in to endorse Nixon.

Despite many of these media savvy techniques, Nixon did not necessarily enjoy a cozy relationship with the media that some of his predecessors did. According to Spear, even though Nixon pointed out that his problems with the press began in the late 1940s, there is one piece of evidence that Nixon’s basic attitudes towards the press were developed much earlier. At the age of sixteen, Nixon wrote a speech, which won a prize, titled “Our Privileges under the Constitution”. In the speech a young Richard Nixon argues that there should be some limits placed upon the press and that the First Amendment is not “sacrosanct.” Spear is also quick to point out that many newsmen that covered Nixon’s pursuit of suspected Communist Alger Hiss found Nixon to be “comfortable with the press” and a “useful ‘leak’.” Nixon saw his treatment by the press following the Hiss case differently, as he wrote in his book *Six Crises* that the case “‘left a residue of hatred and hostility toward [Nixon]…among substantial segments of the press and the intellectual community.’” Spear goes on to outline many of the battles
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Nixon had with the media in his book. Perhaps some of the blame that he laid at the feet of reporters after he lost elections in 1960 and 1962 caused a lingering resentment among the reporters, or perhaps reporters were upset that they were lied to repeatedly about the Watergate scandal.

The legacy of Watergate in presidential relationships with the media still exists today. Ironically enough, Bob Woodward authored a book about the legacy of Watergate on the presidencies of Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and Bill Clinton. The book is titled *Shadow: Five Presidents and the Legacy of Watergate*. In the book, Woodward shows how new ethics laws, which were passed in the wake of Watergate, impacted the administrations that succeeded Nixon. In addition, Woodward also discusses how Congress and the media also became emboldened in their quests to uncover any kind of wrongdoing within presidential administrations. In the epilogue, Woodward expresses surprise at the fact that the presidents that followed Nixon were dogged by scandal. He felt that Nixon’s successors would

…recognize the price of scandal and learn the two fundamental lessons of Watergate. First, if there is questionable activity, release the facts, whatever they are, as early and completely as possible. Second, do not allow outside inquiries, whether conducted by prosecutors, congressmen or reporters, to harden into a permanent state of suspicion and warfare.  

Woodward concludes that the five presidents detailed in *Shadow* fell victim to the myth of the big-time president like George Washington and Franklin Roosevelt.

Woodward argues that since Vietnam and Watergate, the office of president has been

---
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limited and diminished. In addition, there is no air of mystery or intrigue around the presidency, as its “inner workings and the behavior of the presidents are fully exposed.”

One interesting aspect of Woodward’s book centered around a letter he received from former President George H.W. Bush in which Bush stated his belief that Watergate and Vietnam moved “Beltway” journalism into an “aggressive, intrusive ‘take no prisoners’ kind of reporting” that he found offensive. This comment certainly could not be lost on Bob Woodward as he was one of the journalists who were at the center of this movement due to his involvement in the investigation of the Watergate break-in and subsequent cover-up.

Clinton Scandals V. Watergate

Presidential scholar Robert Spitzer wrote that if Watergate was considered to be “a long national nightmare”, than the scandal involving President Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky was a “drug-induced hallucination”. In his article titled The Presidency: The Clinton Crisis and Its Consequences, Spitzer notes the similarities and differences between the problems faced by Bill Clinton and those that Richard Nixon was forced to deal with. Spitzer makes the point that during the Clinton impeachment process, there was no debate over the power of the presidency or the internal functioning of the executive branch, but rather the focus lay with the misdeeds of Clinton which some
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felt were unrelated to his job as President. This is not to say that there were not some specific constitutional questions that arose from both scandals. Spitzer shows that there were four of these. The first question revolved around the legitimacy and limits of executive privilege. The second question concerned the definition and applicability of impeachment. The third question dealt with the proper role of an independent prosecutor and the fourth question centered on the proper role of the courts in arbitrating disputes involving the presidency.

Other historians, journalists, and authors have noted other similarities between Watergate and “Monicagate”. Howard Kurtz makes the point that Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton used similar defensive tactics, such as blaming their problems on a hostile press and attacking the special prosecutor whose job it was to investigate the charges being brought forth. In addition, both Nixon and Clinton had family members go out to the public to dispute the charges, with Clinton’s wife Hillary offering the famous rebuttal by stating that special prosecutor Ken Starr was a “politically motivated prosecutor” who was part of a “vast right-wing conspiracy” of “malicious” and “evil-minded” people.

That, according to most historians, is where the similarities end. Robert Spitzer makes the point that the Watergate investigation was much less partisan than was the Clinton impeachment. This evidence is supported by his research of the debates among
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members of Congress, as well as their votes. Watergate saw a number of Republicans join Democrats in speaking out against the president as well as in voting for the articles of impeachment that were introduced. In addition, Spitzer acknowledges that the supporters of Nixon did not acknowledge any misdeeds made by the President and that the charges brought against Clinton did not necessarily fit the definition of high crimes and misdemeanors that are necessary to impeach a president or federal official.92

Public perception of the Watergate scandal against the alleged scandals of the Clinton Administration varies as well. In his book, Spin Cycle: Inside the Clinton Propaganda Machine, Howard Kurtz notes that on the twenty-fifth anniversary of Watergate only twenty percent of the American public felt that Bill Clinton’s involvement in a real estate deal called Whitewater was worse than Nixon’s role in Watergate.93 At a press briefing that day, Clinton’s press secretary, Mike McCurry, was reminded that the lesson of Watergate was for “the White House to tell the truth”, to which McCurry replied, “[w]e do.”94

Kurtz also discusses how members of the White House felt that reporters had no historical memory of the Watergate scandal or how members of the Nixon Administration had no reservations about shredding the Constitution.95 In fact, Kurtz writes, the Clinton Administration was inhabited by people who believed that Nixon and members of his Administration were criminals that were “…brought down by righteous
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investigators and journalists.” In fact, Hillary Clinton was a lawyer for the House Judiciary Committee in 1974 that brought articles of impeachment against Nixon. Of course, Nixon resigned before those articles were ever fully voted on.

History will show that although Bill Clinton was impeached by the House of Representatives, he was able to hold on to his presidency because the Senate did not vote to convict him. History will also show that although Richard Nixon was never impeached, he could not hold on to his presidency. Republican Senator Fred Thompson of Tennessee was one of one hundred senators who decided Clinton’s fate. Thompson also served as the Republican counsel for the Senate Watergate Committee. Thompson stated to author Bob Woodward that four elements must exist to remove a sitting president. They are low public opinion polls, a bad economy, a hostile media, and incontrovertible evidence, like the Watergate tapes. It was ironic that Watergate was saving the Clinton presidency because there was no “smoking gun” like the revelations of audio tapes that ultimately sank Nixon.

Woodward also goes on to state that in the case of Bill Clinton and the Lewinsky scandal, there really is no comparison to Watergate. Whereas, Nixon and his subordinates conspired to cover-up Watergate, there was no effort on Clinton’s part to conspire with members of his administration to cover up his problems. Rather, according to Woodward, Clinton’s cover-up was a one-man operation designed to hide his
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embarrassment and shame, not to conceal a crime. Woodward criticizes Clinton for treating some of the earlier investigations as if they were Watergate. It gave the impression that Clinton was hiding something. Likewise, Woodward is critical of how Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr handled his submission of the Starr Report to Congress, deeming it “pathetic and unwise”. Woodward closes his book by expressing his concern that like Nixon, Clinton will be spending the better part of his time rehabilitating his image. Unlike Nixon, who attempted this feat out of office, Clinton would be trying to do this while in office.  

Like Richard Nixon, Bill Clinton wrote his memoirs which would be his chance to express how he would like history to view his administration. Although Nixon and Clinton are connected because of the fact that articles of impeachment were drafted against each, Clinton does not devote much of his memoir to what might be an obvious comparison. Nor does Clinton try to distinguish the differences between himself and Nixon. Rather, Clinton chooses to attack the partisan nature of the investigation by Ken Starr and the fact that conservative Republicans had it out for him. Clinton does express his shame of what happened with Monica Lewinsky and the fact he had misled various members of the media, his family, and his administration. However, Clinton does point out that his offenses were not grounds for impeachment, an opinion that is shared by Bob Woodward.
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Conclusion

Although Watergate and the resignation of Richard Nixon occurred over thirty years ago, the impacts of the event continue to be felt even today. Even though Nixon brought shame and disgrace to such a revered office, that was once held by great men like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, the luster of the presidency has not suffered any long-term ill effects. Rather, the changes to the office of the president have been how the private affairs of the president must be conducted. No longer can a president trust that the media will wink and nod at his various dalliances, like John Kennedy was able to do during his brief tenure as chief executive. The media, emboldened by its perceived success at the ousting of Richard Nixon, continues to dog presidential administrations hoping to achieve the same type of fame that Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward received following the publication of All The President’s Men and The Final Days. However, this determination has come at a price as some view the media and their motives with the same cynical eye that they view today’s politician.

Some powers enjoyed by the president also were impacted by Watergate. The use of executive privilege, which was deemed a legitimate power by the Supreme Court during the Watergate controversy, has become, like the Fifth Amendment, freedom from self-incrimination. Even though both are considered valid tactics, the use of each often causes others to wonder what the practitioner is concealing. Much like those suspected Communists who pleaded the Fifth before the House Un-American Activities Committee, a president who uses executive privilege to protect confidentiality is considered guilty of
hiding something. This is due to the fact that Nixon misused executive privilege because
he was hiding something.

Watergate was also responsible for emboldening Congress to pass a slew of legislation regulating campaign finance. However, all the campaign finance legislation passed in the last thirty years still has not reduced the importance of money in elections. 2004 saw a record amount of money spent in campaigns throughout the United States. The only difference between today and the early 1970s is that most of the money today is not ending up financing illegal activities such as break-ins.

Finally, any president that does not learn from the mistakes of Richard Nixon does not deserve the nation’s support or forgiveness when problems arise. Americans for the most part seem to understand that the president is an imperfect person who makes mistakes like the rest of the American population. It is when the president attempts to stonewall investigations or blame others for his problems that the trouble begins. Richard Nixon understood this when he said that problems begin when you try to cover up wrongdoing. However, what he failed to realize is that people want the truth and they want it immediately. Had Nixon told the truth right away, then perhaps he would have finished out his second term with history focusing on his achievements in foreign policy. As it is now, the first word that comes to mind when the name Richard Nixon is mentioned is Watergate and the only person that Nixon can blame is himself.
LESSON PLAN

Introduction

The topic of the following lesson plan will be Watergate and its impacts on today’s political climate. There will be three themes used to illustrate the topic. The three themes are those that fail to learn from past mistakes are often doomed to repeat them, power corrupts, and those in power will fight to stay in power.

The lesson is designed for a 12th grade United States Government class and addresses the California History and Social Science Standards as well as the National History Standards as shown below. The lesson should take two weeks and is designed for ten classes of 55 minutes each.

California State Standards:

11.11 Students analyze the major social problems and domestic policy issues in contemporary American society.

4. Explain the constitutional crisis originating from the Watergate scandal.

12.4 Students analyze the unique roles and responsibilities of the three branches of government as established by the U.S. Constitution.

1. Discuss Article I of the Constitution as it relates to the legislative branch, including eligibility for office and lengths of terms of representatives and senators; election to office; the roles of the House and Senate in impeachment proceedings; the role of the vice president; the enumerated legislative powers; and the process by which a bill becomes a law.

4. Discuss Article II of the Constitution as it relates to the executive branch, including eligibility for office and length of term, election to and removal from office, the oath of office, and the enumerated executive powers.

12.5 Students summarize landmark U.S. Supreme Court interpretations of the Constitution and its amendments.

12.6 Students evaluate issues regarding campaigns for national, state, and local elective offices.

3. Evaluate the roles of polls, campaign advertising, and the controversies over campaign funding.

12.7 Students evaluate and take and defend positions on the influence of the media on American political life.

1. Discuss the meaning and importance of a free and responsible press.

National Standards Era 10: Contemporary United States (1968 to present)

Standard 1: Recent developments in foreign and domestic politics

The first week of the lesson plan will introduce students to the Watergate scandal and the corruption that plagued the Nixon Administration. Students will learn how Richard Nixon is viewed in the eyes of others. The theme of “power corrupts” will be introduced here as students will understand that the Nixon Administration abused its power.

In week two, comparisons and connections will be made between the scandals of Richard Nixon and those of Bill Clinton. Students will have the opportunity to view the articles of impeachment that were drafted against each president, as well as note the similarities and differences between Nixon and Clinton. The themes of “those that fail to learn from past mistakes are often doomed to repeat them” and “those in power will fight to stay in power” will be introduced during this portion of the lesson.
Prior Content Knowledge and Skills

Prior to the introduction of this topic, students will have already learned about the powers granted to the three branches of government by the Constitution. In addition, students should have some knowledge of the administrations of Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton. Students will know how to use and interpret diverse sources, such as political cartoons, speeches, government documents, and film. Students should possess basic academic skills such as reading and note-taking.

Discussion of Content Hook

At the beginning of the first day of the unit, the teacher will place a transparency of an article from the *Arkansas Gazette* on the overhead projector with any reference to Bill Clinton or the state of Arkansas erased.¹⁰¹ Students will be asked to follow along as the teacher reads the article aloud. Upon completion of the reading, the teacher will ask the students to speculate about whom the person in the article is referring. Ultimately it will be revealed that the person in question is Bill Clinton. The teacher will then distribute copies of the book *All The President’s Men* by Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward.¹⁰² Once all of the students have a copy of the book, the teacher will then ask why the article about Bill Clinton encouraging Richard Nixon to resign was used to introduce *All The President’s Men*. Students should then understand that Clinton had

¹⁰¹ See http://www.watergate.info/chronology/74-08-08_clinton-comments.shtml. Accessed 21 April, 2005
been impeached by the House of Representatives, but not convicted by the Senate, whereas Nixon had resigned before he could be impeached and that the book *All The President’s Men* was credited with helping to bring down Richard Nixon. At the conclusion of the class, the teacher will assign Chapter One of *All the President’s Men* for homework.

**Lesson Content**

Following the introductory hook and assigned reading from the day before, students will be given a handout titled “Watergate Incident Video Comparison”. (See Appendix A) The teacher will then show snippets from four movies that depict the Watergate break-in. The four movies will be shown in this particular order: *All The President’s Men*, Oliver Stone’s *Nixon*, *Forrest Gump*, and *Dick*. Students will be asked to view the snippets and then compare the material with what they read the night before in Chapter One of *All The President’s Men*. Students will be asked to share their impressions with what they just viewed. At the conclusion of class, the teacher will distribute a handout titled “*All The President’s Men* Character Sheet”. (See Appendix A) This sheet will contain the names of some of the key figures in the Watergate incident. Students will be asked to briefly describe the key figures’ position within the White House and their roles in regards to Watergate. This sheet will be due at the conclusion of the reading of the book. For homework that evening, students will read Chapters 2 and 3.
On day three, students will enter class with a Herb Block cartoon detailing the other scandals that plagued the Nixon Administration on the overhead transparency. Students should make note that Watergate was not the only scandal that plagued the Nixon White House. Students will be broken up into even groups and asked to research the additional four Nixon scandals “flying” over the White House. The first scandal in the cartoon is the ITT scandal. This scandal involved a corporation that gave Nixon $400,000 in order to prevent the Justice Department from filing antitrust charges against it. The second scandal is the Milk Fund scandal. Nixon had let it be known that he was considering cutting the price supports for milk. The dairy industry responded by making significant monetary contributions to the Nixon campaign. The third scandal involved the use of taxpayers’ money to make improvements on Nixon’s home in San Clemente. The final scandal mentioned in the cartoon centered on a large tax deduction that Nixon took when he donated his vice-presidential papers to the National Archives.

Students will do their research in a computer lab using online resources found by entering key words into a search engine like Google. Students will be asked to present to the class basic information such as what was the scandal about, who was involved, and what was the end result for Nixon and others in his administration. Research should last until the end of the period with the brief five minute presentations to be conducted the next day. Homework for the evening will be to read Chapters 4 and 5 of All The President's Men.

Day four will commence with each group making their final preparations for their brief five-minute presentations. While each group is presenting, the other groups should be taking notes on the information being presented. After each group has presented, students will then be asked to rank, in their opinion, the most serious of the four scandals to the least serious of the four scandals. Students will be asked to share their thoughts. Homework for the evening will be to read Chapters 6 and 7 of *All The President’s Men*.

Day five (which should be a Friday) will be spent viewing the movie *All The President’s Men*. By viewing the movie, this should allow those students who may be struggling with the book to better understand what they are reading. Homework over the weekend will be to read Chapters 8, 9, and 10 of *All The President’s Men*.

Day six will begin with a quick review of what students have read thus far through the first ten chapters of *All The President’s Men*. Following the quick ten minute review, the teacher will place lecture notes comparing the Nixon impeachment proceedings with those of Bill Clinton’s over twenty years later. (See Appendix B) Following the lecture, students will then be assigned Chapters 11 and 12 from *All The President’s Men*.

Day seven will begin with the teacher distributing to the students copies of the Articles of Impeachment against Richard Nixon and the Articles of Impeachment
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against Bill Clinton. Accompanying both copies will be a set of questions that students will asked to answer and then turn in. (See Appendix A) Prior to the answers being turned in, students will be asked to share their answers and their opinions on each of the Articles of Impeachment. Finally, the teacher will distribute a handout that shows how the vote went for each article of impeachment brought against Bill Clinton.

Homework for the evening will be Chapters 13 and 14 from *All The President’s Men*.

Day eight will begin with two political cartoons depicting both Nixon and Clinton in precarious situations. Students will be asked to make comparisons between the two cartoons. The teacher will then show a snippet of the PBS documentary *The Clinton Years* to the class. The section shown will focus on the Lewinsky scandal and subsequent impeachment proceedings. Following the snippet, the teacher will distribute a blank chart titled “Nixon and Clinton: A Comparison” and ask the students to fill it out using their knowledge of both scandals. (See Appendix A) Students will be asked to share their answers when prompted by the teacher. Homework for the evening will be Chapters 15, 16, and 17 from *All The President’s Men*.

Day nine will be considered a review day as the previous night’s reading was the last assigned reading for *All The President’s Men*. Because the book ends rather
abruptly, the teacher will show transparencies of a timeline of the key events of the Watergate break-in and subsequent resignation of Richard Nixon with the idea that the students will recognize some of the key events due to the fact that they have been reading the book.\footnote{See \url{http://www.watergate.info/chronology/brief.shtml}. Accessed 19 April, 2005} Also, this timeline review will help students prepare for the exam on the book which will be held tomorrow.

Day ten will consist of the exam on the book.

Evaluation

The evaluation for this particular lesson will consist of the following items: an exam which will contain forty multiple-choice questions, ten true or false statements and two essay questions. (See Appendix C) The multiple-choice questions and true or false statements will give the students the opportunity to show that they mastered some of the facts of Watergate, as well as show the ability to identify key persons involved in the scandal. The essay questions will be used to allow the students to weave the themes of the unit with what they learned.

In addition to a traditional exam, a non-traditional, creative form of evaluation will also be assigned. (See Appendix C) Students will be asked to research scandals involving other presidents and draft Articles of Impeachment against that president. The administrations of Richard Nixon, Bill Clinton, and Andrew Johnson will be off limits on this assignment as articles have already been drafted. The details of the scandal and the
students-created Articles of Impeachment will be presented to the class and then a vote will be taken determining whether or not the president in question should be impeached.
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Appendix A. Handouts

Watergate Incident Video Comparison Sheet

Film #1

Title:

How is the Watergate break-in portrayed?

Are there any differences from the book version of the events and the movie version? If so, what are they?

Film #2

Title:

How is the Watergate break-in portrayed differently than Film #1?

Does the break-in portrayed in this film vary much from the book *All The President’s Men*?
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Film #3

Title:

How is the Watergate break-in portrayed in this film?

Are there any elements in the scene that could have been taken from the book *All The President’s Men*? If so, what are they?

Film #4

Title:

How is the Watergate break-in portrayed in this film?

In this film, who are responsible for alerting security to the break-in? How does this differ from the book?
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*All The President’s Men*

Character Sheet

Instructions: For each character listed below, list their job within the Nixon Administration and explain briefly how they were involved in Watergate.

Ken Clawson

Charles Colson

Kenneth Dahlberg

John Dean

John Ehrlichman

L. Patrick Gray

H.R. Haldeman
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Howard Hunt

G. Gordon Liddy

Clark MacGregor

Jeb Stuart Magruder

John Mitchell

Hugh Sloan

Maurice Stans

Ron Ziegler
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**Articles of Impeachment Comparison**

**Directions:** Read through the two Articles of Impeachment drafted by the House of Representatives calling for the removal of Presidents Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton and then answer the following questions.

How many Articles of Impeachment were brought against Richard Nixon? What are they?

What supporting evidence is given in the Articles that support the removal of Richard Nixon from office?

Of the charges brought against Richard Nixon, which do you feel is the most serious? Why?

Would you vote to remove Richard Nixon from office? Give reasons for the way you would vote.

How many Articles of Impeachment were brought against Bill Clinton? What are they?
Appendix A (continued)

What supporting evidence is given in the Articles that support the removal of Bill Clinton from office?

In your opinion, do the charges brought against Bill Clinton qualify as “high crimes and misdemeanors”? Support your answer.

Would you vote for the removal of Bill Clinton from office? Give reasons for the way you would vote?
## Nixon and Clinton
### A Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Watergate Affair</th>
<th>The Lewinsky Scandal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What crime is that the heart of the scandal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the President involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the Congress involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the Supreme Court involved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the charges against the President?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Over Head Transparencies

Nixon v. Clinton Comparison

Similarities:
Impeachment proceedings began during 2\textsuperscript{nd} term

Famous soundbites
  • “I am not a crook” (Nixon)
  • “I did not have sexual relations with that woman” (Clinton)

Use of family to deny charges
  • Nixon’s daughter
  • Clinton’s wife

“Smoking Gun”
  • White House tapes (Nixon)
  • Lewinsky’s blue dress (Clinton)

Critical of Independent Counsel
  • Archibald Cox (Nixon)
  • Kenneth Starr (Clinton)

Both lost key Supreme Court cases

Both blamed media
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Differences:

- During Watergate hearings, Republicans crossed party lines to vote for possible impeachment
- No Democrats opposed Clinton

Clinton had a favorable public opinion rating, Nixon did not

Clinton supporters acknowledged his misdeeds, Nixon’s did not
Appendix C. Evaluation Materials.

*All The President’s Men*

**Book Exam**

**Part A—Multiple Choice**

Choose the letter that best answers the following questions.

1) The Watergate controversy centered on the re-election campaign of what U.S. President?
   a) George McGovern    c) Richard Nixon
   b) John Kennedy       d) Edmund Muskie

2) How many burglars were involved in the original break-in of the Watergate complex?
   a) Four                c) Six
   b) Five                d) Seven

3) What organization were the burglars attempting to bug to gain access to confidential information?
   a) Democratic National Committee
   b) Federal Bureau of Investigation
   c) Central Intelligence Agency
   d) House Intelligence Committee

4) What was the name of the newspaper that the authors, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein worked for?
   a) *New York Times*
   b) *Los Angeles Times*
   c) *USA Today*
   d) *Washington Post*

5) What prominent politician was at the center of investigations by Howard Hunt?
   a) Ted Kennedy          c) Bob Dole
   b) J. Edgar Hoover      d) Lyndon Johnson

6) What was discovered in the bank account of Bernard Barker, one of the Watergate burglars?
   a) a $25,000 check that had been earmarked for the Nixon campaign
   b) a loan from the FBI
   c) a $50,000 check from Cuban dictator Fidel Castro
   d) nothing, he was broke

7) The Democratic nominee for president at this time was
   a) Ted Kennedy          c) George McGovern
   b) Hugh Sloan           d) Richard Nixon

8) What was the nickname given to the high-level, anonymous source that Woodward had in the executive branch?
   a) Beowulf              c) Deep Throat
   b) Midnight Cowboy      d) Soylent Green
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9) Who forced Hugh Sloan, the treasurer for the Committee to Re-elect the President to resign his position from the campaign?
   a) the President        c) his wife
   b) H.R. Haldeman        d) John Dean

10) What role does John Mitchell serve in the presidential campaign?
    a) presidential lawyer  c) chief fund-raiser
    b) press secretary      d) campaign director

11) How did John Mitchell respond when Bernstein informed him that his paper was going to run a story naming Mitchell as the controller of a secret fund?
    a) he uttered obscenities while issuing a strong denial
    b) he threatened a lawsuit
    c) he hung up abruptly after a few short moments
    d) all of the above

12) What was the Canuck Letter?
    a) a letter written by Richard Nixon to the Canadian government asking for campaign funds
    b) a letter sent to a New Hampshire newspaper detailing an alleged racial slur used by a Democratic presidential candidate
    c) a letter written to Woodward and Bernstein from a Canadian man who was being investigated by the Nixon Administration for having ties to Ted Kennedy
    d) none of the above

13) What person was most adversely affected by the Canuck Letter?
    a) Richard Nixon        c) Bob Woodward
    b) Deep Throat          d) Edmund Muskie

14) Who is the presidential press secretary at the time of the Watergate investigation?
    a) John Mitchell        c) Ron Ziegler
    b) H.R. Haldeman        d) Charles Colson

15) Who is the President’s Chief of Staff at the time of the Watergate investigation?
    a) H.R. Haldeman        c) Henry Kissinger
    b) G. Gordon Liddy      d) Howard Hunt

16) What was the significance of the “USC Mafia”?
    a) It membership included many people who ultimately worked for Nixon’s campaign
    b) Some of its members were involved in the political pranks that were being played on the various Democratic presidential candidates
    c) They helped swing the 1962 gubernatorial election for Nixon
    d) A and B only

17) What was the nickname of the group ordered by Nixon to investigate “leaks” within the White House and executive agencies?
    a) Plumbers              c) USC Mafia
    b) Roto-Rooters          d) Special-Ops
Appendix C (continued)

18) What is Ben Bradlee’s role in the Watergate investigation?
   a) he controls Nixon’s secret re-election fund
   b) he turns out to be Woodward’s high level executive source
   c) he is the editor of the *Washington Post* who gives the approval on which Watergate
      stories can run
   d) he is one of the original five burglars who were caught wiretapping

19) What is the name of the judge who oversees the Watergate Grand Jury investigation?
   a) John Sirica  c) Earl Silbert
   b) Pat Buchanan  d) Donald Segretti

20) What high-ranking Nixon administration official did the group that investigated the “leaks” have
    to report to?
    a) H.R. Haldeman  c) John Ehrlichman
    b) Henry Kissinger  d) Ron Ziegler

21) What is the significance of Sam Ervin?
    a) he is legal counsel for the President
    b) chairman of the Senate Watergate Committee
    c) publisher of the *Washington Post*
    d) Woodward’s source in the executive branch

22) One of the Watergate burglars, James McCord, sent a letter to the judge overseeing the case.
    What was the content of the letter?
    a) his family was fearful for their lives
    b) perjury had been committed during the trial
    c) defendants had been pressured to plead guilty and remain silent
    d) all of the above

23) As a result of this letter, McCord was then
    a) mysteriously killed in a car accident
    b) pardoned from his charges
    c) brought before the Senate committee on Watergate
    d) none of the above

24) Maurice Stans, the chairman of the Committee to Re-elect the President, kept illegal campaign
    contributions in what object?
    a) a safe   c) a safety deposit box
    b) a freezer   d) a piggy bank

25) Which two members of the President’s inner circle did the Deputy Campaign Director of the
    Committee to Re-elect the President, Jeb Stuart Magruder, single out as helping to plan the
    Watergate bugging operation?
    a) H.R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman
    b) H.R. Haldeman and John Dean
    c) John Mitchell and John Ehrlichman
    d) John Mitchell and John Dean
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26) What was John Dean’s position within the Nixon administration?
   a) White House counsel
   b) Chief of Staff
   c) Secretary of State
   d) Press Secretary

27) Who succeeded J. Edgar Hoover as the director of the FBI?
   a) L. Patrick Gray
c) John Ehrlichman
   b) Sam Ervin
d) Pat Buchanan

28) At one point during the investigation, John Mitchell figured he was headed to jail. What advice was his wife giving him?
   a) remain silent and even if he goes to jail Nixon will pardon him
   b) lie about his involvement and force a long, drawn-out trial
   c) write a book about the experience
   d) take everyone, including Nixon, down with him if he goes to jail

29) Which one of the following persons did not get removed from their position in the White House on April 30, 1973?
   a) H.R. Haldeman
c) John Ehrlichman
   b) Henry Kissinger
d) John Dean

30) *All The President’s Men* ends with many of the President’s top people either being fired or resigning. What ultimately happens to President Nixon?
   a) he dies of a heart attack while in office
   b) he is impeached by the House and falls ten votes shy of conviction in the Senate
   c) he resigns his office, becoming the first president to ever do so
   d) he finishes the rest of his second term without any major accomplishments

31) As associate of John Dean confided to Bernstein that Charles Colson was going to perform an act that caused John Caulfield, an aide to Ehrlichman, to claim he never wanted to deal with Colson again. What was that act?
   a) plan the assassination of Ted Kennedy
   b) firebomb the Brookings Institute
   c) bribe Woodward and Bernstein
   d) start a mini-war with another country, ala *Wag the Dog*

32) What political candidate did Arthur Bremer attempt to assassinate, effectively derailing this individual’s chance to win the White House?
   a) Ted Kennedy
c) Henry “Scoop” Jackson
   b) Edmund Muskie
d) George Wallace

33) Why did Woodward get summoned to Charles Colson’s law office for a meeting?
   a) Colson wanted to deny a story that he had ordered a break-in of Arthur Bremer’s apartment
   b) Colson wanted to bribe Woodward for some information
   c) Colson had some top secret information to share that could bring down the President
   d) Woodward was going to be asked to testify before a grand jury on Colson’s behalf
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34) Alexander Butterfield, a presidential aide, revealed his knowledge of something within the Executive Office. What was it?
   a) Nixon’s safe containing secret funds
   b) an elaborate taping system
   c) the Watergate cover-up plan
   d) the Pentagon Papers

35) Who do Woodward and Bernstein attempt to interview, which draws a stern reprimand from the judge in the Watergate case?
   a) Alfred Baldwin
   b) Hugh Sloan
   c) members of the grand jury
   d) the Watergate burglars

36) How many of the seven persons indicted in the Watergate break-in actually went through a trial?
   a) none of them
   b) two
   c) four
   d) all of them

37) After the resignations of some of the men in the President’s inner circle, what do Woodward and Bernstein receive from Ron Ziegler?
   a) an exclusive interview with Ziegler
   b) a subpoena to testify in the Watergate investigation
   c) a public apology
   d) blame for the resignations

38) What event was dubbed “Watergate West”?
   a) the break-in of the Democratic headquarters in San Francisco
   b) Donald Segretti’s car accident
   c) the building of Nixon’s vacation home in California
   d) the break-in of Daniel Ellsberg’s psychiatrist’s office

39) What information could be found in some of the files that the acting FBI director ultimately burned?
   a) information collected by Hunt on Ted Kennedy
   b) J. Edgar Hoover’s investigation on Martin Luther King
   c) suspected illegal activities of John Lennon
   d) personal information on Ben Bradlee

40) Which quote from Richard Nixon ends the book All The President’s Men?
   a) “You won’t have Dick Nixon to kick around anymore.”
   b) “I am not a crook.”
   c) “I can report today that there have been major developments in the case concerning which it would be improper to be more specific now, except to say that real progress has been made in finding the truth.”
   d) “I want you to know that I have no intention whatever of ever walking away from the job that the American people elected me to do for the people of the United States.”
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Part B—True or False
Please determine whether or not the following statements are true or false.

41) Richard Nixon barely won the 1972 election.
42) A majority of the Watergate burglars were of Cuban descent.
43) Woodward and Bernstein were given the opportunity to interview the President about the break-in.
44) Woodward and Bernstein spent some time in jail for refusing to turn over some of their notes about Watergate.
45) Woodward’s confidential source of information worked in the Executive Branch.
46) Katharine Graham is the publisher of the newspaper where Woodward and Bernstein work.
47) The Republicans control the Senate investigation of Watergate.
48) One of the Watergate burglars, James McCord, once worked for the CIA.
49) According to some sources, there was a contract out for the murder of Woodward and Bernstein.
50) Henry Kissinger was Woodward’s confidential source of many of his stories.

Part C—Essays
Choose one of the following topics to elaborate on. Be sure to address all parts of the prompt within your essay.

1) One of the themes of *All The President’s Men* could be that “those in power will do anything to stay in power”. Besides the Watergate break-in, describe two other events mentioned in the book that showed that the Nixon Administration would do anything to stay in power. Be sure to describe the event in detail, who was involved in the event and how it illustrated the ends that those in power would go to to maintain their power.

2) Some observers felt that following Watergate, there would not be any major scandals involving the President of the United States because of the increased scrutiny placed upon the office. However, less than twenty-five years later, Bill Clinton was impeached. Explain how Bill Clinton failed to learn from the mistakes of the Nixon Administration. Be sure to mention the similarities that existed in how each president dealt with scandal, then explain the differences that exist between Watergate and “Monicagate.”
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**Articles of Impeachment**

**Research Project**

**Directions:** In groups no bigger than five, research a presidential scandal and draft Articles of Impeachment calling for the removal of the President. Some examples of scandals may include, but are not limited to:

- Credit Mobilier—Ulysses Grant
- Whiskey Ring—Ulysses Grant
- Teapot Dome—Warren Harding
- Gulf of Tonkin—Lyndon Johnson
- Iran/Contra—Ronald Reagan

This assignment will consist of two parts. One part will consist of a typed one to one-half page paper detailing the who, what, when, where, and why of the scandal. The second part will be a draft of the Articles of Impeachment that will call for the removal of the President. You must follow the format found in the Articles drafted for Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton. That means, using specific language, you must state the specific charges against the President that show he has violated his oath of office. The Articles of Impeachment, along with the background paper, will be presented to the class. Be prepared to answer questions about your President and scandal. Upon the conclusion of your presentation, a vote will put to the class seeing whether they think the President should be impeached.
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**Impeachment Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Low Performance</th>
<th>Higher Performance</th>
<th>Higher Performance</th>
<th>Higher Performance</th>
<th>Exemplary Performance</th>
<th>Earned Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background of Presidential Scandal</strong></td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information given on the presidential scandal</td>
<td>Little information given on the presidential scandal</td>
<td>Information given on the presidential scandal is inaccurate and unclear</td>
<td>Information given on the presidential scandal is accurate, but all criteria is not addressed</td>
<td>Information given on the presidential scandal is accurate and all criteria is addressed</td>
<td>Information given on the presidential scandal is accurate and all criteria is addressed in a clear and concise manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles of Impeachment</strong></td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Articles drafted are done poorly and are incomplete</td>
<td>The Articles drafted do not show a clear connection that the President has violated his oath</td>
<td>The Articles drafted show a connection that the President has violated his oath, but are written poorly</td>
<td>The Articles drafted show an adequate connection that the President has violated his oath, but contain some written mistakes</td>
<td>The Articles drafted show a clear connection that the President has violated his oath, but contain few written mistakes</td>
<td>The Articles drafted show a clear connection that the President has violated his oath and written superbly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation and Paper Structure</strong></td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief presentation given, but no paper turned in</td>
<td>Adequate presentation given, but no paper turned in</td>
<td>Good presentation given, but paper is not typed</td>
<td>Adequate presentation given and all papers turned in</td>
<td>Good, factual presentation given and all papers turned in</td>
<td>Outstanding, factual presentation given and all papers turned in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score: [Enter score]
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