

The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of **Richard Nixon**

Stanley I. Kutler

Download now

Read Online •



The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon

Stanley I. Kutler

The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon Stanley I. Kutler "The definitive account of Watergate." —St. Louis Post-Dispatch

The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon Details

Date : Published March 17th 1992 by W. W. Norton Company (first published May 19th 1990)

ISBN: 9780393308273 Author: Stanley I. Kutler Format: Paperback 776 pages

History, Politics, North American Hi..., American History, Nonfiction, Literature, American,

Genre : Presidents

Download The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon ...pdf

Read Online The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nix ...pdf

Download and Read Free Online The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon Stanley I. Kutler

From Reader Review The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon for online ebook

Kenneth Barber says

This was an excellent history of Watergate. The author traces Nixon's early career in the House, Senate, and as Vice President. Each stage of his career was dogged by events and tactics that raised eyebrows and earned him the moniker "Tricky". When he traces the unfolding of Watergate, the author sets the events in the context of the other happenings at the time. The author shows how the unfolding scandal limited his options in both domestic and foreign affairs.

The author follows Nixon's paranoia, his vindictiveness, and his pursuit of re-election in 1972. The things that stand out the most about the events was that Nixon felt that all the dirty tricks and bugging was necessary. He also based these tactics on the need to stop leaks in the government especially after the release of the Pentagon Papers.

The author gives a detailed chronology of the workings of the House committee set up to investigate Watergate. He describes how the coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats emerged that would vote for impeachment. The author also gives a good synopsis of how the decision was made by Ford to grant a pardon.

This reader was left with a couple of impressions. Nixon never admitted any guilt for the crimes. He willingly threw his advisors to the wolves. He justified the crimes by saying that everyone does it. The other impression is that Watergate if fading from memory and is becoming trivialized.

AskHistorians says

If you read one book about Nixon and the Watergate scandal, this should be it.

Paul Bryant says

Reading about Nixon's career in the excellent first part of this book has reminded me that he was the earnest drudge imbued with an unyielding desire for various horrible jobs in politics which few sensible people would want. He was willing to drag his ass all over the country relentlessly campaigning for years and years and years. Eight years as Veep didn't put him off. Nope, not at all. Eight years out of politics in 1960-7 didn't put him off. As Paulie Wallnuts in The Sopranos would have said, "I can do that standing on my head". Clearly, Richard Nixon was **The Mummy** - you run and run and run and you look behind and the damn Mummy is still stomping up, he's gonna get you, you can't get away from him. Run run run - stomp stomp. Richard Nixon was The Mummy.

1972: Nixon confers with Haldeman

A short comparison between two bad presidents - Bush vs Nixon

The 1960s were very interesting times. For all his faults, and they were legion, George W Bush did not preside over a situation where the National Guard shoots dead four students because they were in a demonstration. He did invade Iraq but he didn't authorise Agent Orange and napalm to be used against thousands of civilians. He didn't bomb a neighbouring neutral country for months. Vietnam was immeasurably more corrosive in America than Iraq because of its scale and because of the draft. We knew Bush's crimes because we saw them every day on the tv, whereas the faroff days of Nixon are now blurry, so Bush seems much worse and Nixon nearly got rehabilitated. Nixon's problem was that he got caught. So either all the other presidents have done similar illegal stuff and not got caught making Nixon uniquely stupid or they've been reasonably honest. We assume lazily that all politicians are crooked, but Watergate brought the shock of proof. Nixon did it, he okayed a burglary and he paid hush money to the burglars, then he tried to cover it all up and fired anyone who attempted to uncover it. Fantastique!

"You got me fair and square!"

Why I loved Watergate

The enormous thrill of Watergate was in seeing a president who won the biggest ever landslide in 1972 get torn down step by step and ejected from his seemingly impregnable White House fortress by the American constitution and by the judges and senators who believed in it *all within the space of 2 years*. Sounds like a Frank Capra movie and in some senses it was. Watergate was Shakespearean without the poetry. Nixon was Cassius, Brutus and Caesar at one point or another, and finally he was Lear, raving away, suffering terribly and understanding nothing.

As regards this particular book

I have to remove one star from the rating here because once again he runs into the trap of confusing detail with information, as here:

Dean's recitation began with Haldeman's instruction that he establish "a perfectly legitimate campaign intelligence operation" at CREEP. John Caulfield first developed a plan, but Mitchell and Ehrlichman agreed with Dean that it was not suitable. Dean then suggested that they commission Gordon Liddy for the task. Liddy proposed several hare-brained and expensive schemes which were again were rejected, but he then enlisted Hunt as an ally. The two visited Colson who, in turn, pressed Magruder for action. Meanwhile Haldeman, through his aide, Gordon Strachan, similarly pressured magruder for campaign intelligence. Magruder responded by turning to Mitchell and urging the campaign to authorize Liddy's plan to wiretap the Democratic National Committee. Mitchell agreed, and the fruits of the taps went to Strachan, who gave them to Haldeman.

Zzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzz

So sometimes the stark drama of the events passes through these dense thickets as might a lumbering, dimly perceived but dangerous large beast half a mile away, trumpeting and destroying the next village's huts but leaving your crop of facts and names untouched. Still, a favourite tale well told.

Lynda says

Comprehensive.

Forrest C. says

With the current political climate this book is a reminder of what has happened before. This is superior history written almost like he took the story right from Facebook last night! Very, very good.

Alex Robinson says

Somewhat dry and legally focused, provides a depressing, cynical view into the abuses of power by Nixon and Washington DC which pretty much continue to this day.

Chris says

A superb account of the Watergate scandal, one which emphasizes President Nixon's culpability and central involvement in a series of complex, related, and largely unlawful attempts to secure and retain power at the expense of Constitutional, democratic government.

The crimes perpetrated by Nixon and his men are too numerous to recount here, but in the end it was one man--Richard Nixon himself--who should bear the brunt of the blame. The revisionist attempt to rescue Nixon's historical reputation notwithstanding, it's impossible to dance around the stark reality that Nixon clearly obstructed justice--and not merely in the "ordinary" way an average citizen might obstruct justice, but rather, Nixon's crime is compounded by the fact of his authority to impede the very instruments of justice that reported to him (the FBI, Justice Department, U.S. Attorneys, and so forth). Arguably worse, Nixon abused power and subverted the democratic process in a way that few of his predecessors or successors would have imagined attempting.

Writing about Watergate requires any author to choose between two different perspectives: either (1) recount the scandal from the perspective of revelations to the public, as the revelations were made to the public at the time, or, (2) recount what Nixon's men were doing as it happened chronologically, and and then mention the later revelations as they came out. Stanley Kutler's book mostly opted for the second choice, which served to improve understanding of the full range of the Nixon White House's illegal activities, and also was like setting a ticking time bomb that heightens the tension for the reader. (In some ways, this book read like a thriller.)

The Wars of Watergate, while lengthy, doesn't feel long. The book provides the reader with a full and complete understanding of the Nixon White House's culture that produced the scandal, the different and complex threads of the many scandals themselves, and of all the many different pieces of this complicated story, from the "White House horrors," the "enemies lists," the "Saturday night massacre," the Fielding and Watergate break-in, the "dirty tricks," "CREEP," the White House tapes and "smoking gun," and, ultimately, the only resignation of a President of the United States.

Interestingly (and tellingly), Woodward and Bernstein show up hardly at all, as their role in the investigation has been overstated, often to the expense of the more crucial investigations conducted by the Justice Department, the FBI, the Special Prosecutor, the Ervin Committee in the Senate, and the House Judiciary Committee.

In the end, this as an excellent account of how a bunch of right-wing zealots tried to subvert the Constitution and lawful government processes in order to secure and maintain political power. Scary stuff. Highly recommended.

Kathryn says

This book is a good supplement for someone who wants to know more than the basics about the affairs of Watergate. Beware though, the majority of it is so dry you'll be falling asleep while reading. Plus, it can be an information overload, going into way more info than you ever thought you'd need. But it does have a lot of good information hidden in its pages.

If you don't know much about Watergate and you're hoping to learn, don't pick this up. You at least need the basics to understand whats going on. The book fails to explain the basics of what's happening, and instead focuses on the details of random other stuff, which is interesting but doesn't let you know the underlying timeline.

Also, at one point it spent an entire 3 pages talking about something Jefferson did. Actually, there were a lot of things like that. Very unnecessary.

Mark says

There is no scholar better versed in the matters of Watergate than Stanley Kutler, and this is his definitive account of the subject. In it he lays out in painstaking detail the course the crisis took, from its origins in the Nixon presidency to its legacy today. I expected such an account to be dull; instead, I found it impossible to put down. No reader can walk away from this book -- with its extensive evidence and clearly-reasoned arguments -- and not have a deeper understanding of what Watergate was and how it effected the nation, both then and now.

Robert P. Hoffman says

This is an excellent book on the background to the Watergate crisis and the fall of the Nixon presidency. The author uses the White House tapes effectively and his writing is clear and to the point. The author, for the most part, refrains from editorial comments.

What is striking is how quickly the Watergate scandal overwhelmed the White House. It would appear that it was a constant focus. It is also striking how clumsy the participants were in trying to cover it up.

What this book makes clear is how wrong it is to claim that Watergate would never have resulted in a scandal were it not for the Washington Post. The stories were of value but the scandal broke because of

judges, investigative committees, and prosecutors. All of that would have happened without the Washington Post.