TELL TALES

(Continued From Page 4)

THE HIGHES' INFLUENCE PRESENTED A THREAT TO THE ORDERLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE AREA AND I VOLUNTARILY GOT OFF THE BANDWAGON.

THE REASONS FOR MY ACTION WERE DIVULGED TO THE GRAND JURY AND IT MIGHT BE BEST LEFT WITH THEM UNTIL ALL PENDING MATTERS ARE DISPOSED OF."

We do not know what Greenspun told the Grand Jury. But in light of what he disclosed to the public, he could have brought forth a few more facts. Its all a matter of public record. Greenspun reversed his feeling about Hughes precisely at the moment Maheu was fired. Was that an indication that "this particular group had gone too far''? Could it be possible the ousting of one man "presented a threat to the orderly development of the area"? We had a feeling at the time that Greenspun was enraged because his "in-man" was on the outside. Here's more:

"I ALSO FELT THAT I HAD PROST TUTED MY NEWSPAPER IN HUGHES' INTEREST SUFFICIENTLY, AND WOULD HAVE NO MORE OF IT.

Here we have an admission, for the first time. Precisely what we have been telling our readers in the ISRAELITE for years. But this noble confession from Greenspun is not noble enough. If he's going to come clean, why doesn't he come clean all the way?

It was not merely, Greenspun "would have no more of it." He pulled a complete about His rage was inimal-like. Never, to face. our knowledge, has an American newspaper sunk to the depths of Greenspun's Sun in discrediting a man, Hughes. Greenspun went further, He appeared on national TV to aire his warped, distorted views about a man who he reluctantly admitted under bath he had never even seen. He castigated honest and reputed judges who "dared" rule in favor of Hughes. He was in court every day at the hearings to derecmine whether Maheu should continue to run the operations after being dismissed by the Hughes board of directors. At the time we shuddered at the consequences If Greenspun was successful in keeping Maheu The casinos were losing tens at the helm. of thousands daily. Where would Maheu have gotten the money to carry on? The earning capacity of 8000 employees, and the livlihood of 20,000 dependents were at stake. Under Greenspun's pounding daily in the Sun, they did not know if they had a job frim day to day. But nothing stopped Greenspul. The under-

mining continued for months, until a Perry Lieber came to town as Vice President for Public Relations of Hughes Nevada Operations. Urder his competent supervision the picture starfed to change. It was a long, slow process for Lieber, who step by step, countered each preposterous accusation by Greenspun, and began the building of confidence in Hughes' employees in the security of their jobs.

Did Greenspun tell all this to the grand jury? Were these the actions of a man con-cerned with "the orderly development of the area"? Could it have been possible that Greenspun was distressed about the dismissal of the "paymaster" for the millions he already nad pocketed, or perhaps could there have been fear of exposure of transactions which had not yet been made public at that time?

Now caad this from Greenspun: "IT IS A LITTLE LATE BUT I MUST FREELY ACCEPT BLAME FOR HELPING CREATE A CONDITION IN WHICH THE HUGHES' GROUP IS THE LARGEST FROM THE STANDPOINT OF CASINO OWNERSHIP AND THE BIGGEST SINGLE EMPLOYER IN THE STATE.

"A little late" the man says. He knew all along he was to blame for creating a condition. He should have reported it to his readers years ago, not wait until he's named as a co-conspirator. After the roof caves in he admits to creating the structure. Then, get this:

"AND I BELIEVE THAT NOTHING SHOULD BE DONE TO JEOPARDIZE THE SITUATION WITHOUT SOME ORDERLY TRANSITION WHERE PEOPLE WOULD NOT BE THROWN OUT OF WORK OR THE ECONOMY IMPERILED."

Again, Greenspun displayed a concern for jobs and economy, which had no bearing during his machinations through the past several years. And the gall of the man. He calls for a

transition at this time as though Hughes has already been found guilty and a disposition has to be made of the holdings. Is Greenspun the prosecutor, jury and judge, already passing sentence? But wait, there's more: "ALL PUBLIC OFFICIALS SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THE INDICTMENTS RETURNED

THURSDAY ARE JUST THE BEGINNING.

WHAT HAS TRANSPIRED IS MERELY A PRELIMINARY INDICATION OF WHAT WILL FOLLOW: WITH THE REAL EXPLOSION TO OCCUR WHEN THE MAJOR MASS OF ALL PAST ACTIVITIES IS ENCOUNTERED.

Are we reading correctly? _Do our eyes deceive us? A newspaper publisher feeding us morsels only as they become public. Aren't his readers entitled to the news, right now, of a "real explosion" including names, dates and incidents. Who is Greenspun protecting? How deep is his own involvement? Greenspun concludes with:

"PERHAPS MIGHT IT BE IN AN INDIVIDUAL'S AND STATE'S BEST INTERESTS TO NOW COME FORWARD AND CONFESS AND PROMISE TO SIN NO MORE. OTHERWISE THEIR COURSE WOULD NOT BE WISE AND THE POSSIBILITY IS STRONG THAT WHEN THE VAST UPHEAVAL COMES. THEY TOO WILL BE SWEPT AWAY, ANYONE READY FOR A CONFESSION?

SPEAK NOW OR FOREVER KNOW NO PEACE." After admitting his own sins. After admitting his own errors. After admitting his own blame for the conditions that prevail, which he profited by and kept silent about all these years, Greenspun now asks others to come forward and confess. We hope Greenspun's "sermon" proves fruitful and all involved in past crime speak up. But instead of using veiled threats, would it not be better if Greenspun, himself, named each and every one of them? Do c "iminals deserve fore-warning?

At the beginning of his column Greenspun stated all his sins and errors have already been "unbosomed" before the Federal Grand Jury. If this is so. If he really and truly has revealed ALL, including the gory details of items stated here, then perhaps we may have been a bit premature, and we publicly apologize for encrouching on a man's effort to reform. When a man cops a plea, we mean an honest, no-holds pulled, unadulterated, right from the heart plea--that's good enough for The man deserves to be forgiven, All us. he has to do is return any ill-gotten gains and his debt to society will have been paid.

It reminds is of the paragraph we write on Dec. 18, 1970, immediately after Maheu was fired and Greenspun was beating every newspaper in the country with stories on Howard Hughes. We said then: "Were it not for his past reputation of motivation for self gain, Sun publisher Hank Greenspun, if proven correct in his assertions and accusations, most deservedly should be granted a Pulitzer Prize for public service reporting. Time will tell "

As a further addenda: Greenspun takes deliberate care to point out that although he was named as a co-conspirator, he was not indicted. A Sun story asser's he faces no further "punitive perils" in the case, except it appears his testimony will be needed. Apparently for his testimony before the grand jary, Greenapun was granted immunity from criminal prosecution, because David Charney, who is claimed to have dumped stock at the same time as Greenspun, was indicied. It is possible Greenspun may be liable in future civil actions for damages by former stockholders who have suffered losses.

An unusual sidelight was the observation by Greenspun that his exculpation (clearing of his name) was left in limbo (up in the air) because though he was not indicted, vindication was denied him. This does not jell. If he turned state's evidence and confess ed this still could not be construed as vindication. Forgiveness, yes, after the penalty is paid, but hardly vindication.

One final thought: For years friends back east have been urging us to write a book on Hughes in Nevada, We demurred, There was little we knew about Hughes that had not already been printed, much of which was hear say or pure imagination. We maintained all along the sordid "explosive" story was on Greenspun. But we put off writing it because we did not know the ending. It looks like the day of reckoning is about to arrive. If the final chapter proves interesting, perhaps we'll start thinking about an appropriate title,



PAGE FIVE