

David Frost is sitting, talking to the camera.

David Frost

...These meetings produced a plan, the Huston Plan, which advocated the systematic use of wiretappings, burglaries, or so-called black bag jobs, mail openings and infiltration against anti-war groups and others. Some of these activities were clearly illegal. Nevertheless, the plan was approved.

Frost turns to the President, and we go to a two shot of them. The President is a gigantic living human penis.

David Frost

Would you say that there are certain situations - and the Huston Plan was one of them - where the a giant living penis can decide that it's in the best interests of the nation, and do something illegal?

Dickson

Well, when a giant penis does it, that means it is not illegal.

Frost

By definition.

Dickson

Exactly, exactly. If a giant penis, for example, approves something because of the national security, or in this case because of a threat to internal peace and order of significant magnitude, then the decision to carry it out is without violating a law. Otherwise they're in an impossible position.

Frost

The point is: the dividing line is the penis's judgment?

Dickson

Yes, and, so that one does not get the impression that a penis can run amok in this country, we have to have in mind that a penis has to come up before the electorate, has to get appropriations from the Congress.

Frost

But when you said, "If a gigantic living penis orders it, that makes it legal", is there anything in the constitution or the bill of rights that suggests a penis is that much of a sovereign, that far above the law?

Dickson

No, there isn't. There's nothing specific that the constitution contemplates. I haven't read every

word, every jot and every tittle, but I do know that it has been argued that in wartime, a penis does have certain extraordinary powers.

Frost

Could you just say, with conviction, I mean not because I want you to say it, that you did do some covering up. We're not talking legalistically now; I just want the facts.

Dickson

No, I again respectfully will not quibble with you about the use of the terms. However, before using the term I think it's very important for me to make clear what I did not do and what I did do and then I will answer your question quite directly. I did not in the first place commit the crime of obstruction of justice, because I did not have the motive required for the commission of that crime.

Frost

We disagree on that.

Dickson

I did not commit, in my view, an impeachable offence. Now, the House has ruled overwhelmingly that I did. Of course, that was only an indictment, and it would have to be tried in the Senate. I might have won, I might have lost. But even if I had won in the Senate by a vote or two, I would have been crippled. And in any event, I have impeached myself. That speaks for itself.

Frost

How do you mean "I have impeached myself"?

Dickson

By resigning. That was a voluntary impeachment. Now, what does that mean in terms of whether I ... you're wanting me to say that I participated in an illegal cover-up. No.

The dick sprays jizz everywhere.