

Colson: Finding Christ in the White House

There is a unity in all of this. The jumping around necessary in telling a story that can be put together in countless ways and in the telling of which there is too much detail to include may tend to obscure this unity. It is like a tree and its branches. They are all one, a trunk and these many branches. Some of what may seem like digressions are the smaller branches shooting off the larger one. They are part of the one tree.

Nixon, not the dirty-works, is the trunk. Political intelligence, which is not new, is not one of the branches. It is like leaves, which grow from all the branches, even the twigs.

The Nixon tree has many branches, not all having the same leaves. One variety of these symbolic leaves is spying. Another is operational, including what are called dirty-works.

The difference is that with Nixon the dirty-works that have been among the leaves of all politician trees are much more numerous and immeasurably dirtier. There never has been the complete dedication to dirtiness/nor anything ~~like~~ <sup>like his</sup> <sup>approaching</sup> its extent. If there is one endeavor that dominated the Nixon White House more than any other - more even than running the country - it was all this vile activity that began when he took the White House over and accelerated constantly thereafter.

Caulfield and ~~Wine~~ Ulasewicz are merely the first outsiders to have been brought in. All the agencies of government and all their powers were mobilized by these paranoid authoritarians whose ~~first~~ primary concentration was re-electing the Nixon who had just taken power. The misuse of the Internal Revenue Service is one of the better-publicized abuses of power. There were virtually no exceptions. The FBI was used extensively. The Pat Gray confirmation hearings disclosed that he had used FBI agents to collect political and biographical data on <sup>personally</sup> Democrats. He ~~had~~ made partisan, political speeches pretending there were part of his FBI function. How government money was spent and who got it was another corruption, another misuse of executive power - political use, political dirty-

works. With fidelity to Orwell it was called the "responsiveness" program. In practise it meant simply paying off those who ~~had~~ were or could be expected to be "responsive" to Nixon and his re-election.

What is more unwelcome to most Americans than this totality of the corruption of government and society, unwelcome as that is, is the little-known and always scantily reported fact that one of the undeviating consistencies in Nixon's life is that he has always been a crook. Perhaps not always an indictable crook but a crook nonetheless.

Simultaneously he has always been addicted to spying. One of his earlier failures is meeting

~~with~~ J. Edgar Hoover's standards for FBI agents. ~~He refused to~~

Nixon did apply to be a special agent. Hoover rejected his application.

Nixon's personal dishonesty and his personal preoccupation in spying was brought to light long ago by Jack Anderson. In the version of this book that grew too long and had to be laid aside, beginning with this Anderson confirmed disclosure, I trace this cruddy hidden Nixon back to the days he was part of a totally unnecessary break-in of the Dean's office in college. As a lawyer checking the honesty of Navy contracts Nixon took money from the man he was investigating to fly to California to file against Jerry Voorhis for Congress. (That Baltimore contractor had nothing to pay back to the Government after Nixon's "investigation.") The filthiness of his California campaigns is equalled only by that of his subsequent ones. Nothing was too unspeakable for Nixon, for example his "20 years of treason" cry against Truman and the Democrats. Or his "drive the crooks out of Washington" campaign with Eisenhower in which he was caught as a crook, leading to his infamous abuse of the voter who justified his faith in voter emotion as dominant over thought and reasoning, that "Checkers" speech in which he got away with equating his children's cocker spaniel with taking thousands under the table. We have seen the character of his/campaign against JFK. When he ran for governor of California in 1962 he actually had the gall to pretend one of his (and Haldeman's) front committees was of Democrats and he actually collected money from those who really believed it was going to Democrats! Not until long after ~~the~~ election did that case reach decision. A Republican judge then found him, Haldeman and other guilty. But by

then, save for the three hundred dollars that remain of his fraudulently-obtained Democrat money, which the judge ordered returned, it was moot. In that period what probably more than anything else defeated him is getting caught "buying" a valuable Beverly Hills lot for less than the mortgage on it. It was a teamster-Murchison brothers deal in which he reaped a very large profit within months by selling that lot at its real value. This kind of deal amounts to a bribe. When he was caught he hollered bloody persecution by the press. It is when he was defeated in this campaign and over such truthful reporting of him and his misdeeds that he lost the cool and said the press would not have Richard Nixon to kick around again.

The one real qualification he had for the Republican nomination is a history in which these short items of encapsulation are a faithful summary. He is and was known for a lack of scruple and a capacity for saying anything with passion and a straight face. People of wealth seeking more ~~wealth~~ AND influence wealth and influence saw the possibilities he held for them. They were not disappointed in his presidency. The more than \$60,000,000 they disgorged for his re-election is their vote of confidence and their expression of satisfaction with what they reaped from his first term.

Those who believed a Nixon presidency would be financially rewarding for them could not, of course, elect him. He had to be sold and he was, as he had been in every election. Because he had no record of accomplishment to which to point- and he never did, there having been no real accomplishment in any of his careers in politics- he was sold as are deodorants, bug-killers and worthless nostrums.

The first and longest-lasting of a series of Nixon merchandisers was Murray Chotiner, the man who presided over the campaigns of infamy first waged against Congressman Jerry Voorhis and Nixon's opponent for Senator, Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, wife of Melvyn Douglas. Both had records as strong anti-Communists. Nixon red-baited both, under Chotiner's tutelage.

Truman instituted the first federal "loyalty" program. Nixon red-baited him and the Democrats with the war-cry "20 years of treason!"

He is, in short, a man who was never deterred by considerations of principle. In all

his political career, which was devoid of accomplishment, he was closely surrounded by those whose ethics and morals were as flexible as his, the only kind who could package deodorants and nostrums of no value. This is one of the more interesting and least commented on disclosures of the transcripts of those of his tapes he edited after his selection. At no point is there any concern with principle, moral or ethical considerations of any kind. There is concern about how to be successfully dishonest while appearing to be honest. The same is true of the records that survived the shredders of the preparations for press statements. The lies are rehearsed and the tough-minded around him pelted the official spokesmen with the kinds of questions that could be expected so he could anticipate them and be prepared with still more lies.

The truly astounding thing is the number of people of no integrity with whom he could and did surround himself and of these this high percentage who actually deceived themselves into believing dishonesty in his service was principle and service to the nation and views they held that they deceived themselves into believing were true conservatism. These at one time or another included virtually every YAF leader. The modest confessions of some of them before the Watergate committee began with the first witness, included all the younger ones and some of the more mature and persisted to the end, where those who practised the nastier of the dirty tricks claimed they believed they were doing the right thing because he meant so much to them and as they saw it to the nation.

They may even have believed it. But the actuality is they saw career advancement in serving him. This required emulating him. This they did. Many went to jail for it. More should have. But because for all the leaks a tremendous amount remained and remains secret and because society suffers revulsion at examining itself the punishments were light and the oversights many. Had these been the denied of the ghettos, those whose crimes were minor and lacked the anti-social character of the Nixonian political crimes, their sentences would have been heavy. Society deals harshly with its own victims who turn on it but lightly with those who subvert it.

No less astounding is the number and variety of those as unprincipled as he was from whose ranks he could draw. These ranged from political renegades of his Un-American witch-hunting days, those who believed the vengeance they sought was the purification of their souls, to the grim-faced believers in authoritarianism, bitter haters.

Inevitably, with so many who could see such profit from him and serving him, he built a following of the dedicated. The least unprincipled of ~~them~~ <sup>are</sup> were the party regulars. Of these, the best ~~were~~ those who look better than they are by comparison with the worst, not by their own records.

And also inevitably, the hard-sell, as with Geritol, convinced many, many people, those who ~~ignore the warnings of the political~~ imagine benefit from the patent medicines that have no value, that he did them good. This is a land in which such remedies have for years contained only such ingredients as alcohol in its most expensive form. People feeling the alcohol believed they felt better and were sincerely persuaded that the worthless did them good. These are the same people who look down on and condemn others who drink alcohol as alcoholic beverages, not in the form of fake healing potions that do not heal. Patent medicines like these enjoyed their greatest sale in the bible belt, among those who condemned alcohol in any form and consumed it blissfully unaware of what they imbibed.

There is no point in the career of such a man where he does not attract sociopaths. The greatest single advance in his career came from Whitaker Chambers, a true sociopath. Again the transcripts reveal much. Over and over again Nixon muses to his disciples about the Alger Hiss case. Convicting Hiss of perjury, not the Nixon charge of espionage, is perhaps the single real "accomplishment of his almost three decades of public life. Conviction was possible only because of the spirit Nixon and those like him enflamed, the hate and prejudice that consumed the land in the McCarthy era, of which Nixon was one of the originators because he was one of the earliest copiers. He commercialized hate and built a career on no more by way of accomplishment. There was no trick below him in his drive to convict Hiss, who is a victim, not a criminal. There was no pressure he and his could not apply to convict Hiss, openly on the judge at the trial

in which Hiss was not convicted. In practise this became the intimidation of all judges. One of the never-mentioned by-products of the drives of the Nixons and the McCarthys and the legion of their political fellows today less clearly remembered is the corruption of the system of justice without which they could not have survived.

Any retrospective look at Nixon's career shows him to be a man who would say and do anything at any time for immediate gain while accomplishing nothing of social value, doing nothing that in any way served the needs of the nation as a whole or the people in general. There is no worthwhile legislation bearing his name, not in all those years in elective office.

Those who flock to the support of a man who is so singularly without accomplishment see something in him that is not there or see something for themselves in it or are like him, find good in evil. Any study of his administration shows that it is negative, not positive, was devoted to demolishing what had been accomplished in previous administrations except for the requirements of political expediency. He refused to obey the enactments of Congress. This refusal to follow the enacted laws is described with a word that means much to Congress and nothing to the people, "impoundment," coming from his impounding appropriations voted for social needs.

The people who have the ability to serve him and his purposes are at best believers in the negative. Those who could and did become his closest advisers, in practise assistant presidents, are authentic sociopaths. Those who doubt this ought study their records published by the Senate Watergate committee and the House Judiciary Committee. Nowhere in our history is there anything approximating the overt sociopathic quality that permeates the memos and the comments on the memos of others by Haldeman and Ehrlichman. These are men to whom there is no such thing as a lie. They can't recognize there is such a thing as falsehood and dishonesty because the twist of their minds makes the most unethical practise a devotion to principle. In practise they equated what they saw as Nixon's personal need as high principle. Thus they could and did order crime after crimes, infrequently with the caution that their criminal agents not be caught, genuinely believing it to be right, not wrong. And thus an Ehrlichman could

face the nation - indeed the ~~would~~ - on TV and without blushing or any sign of any kind of misgiving claim the president has the right to order murder on whim, supported by a like-minded lawyer who contorted decisions and laws to pretend legal sanction for the belief there can be official murder on official whim. All that is needed is to invoke an imagined "national security" need.

Over the years serving Nixon became too much for even these kinds of people to whom wrong is right. Murray Chotiner, who ~~first~~ was the first to package Nixon for commercialization, left his first administration, but served his re-election in secret, including by corrupting reporters into being spies. Lyn Nofziger whose great skill at the black arts is memorialized in the Nixon White House in the designation "Nofziger job" returned to California. Others left quietly. There remained the largest personal staff any president ever loaded onto the taxpayers' backs. (Typically Nixon did it while proclaiming he was cutting federal expenditures and reducing the bureaucracy.)

In the shakedown the three longest-lasting of the masters of the dirtier practises were Haldeman, Ehrlichman and Charles Colson. The wiliest of these, the one who presented a smiling face, the one who is far and away the smoothest liar and the one who received least attention in The Watergate scandals is Colson. Haldeman and Ehrlichman are sick-minded <sup>men</sup> who truly believe that wrong is right, that the end justifies the means - even murder - ~~rank~~ cardinals to the pope of authoritarianism. Colson is a con artist without peer. Of him alone even Nixon said he "could do anything," in the sense of is capable of anything. The full import can be perceived only by recognizing what Nixon, Haldeman and Ehrlichman were themselves capable of and had done. If Colson exceeded this never-before-equalled record, then that is which he was capable is beyond the concept of those who live decent, normal lives.

Unlike the Hldemans and Ehrlichmans who in that order were willing to sacrifice themselves on their pope's altar, Colson, who had the same disposition, was willing to do nothing at any cost or jeopardy to himself. His controlling instict once it was motivated was self-preservation. To this end also there was nothing of which he was not capable.

Firebombing the Brookings Institution as a diversion so some of the files Colson imagined were there could be stolen in the confusion was his idea. It so terrified Jack Caulfield, who testified to it before the Watergate committee, that he rushed for higher-level aid in restraining Colson. In turn, Colson merely pretended he had been misunderstood, that he has this sense of humor people can't grasp. "e's just a funny guy. The kind who told his staff they like he would have to walk over their grandmothers if that helped re-elect Nixon.

In this ~~large~~ assemblage of the sick-minded and the authentically sociopathic with which Nixon surrounded himself, Colson is in many ways unique.

Haldeman and Ehrlichman were known as the Berlin Wall around Nixon, as the German Mafia (in the sense of the word never used, the Nazi Mafia) and by other such designations. Not so Colson. Haldeman and Ehrlichman, <sup>were,</sup> like Nixon, generally grim-faced. ~~and~~ With Colson the smile comes spontaneously and seems genuine. No matter how outrageous his word, how enormous the lie, there is this ready smile and the appearance of deepest sincerity.

Understanding these, Nixon's key people, is essential to understanding him and his Watergating. They are the ones who did it for him and insulated him from it. Nixon was like the traditional spook, always concerned with isolating himself from all the dirty-works ranging from mere dirty tricks to the most subversive crime. Most of us have no experience with the sociopathic so we have no understanding of these types who were Nixon's personal selection for the most exalted posts and the highest authority in his administration. The minds of the Haldemans, Ehrlichmans and Colsons are utterly foreign to us. It becomes impossible to believe that a man with a face as pleasant as Colson's, an appearance so genuine, a smile so open, can mask the evil he did. It is beyond concept that this unspeakable evil, so far beyond the imagining of the normal human, is to a Colson a true dedication to what he imagines is principle.

We are lost when confronted with this unique trio and those like but junior to them who took over the White House and the government and the country with him.

They brought us The Watergate for him. Their careers with him are careers of undetected Watergates, for him.

Colson is <sup>also</sup> unique because of them all he is the one outgoing type.

He proved Nixon was right in saying he was capable of anything by using Christ as his first-line of defense when the jail doors yawned. There turly is nothing of which Colson is not capable. When all else failed - and Colson was skilled enough to delay or prevent all the others suffered, like international TV exposure before the Watergate committee, which he avoided - there was Christ for this supposed Christian to find in his extremity.

The Christ Colson found was in the White House.

Nixon remained his Christ. His heaven was the White House.

It was the most super-collosal con job of a con artist who has no equal.

Colson's finding of his private Christ, accepted as a genuine conversion by those of sincere faith who trusted him and were used by him, coincided not only with the certainty he would be jailed and thus held out the hope for leniency. It coincided exactly with a new Nixonian defense, a new attempt to attribute The Watergate to the CIA, the personal political need of the baby-faced Senator Baker whose career and hope of advancement could be ended by Nixon's Watergate and thus was Nixon's secret defender. This will interest us separately.

Colson was a special kind of operator in the Nixon White House. His operations ran the gamut of the politically obscene. He was a leaker, a fabricator of cases, a man whose skill in those varieties of dirty-works on which he specialized was greater because he alone of the trio had political experience. He had been an assistant to Massachusetts Republican Senator Everett Saltonstall. He had the talents of the Haldemans and the Wieglers who came from the ad agencies. But he also had a practical, political know-how from practise political experience and a wide circles of acquaintances, including in the press, on whom he could draw from a career in Washington neither Haldeman nor Ehrlichman had.

This experience and his different personality enable him to do what the others did not attempt. Nixon chose well.

He could conceive of starting a fire in the heart of Washington as a distraction that could enable a theft of files where security precluded robbery by the most skilled bagman, without concern for the consequences of a fire in a major research institution, and at the same time he could dream up some of the smoother political crimes, what is not generally conceived to be crime.

Whether or not Colson is responsible for bringing Hunt into the White House, the official story, he was responsible for one of Hunt's more thoroughly despicable projects, faking State Department cables to blame the assassination of the unpopular Vietnamese dictator, Diem, and his secret-police head/brother-in-law on JFK. Hunt did fake the cables and he did testify to this openly before the Watergate committee and he did then lay out in full Colson's plan for their use. (9H3668 ff3732f,3771f,3808ff)

~~HUNT~~ Colson has qualms about nothing. Hunt had no compunctions against the deliberate manufacture of fake cables because what he fabricated what he really believed had to have been the case, his beliefs sired by his hatred of all Kennedys and liberals (Compyp (Comsymp to him) and his faith in being possessed of a political intelligence and understanding denied mere mortals. Because he believed the hated Kennedys had ordered the assassinations they had had nothing to do with and were but a means of one set or tyrants replacing another fact and ethics became irrelevant. He just phoneyed up and gave Colson what he believed the files of cable to which he was given unrestricted access and copies should have held and didn't.

The scheme was for William Lambert, investigative reporter for Life magazine, to have a scoop. Life, then had the largest circulation of any weekly magazine.

From the sworn testimony, which did not include Lambert, who was not called as a witness and who remained discretely silent, Lambert went for it but insisted on having a copy of the Hunt fakes. (Again Orwell, the manufacture of history.) Colson was all for giving Lambert xeroxes but Hunt, knowing his work was unskilled and could not withstand close examination, refused. His particular rewriting of history failed with Hunt's refusal to yield to Colson's importunings. <sup>Hunt</sup> He did pull of others, which did not hold

the high probability of kicking back and hurting him. For one, convincing a former CIA colonel, Lucien Conein to remember something he did not remember and wasn't true, the Hunt-Colson operation got an even larger audience on an NBC-TV special. It was also an Orwellian rewriting of the history of the Vietnam adventure. (9H3667,3810f,3881ff)

Similar projects with Lambert and with Life and with the two of them together had succeeded and with their success exerted major influence of what followed them. They are like the Caddy-Douglas enterprise and company impeach Douglas enterprise.

Reporters guard their sources. If Lambert ever came to realize that he had been used and that his writing lacked fidelity he had made no apology, expressed no regret, disclosed no sources, and appears untroubled by his personal corrupting of what was then the future, an essential pre-condition for The Watergate.

Some at the very least were Colson operations.

From this the reader should not assume that all were. Or that Colson had a monopoly, in the Nixon administration. Or that it was the only administration to practise and grow skilled with crooked leaks of partial truths, defamations and distortions designed to accomplish its political purposes.

~~SECRET~~ Democratic Senator Ed Long was defeated for re-election after this Life treatment. He called it dishonest and outright defamation. Long, however, had many enemies. Defeating him served the ends of others, not alone Nixon's when Nixon ~~was~~ became President in the same 1968 election. Long made enemies by fostering a Freedom of Information law and by exposing bugging and wire-taping. He thus made enemies within his own party, the in power. Some of the <sup>his subcommittee exposed</sup> bugging and taping/was by the Department of Justice when Robert Kennedy headed it. Bobby, in turn, had as his ramrod in getting Jimmy Hoffa a pro, Walter Sheridan, who was no notorious and unconcerned a bugger that he even had himself wired for sound, to transmit to a ~~nearby~~ nearby vehicle where it could be taped, the proceedings of a New Orleans court from which all tape recorders had been barred. Sheridan, then working an anti-Jim Garrison "special" for NBC, was caught by Sheriff Louis Heyd. Because of Sheridan's connections nothing happened. Had it been anyone else he'd have been jailed for contempt. But when Sheridan was caught in the act, it created no stir. (Source, Assistant District Attorney Andrew Sciambra.)

Like Long, as New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison had tread on federal toes, hardest on the FBI's corns, for it had conducted the entirely inadequate investigation of the JFK assassination. Life's series of anti-Garrison articles began the year before Nixon was elected. (First issue dated 9/1/67) The federal bureaucracy retaliated after

~~Nixon was elected~~ Nixon did have the motive, framing Garrison in two separate cases, in both of which he won acquittal. The first was announced under the most prejudicial conditions and in the most prejudicial manner by Mitchell personally. The charges on which Garrison was acquitted are those of which the Nixon/Mitchell forces are without guilty, taking graft and gypping on income taxes.

Nor was it only Life that the forces of real influence use for political retaliation. The FBI leaked false stories about San Francisco's "Democratic Mayor Joseph Alioto to twice lost Look, which printed them and ~~twice~~ libel actions. This was during the Nixon administration, when Mitchell ran the Department of Justice. The story appeared in Look for September 23, 1969, headed "The Web That Links San Francisco's Mayor Alioto and the Mafia." In reporting this Time (11/13/72) noted that "Few politicians could have survived such accusations. [Alioto] he/has in fact been cleared of all civil and criminal charges."

But as Garrison was defeated for re-election, with benefit to Louisiana's "Republican vote, so also were California Democrats hurt. Time, not mentioning its own corporate benefit from the same sources, found "More ominous...the covert cooperation Look's writers had received from federal authorities...at least two FBI agents had obtained records" from four other federal sources, including Mitchell's own office. "Alioto said that they also had gathered information from intercepted mail and an illegal tap operated by the FBI." (Time 11/13/72)

This is precisely the kind of operations Nixon duplicated privately inside the White House, his Watergating beginning with Caulfield and extending through the Hunt operation, with the Gestapo plan in between.

When a Senate subcommittee looked into this, William Rehnquist, then as assistant Attorney General, "denied any wrongdoing by any federal agency." (Times 11/13/72) Could he have better Nixonian qualification for packing the Supreme Court? Or better reason for disqualifying himself from Watergate cases, as he did?

Getting rid of Democrats anywhere and by any means possible, while a prime purpose of all Watergate activities, especially those before the word became a symbol, it was by no means restricted to Democrats. Nixon purged "Republican he didn't like, ~~Like~~ The Liberal Senator Charles Goodell of New York/ was one. Once Nixon took power he was no longer a "Republican. He was a Nixonian, an authoritarian whose authoritarian successes will outlast his tenure if not his lifetime.

Because this was his intent, these dirty-works that may not be criminal but are more dangerous to society than the most serious felonies were focused on the system of Justice, which Nixon had to control or his acts would be ruled illegal and un-Constitutional, as even his own packed/Supreme Court held in bugging and wire-tapping cases.

The Lambert-Life/Colson job of Senator Joseph Tydings eliminated a forward-looking and influential member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Tydings had been United States Attorney in Baltimore, so he was an experienced prosecutor (and another curse, a Kennedy protoge). With a good record on civil rights he was a natural ~~victim~~ Nixon/Colson target.

By the time the unfairness of the inspired attack on him was established it was too late. Denials never catch up with these defamations and there are always a significant number of people who believe them to be true. Tydings was defeated by the Nixonian conservative J. Glenn Beall, Jr., who is so Nixonian that ~~two years~~ after two years of The Watergate he was still counted a Nixon supporter against impeachment when an overwhelming majority of his constituency and the country at large were for getting rid of Nixon. His brother also received a reward and also rendered service for Nixon. George Bell became United States Attorney in Baltimore. He did the Nixon job of getting rid of Spiro Agnew when that helped the unimpeachment of Nixon. George Beall then turned himself to Democrats in a state notorious for political corruption and thereafter concentrated on them.

But the most important, the most subversive, the most enduring of these ax jobs was on the Supreme Court so Nixon could have his violations of the law and the Constitution found legal and proper by those he put on it.

14  
The Caddy-Munt-Mullen/CIA/ Nixon job on Douglas is not the only one. They also forced Abe Fortas to resign.

In all of this the press failed the people by simply not reporting what could and should have been fully reported.

As an example, there is Jack Anderson, whose superb exposures were mixed with generous self-praise. ~~Anderson~~ Both were compromised by his need to protect his sources. Some of the exclusive leaks to him, like those of the <sup>Watergate</sup> grand-jury transcripts, could have resulted in criminal actions and didn't and had to come from officials-very few of whom are possible because so few had access to the transcripts- who needed all the favor they could curry to protect themselves. Anderson in all The Watergate columns he ~~wrote~~ wrote, with all the consultations with his own files that he reported, ~~he~~ never managed to remember the June 2, 1969 column he co-authored with its originator, the late Drew Pearson.

The Chief Justice presides over the Senate's impeachment proceedings, so in any and all impeachment proceedings, the Chief Justice is news. What that column reported about Burger is so compromising that <sup>it</sup> ~~he~~ should force him to disqualify himself in favor of the senior Associate Justice in any impeachment proceeding.

The Washington Post headed this column "Burger Has Witch-Hunting Record." (6/2/69)

Part of what Anderson forgot we should not: Lil-marked parts, return for Burger file.

The next day the Pearson-Anderson column included: (marked in return, Burger file)

Nixon's Supreme Court stackers all have special qualifications.

Burger's extended to his son, who was exposed in another Anderson column, that of unqualified son benefitted January 23, 1973 and promptly forgotten, as people do. The son ~~benefited~~ from improper influence and got a top job in the General Services Administration in violation of regulations and over the qualified career person who was entitled to the job. GSA was run by Hugh Scott's former administrative assistants once Nixon took over. While the Civil Service Commission frowned on this impropriety, possible because of political corruption, in the end it ruled in effect no matter because young Burger has been in the job a long time.

# Burger Has Witch-Hunting Record

By Drew Pearson  
and Jack Anderson

If the Senate Judiciary Committee, passing on the qualifications of Warren E. Burger to be Chief Justice, digs deeply enough, it will find an interesting affinity between him and President Nixon which Mr. Nixon has been trying to forget. It is the record of witch-hunting in the days when Mr. Nixon was a rootin' tootin' member of the House Un-American Activities Committee backing up Sen. Joe McCarthy and, in some cases, ahead of him.

Warren Burger at that time was his chief operator inside the Justice Department. That was where the 21-year-old friendship between the two really began.

The Senate is sure to confirm Burger. But the Judiciary Committee has an obligation to bring out the full facts regarding his career. Whether it will do so, stacked as it is with Dirksen, Dodd, Hruska and Strom Thurmond, is another matter. However, this column on April 9, 1955, reported on an incident in Burger's career which goes to the root of his old witch-hunting days. It was the famous case against Dr. John P. Peters of Yale before the Supreme Court which Burger argued because the then-Solicitor Gen-

eral Simon Sobeloff refused to participate in witch-hunting. Sobeloff would not even sign the Justice Department's brief.

The issue was very clearly drawn between Burger, Mr. Nixon and McCarthyism on one side, and the protection of constitutional rights on the other. Justice Abe Fortas, now forced off the court, signed the brief against Burger, and his two partners, Judge Thurman Arnold and Paul Porter, argued the case in the Supreme Court.

## Faceless Informers

Dr. Peters was an eminent specialist whom the U.S. Public Health Service brought down from Yale for four to ten days each year to give advice on where money should be spent on medical research. As Chief Justice Warren later described it, "This work was not of a confidential or sensitive character and did not entail access to classified material." Furthermore, Dr. Peters was cleared regarding any disloyalty by two loyalty boards during the Truman Administration.

However, when the Eisenhower Administration came into power, it reversed the Truman board findings and found Dr. Peters disloyal. It did so on the basis of "faceless informers," many of them

not under oath, whom Dr. Peters was not permitted to cross-examine or even know about.

The Eisenhower loyalty board's opinion was handed down April 6, 1953, approximately two months after Eisenhower and Nixon took office and at a time when both had campaigned on a platform of driving all "Communists" out of government. Attorney General Herbert Brownell was the public spearhead of that drive with an assist from Vice President Nixon on the outside and Assistant Attorney General Burger on the inside.

And in the fall of 1953 he held a famous press conference just before a special Congressional election in California in order to benefit Mr. Nixon's close friend Glen Lipscomb, then running for the seat vacated by Mayor Norris Poulson in Los Angeles. But when the Los Angeles Times poll showed George L. Arnold, son of Judge Thurmond Arnold, a Democrat, well in the lead, Brownell called an unusual press conference with J. Edgar Hoover present. Hoover had never participated in a political press conference before. Together they denounced communism in the Truman Administration, particularly the career of the Treasury aide Harry Dexter White, then dead and unable to defend

himself. The implication was that any Democrat was tainted with communism.

The smear campaign worked. Mr. Nixon's friend Lipscomb was elected. Judge Arnold's son was defeated.

But when the Peters case came up for argument before the Supreme Court, Solicitor General Sobeloff, the Solicitor General who was entrusted with arguing all cases before the Supreme Court, refused to do so. Joseph Alsop, columnist, reported Sept. 7, 1955: "At first Sobeloff persuaded Brownell to confess error by refusing to contest the Peters suit. Then Brownell was persuaded by the politicians (Nixon et. al.) who have acquired an immense vested interest in the security system's abuses. Sobeloff was informed that Brownell would not keep his promise. The Solicitor General then flatly refused to sign the Government's brief against Peters. He further pleaded with Brownell not to sign the brief either, and there is some evidence that Brownell hesitated long before doing so."

This was why Burger, then Assistant Attorney General, also signed the brief and argued the case. However, he did much more by staging an unethical background press conference in an effort to influence the court through public opinion. This will be reported in a future column.

If all those ~~things~~ charges levelled against Justices Douglas and Fortas had been true they are minor compared to the record of the Burgers. The charges against them amount to no more than taking legal fees while they sat on the Court. Nixon and gang didn't like the justices or the purposes of the services they rendered in return for which they received fees.

Whether one likes or dislikes these Justices, unlike Burger, made the chief of them all by Nixon, they have no record of subverting Justice as he does and both had distinguished careers before they were appointed to the Court. Douglas had helped clean up the business world at the selection of the conservative head of the Kennedy family, Joseph. And Fortas' dedication to the workings of the system of justice led him to take without fee the cases of indigent defendants that resulted in precedent case law, Gideon v Wainwright. It assured counsel to ~~those~~ <sup>defendants</sup> who could not pay lawyers.

In the Fortas case, there is proof of long-range Nixon planning. Johnson had nominated Fortas, a respected and experience lawyer inside the government and in private practise, to be Chief Justice. United Features Syndicate/distributed a column dealing with the situation as of September 13, 1968, less than two months before the election Nixon barely won: Lil-marked in yellow, return to Fortas file

Nixon had no ~~intention~~ <sup>intention</sup> of passing up his golden opportunity to stack the Court at and simultaneously ridding the court of a justice whose view so opposed his own. the top with his fink. This did not come out until Warren Weaver exposed it four ~~months~~ and after Fortas resigned. months after Nixon took office (NYTimes 5/23/69) among the many paralleling developments with which this coincides is bringing Caulfield and his ~~spying~~ <sup>spying</sup> into the White House:

"Prominent Republican leaders, including close associates of Richard M. Nixon, were aware at least eight months ago of a potentially explosive relationship between Abe Fortas...and Louis E. Wolfson, then awaiting sentence on perjury and conspiracy convictions. [They passed] a warning...to Senator Jacob K. Javits...then seeking re-election [to] avoid any close association with Mr. Fortas in the campaign... Secretary of State Rogers, then as now one of Mr. Nixon's closest advisers, said yesterday he was aware early in the 1968 campaign that the former Fortas law firm once represented Wolfson...[John Mitchell] had probably heard..."

But Rogers did not "remember" that his firm <sup>"has for several years</sup> ~~and~~ represented Alexander Rittmaster...who was indicted with Wolfson" and made a deal, turning state's evidence. What Rittmaster told the federal agencies is what was leaked to Lambert.

Rogers was one of the good guys with whitebats in the Nixon administrations.

# Burger Choice Linked to Loyalty Case

By Drew Pearson  
and Jack Anderson

President Nixon went to unprecedented lengths to explain why and how he picked Warren E. Burger to be his first major judicial appointment, that of Chief Justice.

There was good reason for this, because never in the past half-century has such an obscure jurist been appointed to this high post. In the past, Presidents have picked ex-Presidents of the United States, candidates for President, or Cabinet officers to be Chief Justice.

Among them were;

- William Howard Taft, former President of the United States.

- Charles Evans Hughes, Governor of New York, Secretary of State, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and candidate for President.

Harlan Fiske Stone, Attorney General and Associate Justice.

- Fred Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, chief of war mobilization, member of Congress and Judge on the Court of Appeals.

- Earl Warren, three times Governor of California, Attorney General of California, and candidate for Vice President with Gov. Tom Dewey in 1948.

In contrast, Judge Burger held only an obscure position as Assistant Attorney General

and as Associate Judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals.

The inside reason for the President's choice, as previously reported, was Burger's close affiliation with Mr. Nixon in the Joe McCarthy witch-hunting days, and his role in the No. 1 loyalty case under President Eisenhower—that of Dr. John Peters of Yale.

Here is a quote from the Washington Merry-Go-Round column of April 9, 1955, regarding an off-the-record luncheon which Burger staged in connection with the Peters case:

"Purpose of the luncheon was to do what the American Bar Association frowns on—influencing the courts through the press.

"Assistant Attorney General Burger is scheduled to stand before the Supreme Court of the United States on April 18 to argue a famous security case. And, to sway public opinion in advance, he invited 12 newsmen to an off-the-record lunch. Upon arrival they were amazed to hear a bald attempt to use them to incite the public for the purpose of influencing the Supreme Court.

"The Supreme Court case that Burger will argue is the famous one of Professor John P. Peters, top medical officer of Yale University who was fired from his part-time, non-sensitive Government job in the U.S. Public Health Service after an unnamed, undercover

Government witness claimed that Peters had Communist affiliations.

## Sobeloff Said "No"

"The case comes up for argument in the Supreme Court in about a week and already the Justice Department has one strike against it because Solicitor General Simon Sobeloff, who is supposed to handle all Supreme Court matters, refused to sign the Justice Department's brief.

"So, to arouse public opinion in advance, Assistant Attorney General Burger proceeded to tell newsmen how a wrong decision by the Supreme Court could wreck the Government's entire security program, how the Justice Department could function efficiently only if its corps of informers remained undercover, and how disclosure of their identities would wreck the security machine.

"Sooner than identify its secret witnesses, Burger hinted, the Eisenhower Administration would abolish its security hearings altogether.

"Burger did not explain why the reported secret witness against Dr. Peters, understood to be Louis F. Budenz, could not be named, since Budenz has occupied the limelight at many public Congressional hearings.

"But he did attack anyone who criticized the Justice Department's security program, as being Communist-inspired.

"The 12 newsmen listened in

silence. Then one of them asked whether he considered Vannevar Bush, a top American scientist and vigorous critic of the security program, as being Communist-inspired.

"Another newsmen asked whether Harry Cain, an Eisenhower appointee on the Justice Department's own subversive control board, was Communist-inspired. Cain too has been a vigorous critic of the Eisenhower security program.

"I'd just like to know," replied the Assistant Attorney General, 'who is feeding them their information.'

"Crude as he was, Burger ran no risk of a contempt-of-court citation. He used the technique of the background press conference where the public official who wants to get his views across remains anonymous.

"Note—Newsmen present did not fall for Burger's anonymous diatribe. Only one man present, Robert K. Walsh of the Washington Star, used the substance of what he said. Walsh waited several days, then wrote a carefully balanced story. It contained no hysteria."

## Burger Criticizes

Burger's criticism of anyone who criticized the security program as "Communist-inspired" later could have been applied to most of the Supreme Court over which he will now preside. For a majority found against him.

© 1969, Bell-McClure Syndicate, Inc.

Post 9.13.68

# Nixon Role Urged In the Fortas Case

By Marquis Childs

United Feature Syndicate

RICHARD NIXON is under increasing pressure to divorce himself from the powerful forces on the right blocking the confirmation of Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice of the United States. Racist, virulently anti-Communist and on the fringe anti-Semitic, the drive on Fortas has been picked up by extremist groups as a handy stick to assault the Supreme Court.

Sen. Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts, the first Negro to sit in the Senate since Reconstruction, who is Richard Nixon's Exhibit A to establish his link with Negro voters, is urging Nixon to call off the Republicans. He is advising him to follow a face-saving strategy that would in all probability insure Fortas's confirmation.

Nixon's position is that the President should have let his successor, whether it is Nixon or Hubert Humphrey, name a Chief Justice to succeed Earl Warren. But he has also said that the Senate should pass on Fortas. That is presently not possible, however, with 17 to 20 Republicans linked with Southern Democrats determined to filibuster long enough to prevent a vote which would, as shown by an Associated Press poll, go for Fortas.

Brooke is telling Nixon that to ask the Republicans to let the confirmation come to a vote will not be backing down from his initial stand. What is more, if he makes this clear publicly he will reassure the minorities who feel that Nixon is part of a conspiracy to block the first Jewish Chief Justice.

BUT WHETHER Nixon will go counter to opinion inflamed by the rightist groups is debatable. Most Senators, including those favoring the Fortas nomination, say their mail is running heavily against confirmation. Many letters repeat the charges put out in a mailing of 280,000 by the most potent of these groups.

The Liberty Lobby calls Fortas a "convinced revolutionary in deadly earnest" who is "well qualified to guide this once-free and independent Nation down the final pathway to the Communist tyranny that awaits."

"Under Fortas's control," the massive mailing continued, "the Supreme Court will smash every effort by the people to restore law and order and crack down on crime, communism and corruption. Under Fortas's control the pornographic industry will go on attacking the morals of American youth while the narcotics industry continues as-

ta's control it will be 'business as usual' for the Communists and the underworld and the big contractors who are cleaning up on cost-plus at the taxpayers' expense."

W. B. Hicks Jr., Liberty Lobby's shrewd executive secretary, says that if it appears likely the nomination will get to a floor vote he intends to launch a Nation-wide newspaper ad campaign on the obscenity issue. A Southern Congressman has called Fortas, "Mr. Obscenity" and the effort is to make it appear that Fortas, by a swing vote, has caused the Court to throw out obscenity convictions.

In all this there are overtones of the McCarthyist (Joe) era and guilt by association. Those were the undertones of Nixon's early career as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee and a cold war warrior. The memory of those beginning Nixon years troubles many of his current followers who, like Brooke, fear the Fortas attack is the start of a new wave of character assassination.

~

OFFICIALS OF THE American Bar Association and law deans in various parts of the country are worried that the authority of the courts and particularly the Supreme Court will be further weakened. Joseph O'Meara, dean emeritus of the Notre Dame Law School, points out in a letter to *The Washington Post* that the two obscenity cases on which the Fortas attack concentrates were decided on points of law and not on substance. Noting his votes in two other obscenity cases and one opinion O'Meara writes that Fortas's views "reflect a developing sensitivity to the complexities of the problem, a realistic appreciation of the significance of the way challenged films and books are marketed and a concern with the peddling of obscenity to the young." Four deans of law schools in prominent universities joined in the O'Meara letter.

In Nixon's dilemma—if indeed for him it is a dilemma—he must face the stern opposition to Fortas of some of his devoted political engineers. Foremost on this list is Sen. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina who is credited with rounding up the Southern delegate strength that made his first-ballot nomination at Miami Beach inevitable. When Fortas was testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee Thurmond directed a furious barrage at him.

An editorial in the *Oklahoma City Oklahoman*, headed "Nixon Owes a Debt to Thurmond," suggested that the South Carolina Senator's name might enter into speculation for Chief Justice under Nixon as President. That would insure Earl Warren staying on as Chief Justice, the editorial added.

There are many ways under the Senate's complicated procedure to block the Fortas nomination. But if the holdup succeeds the consequences will be felt for a long time to come both on the Court and in the politics of 1968 and after.

Republican Javits was a friend of Fortas and of Wolfson, who wrote him after the election protesting that he had been framed and asking for a Congressional election, hardly the gesture of a man who ~~is~~ is not satisfied of his innocence. Javits' reply was a "Dear "ou" note. It concluded, contrary to the Nixonian line, "I am, of course, well aware of ~~your fine civic work~~ all the fine civic work you have done and your personal contributions to the community..." (NYTimes 5/23/69)

The Life -Lambert story was published May 5, 1969.

~~Three days before Weaver's story Life appeared with Lambert's story.~~ It credits no Nixon operation as its source. ~~It was her~~ Its headline across the top of facing pages is "Fortas of the Supreme Court and ethics" above "The Justice...and the Stock Manipulator." The wrongdoing attributed to Fortas is "While a member of the <sup>High</sup> Supreme Court, Fortas was paid \$20,000 by the Wolfson Family Foundation set up by Wolfson and his brothers... Ostensibly [sic] to advise the foundation on ways to use the funds for charitable ~~purposes~~ educational and civil purposes..." This is precisely what the Wolfson foundation did and does. As Lambert also wrote, Fortas also returned the money.

Perhaps Fortas' real crime, aside from his views, is that he "continued to advise ...Johnson..." Not welcome to Nixon and his hardcore was Fortas' advice to the foundation on its future charitable and scholarship programs...a program for granting scholarships for theological studies...advising the trustees on possible civil rights projects."

All of this was two years before Lambert's story.

May 23, after Fortas' resignation, Life went after him hard again, using words and making admission that look less innocent in retrospect. In describing the problem of the oure President Nixon, its language gags one after two years of The Watergate, "How could President Nixon act without seeming to appear overly eager to name a Fortas successor?" It was a straw-man question because, "On ~~may~~ Wednesday, May 7, Attorney General Mitchell, at the President's direction, met with Chief Justice Warren and relayed to him" what would be charged - unless. Two days later the FBI was after Wolfson, then in ~~the~~ jail.

If this assemblage of the Nixonian pure headed by the Nixon of "Checkers" and that under-the-table look to the Nixon of Watergate and a tax-gyp of a half-million - is not enough Life later had more- at the time of the Sharpstown ripoff of the Jesuits <sup>about</sup> that

friend and enricher of Nixon and Mitchells chief of the Criminal Division, Will Wilson. Lambert did not write that Wilson "took charge in his new job confidently...to 'wipe out organized crime in a year or two ...and investigating everyone from former Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas to fugitive love child Timothy Leary. The heart of a Puritan beat on, however...He was intensely partisan. Career lawyers were stunned to learn that he was asking job applicants about their views on the Vietnam war."

Donald Jackson wrote this story. The "Puritan" Wilson suspected all Democrats, Jackson reported.

What about Sharp and the swindling of so many beginning with the Jesuits? After it was all over, this "Puritan" still could say, "I can't think of Sharp as a swindler."

Could he have thought of stamping out crime without cleaning out the White House?

Nixon and Mitchell pick 'em. The kind of man whose personal ~~life is enriched~~ assets are swollen by the fleecer of the Jesuits and who targets on a justice with the Fortas record.

Replaced by a Burger who is a purposeful corrupter of the workings of the system of justice to persecute innocent doctors for Nixon's personal gratification.

But ~~blitting~~ throats ~~ix~~ does not quench the Nixon yen for "enemies" blood. First the Civil Service commission announced that Fortas, because he resigned, would not get his pension. Just nastiness. Fortas, a success lawyer, was not poor. Then the special kind of Mafia Nixon put in charge of justice leaked more prejudicial defamation after Fortas has resigned. They had "seized" letters. There was no possibility of criminal charges for no crime had even been alleged. It was the kind of misuse of power and of the FBI that was typically Nixonian. They just went out and got more than could draw Fortas' blood to set in hate type. (Post 5/17/69)

Part of the play of major magazine pieces is the attention they get in the newspapers. John Kifner interviewed Lambert for The New York Times. (5/17/69) "A fairly low-level guy" Lambert said, started him after Fortas. This "low level" knew about "the relationship between Fortas and Wolfson."

Low-levels don't move in Nixon administrations without high-level approval, unless

they have personal interest, as in The Watergate. Lambert admits, however, in describing their alleged reluctance to talk, that he had government sources.

The point was lost on Kifner, but Lambert told him he had met Fortas during the Johnson administration, when Lambert and Life were interested in exposing ~~allegations~~ of Johnson's "financial holdings."

Isn't it odd that they had no such interest in Nixon, where the vein was rich as it had never been in history?

As a team they went after Johnson, Tydings, Fortas and other Democrats and were more than willing to go for an obvious defamation of the first Catholic President, JFK, but not after the Nixon-Mitchell-Stans gang that blackmailed the largest campaign war-chest out of those who wanted favors from them or were in trouble with federal agencies.

After the Senator Longs and the Jim Garrisons, who sounded off against the abuses of legal and Constitutional rights by the federal police but not against those committing these and identical abuses.

It can't be because the stories were not there. "ever in history has there been the opportunity for investigative reporting that the Nixon administration presented and often, particularly in the denial of the rights of citizens and the announced plans to further abridge these rights, made public.

When it was known that Nixon had all this expensive property/and there was nothing in his employment history to account for the money required to swing it, that was not a lead to be followed. Trying to pin something on LBJ, whose wife inherited wealth, was.

When Garrison cleaned New Orleans up he was the subject of an attack alleging Mafia connections to him. When Nixon did have many connections with Mafia and other dubious types, even after it was exposed, by Hank Messick in his book Dansky and by other, down to the minor magazine, Sundance, which devoted an issue to it. it set off no Life investigative teams in hot set pursuit. But Life and Lambert were interested in the libel against JFK. It was hot news for them and they would believe the inherently incredible when handed by Colson.

That there was no purpose in the first Catholic President ordering the assassination of a Catholic dictator did not occur to the unquestioning Lambert of the record that shows anti-Democrat interests. Which means pro-Nixon interests. JFK had ordered the liquidation of the adventure he had inherited from the administration that refused to go as far in that adventure as Vice President Nixon had urged was not newsworthy. That with this liquidation there was no need to assassinate Diem also was not of interest. And if Diem, who had no following and was imposed on the South Vietnamese by the administration whose Vice President Nixon had been, were ousted by his own military, as the CIA and the JFK White House and their "Republican ambadd ambassador all knew, what earthly purpose was served by an American assassination?

None except to the sick minds of ~~the~~ <sup>a</sup>Colson.  
and The Hunt who fakes the "evidence" for them.

And the Lamberts who actually give it a second look.

This is why the Nixons have as top assistants <sup>like</sup> ~~the~~ Colsons.

Why the Colsons have their Hunts and their Bennetts and their Caddys and their others of like mind, conscience and high principle.

The continuity in this pre-Watergate Watergating is clear.

The "New Majority" minuscule minority was an important part in it.

Nixon did make the court over, in time for his partosans to have a chance to dare to pay him back if he did not remain unimpeached.

The extent to which he was able to remake the Court and with it the decisions that influence all of national life and what the Government can and cannot do was helped much by the full range of those drawn upon, from the little-known Caddys to the well-known Life and its "investigative" reporter.

But there was no Lambert expose of any of The Watergate after the story broke as ~~their~~ there had been none when to any perceptive, honest reporter all the makings were visible.

The complete tracing of the combined White House-CIA operation here exposed in the effort to get Douglas was available from public sources, as the reader has seen.

Life had Who's Who, as had its sister magazine, the surviving Time. I twice made offers of this material to Time. It supposedly ~~was~~ was making a great competitive effort on The Watergate, to beat its competitor Newsweek (to which I also made similar offers)/

There was no interest.

Had there been, in the very early days of Watergate reporting, while Nixon and his Hadlenans, Ehrlichmans, Colsons Deans and others were blocking any real investigation, the story of the CIA involvement, of the Nixon effort to lay the blame on the CIA and of its intrusions into domestic affairs would have come out.

In those early days, before the people and the politicians were beyond shock from continuing mind-boggling revelation of what Nixon had really done, it might have been different.

With no "investigative reporting" interest in anything except leaks and with the leaks all angled and designed to let the shock grow as the disclosures dribbled, Nixon remained unimpeached.

As he owes much to Haldeman and Ehrlichman, so also does Nixon owe more than is generally understood to the Colson of these kinds of operations that influence the national mind.

His own variant of ~~Hofzier~~ "Hofziger Jobs" was only one of Colson's black arts. He had a whole list of enemies. This gives a peek into the workings of the Nixonian mind. What was right for a Burger was wrong for a Fortas when what Burger did subverted justice. What was right for a Bennett, to represent Howard Hughes, was wrong for a Democrat, Larry O'Brien, and he got the full Nixon works, including IRS "treatment." Yet Nixon had already gypped the IRS out of almost a half-million dollars and this was not all his gypping, on taxes or anything else. He used campaign money illegally, from paying bribes to remain unimpeached to buying his wife expensive jewelry, as the Watergate committee reported July 13, 1974.

The O'Brien innocent victims were legion when Colson presided over getting even with Nixon "enemies." Not even sports-figures, entertainers and educators were immune.

And all this, mind you, was before Colson found his personal christ.

What he did after the revelation follows. Hold tight!