

## Ethics Issue

## Buchanan Stands Firm

By Lawrence Meyer and Peter A. Jay  
Washington Post Staff Writers

The Senate select Watergate committee's inquiry into "dirty tricks" during the 1972 presidential campaign bogged down yesterday in prolonged debate among committee members and star witness Patrick J. Buchanan over what practices go beyond the acceptable limits in American politics.

Buchanan, a White House aide and long-time Nixon adviser was called as the opening witness of the dirty tricks inquiry to show the "tone" or attitude of the White House toward the 1972 campaign.


Committee chief counsel Samuel Dash questioned Buchanan closely about a number of memoranda, including several written by Buchanan, that discussed strategy to be employed by the Nixon forces in the 1972 election.

Fascinating for their insight into the running of a campaign and their detailed tactics for trying to divide the opposition, the memos failed to show, however, any broad campaign to employ illegal practices in the 1972 campaign.

While defending the tactics discussed in the memos, Buchanan disavowed responsibility for proven campaign misdeeds such as the Watergate bugging and admitted that they were indefensible actions.

Apparently in reaction to yesterday's rambling, argumentative session and repetitive testimony Tuesday by Watergate

See HEARING, A13, Col. 1



By James K. W. Atherton—The Washington Post

Patrick J. Buchanan: "...institutionalized power."

Stalls Probe

### HEARING, From A1

conspirator E. Howard Hunt Jr., the three major television networks voted yesterday, with CBS dissenting, to drop live coverage of the hearings. The Public Broadcasting Service will continue, however, to rebroadcast taped hearing sessions at 8 p.m. each evening. (See details on page A-9).

A principal focus of the committee's questioning yesterday was Buchanan's advice in several memos written in mid-1971 and early 1972 to direct principal Republican attention to thwarting the presidential candidacy of Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), whom Buchanan saw as the strongest Democratic candidate. Buchanan also advised not immediately attacking Sen. George S. McGovern, whom Buchanan saw as the weakest Democratic candidate.

Throughout his testimony, Buchanan firmly insisted that nothing he had advocated in the memos was illegal, immoral or unethical but rather was the stuff and substance of time-honored American political traditions. At one point, as Buchanan's tough language in the memos was quoted back to him, he complained to the committee that what he had written was intended as a confidential communication.

"I think you should be held accountable for what you say publicly," Buchanan told the committee, "but I think a man's entitled to the privacy of his own papers." Had he known that his choice of words in memos would become a matter of public scrutiny, Buchanan said, "I certainly would have written them differently."

The committee also spent considerable time with Buchanan discussing his urging that a conservative tax-free foundation be set up to compete with the liberal-oriented Brookings Institution. In doing so, the committee briefly opened again the sore subject of the role that tax-free institutions play in shaping public policy.

Unlike previous witnesses who worked in the White House but have come to regret—at least publicly—what they did in the campaign, Buchanan had no confession or apology to make to the committee.

Buchanan began his testimony on a combative note, criticizing the committee for failing to restrain leaks to the news media of information about Buchanan's expected testimony. Without mincing words, he defended himself against preview stories suggesting that he had advocated any improper campaign activities.

"I did not recommend or authorize nor was I aware of, any ongoing campaign of political sabotage against Sen. Muskie or any other Democratic candidate," Buchanan said. "I did not recommend, either verbally or in memoranda, that the reelection committee infiltrate the campaigns of our opposition."

Muskie's downfall was not the result of Republican activity, Buchanan told the committee, but the result of McGovern's superior campaign organization and hard

work by McGovern supporters.

In his testimony, Buchanan demonstrated fierce pride in his loyalty to President Nixon, coupled with a quick wit that periodically turned an aggressive question back on the questioner.

How far, Dash asked Buchanan, was he willing to go to re-elect Richard Nixon?

Buchanan: Charles Colson (Former special counsel to the President) was quoted once as saying, "I would do anything the President of the United States would ask me to do, period." I would subscribe to that statement for this reason: The President of the United States would not ask me to do anything unethical, improper or wrong or illegal . . . I am loyal to the President of the United States, that is correct.

I have been loyal to im for eight years.

Dash: I am not questioning that Mr. Buchanan.

Buchanan: What is it that you are questioning, Mr. Dash?

Dash: I am just asking you in the memorandum where you have indicated the nature of the danger that you saw to the country and the importance that the forces of the Republican Party including the White House be aimed at knocking out the front-runner, Mr. Muskie, how far would you go to do that. What tactics would you be willing to use?

Buchanan: What tactics would I be willing to use? Anything that was not immoral, unethical, illegal or unprecedented in previous Democratic campaigns.

One of the few points that Buchanan seemed the least bit apologetic about was his choice of words in writing his memos. "Incidentally," he said at one point during Dash's questioning, "let me make a point here. The exaggerated metaphor is really the staple of American politics."

In one memo about Muskie, for example, Buchanan had said, "We ought to go down to the kennels and turn all the dogs loose on Ecology Ed."

And in another, entitled "The Muskie Watch," written in March, 1971, he asked, "Who should we get to poke the sharp stick into his cave to bring Muskie howling forth?"

By June, 1972, when it had become clear that McGovern would be the nominee, Buchanan recommended in a memo, entitled "Assault Strategy," that "From the way the stock market is reacting, it is apparent that McGovern's nomination should bring about a sharp drop. We should do nothing to prevent this from happening. Indeed if Shultz (George Shultz, then director of the Office of Management and Budget) or Connally (John Connally, then Treasury Secretary) or one of them can predict that McGovern's election would mean a depression or panic on Wall Street, and do it creditably, then they might well do so."

Republican members of the Senate committee lost no opportunity, meanwhile, to cite examples of pranks that had been played in the past on Republican candidates—especially by Democratic prankster Dick Tuck—and that tactics similar to

those advocated by Buchanan had been used by Democrats in other elections.

At one point in the hearings, Buchanan's political advice drew praise from committee chairman Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.). "Well, I will have to say I admire the Buchanan recommendations. They are very forthright."

"Thank you, Senator," Buchanan replied.

Ervin, delivering a delayed punch line, concluded, "I do not fully approve all of them, however."

Under questioning by Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.), Buchanan outlined the task that the committee faces in this, its second, phase.

"My own view is that there are sort of four gradations. There are things that are certainly outrageous and I would put that in with the kind of demonstrations against Vice President Humphrey in 1968 which denied him an opportunity to speak for almost a month.

"Then, there is dirty tricks, then there is political hardball, then there is pranks. I think you will almost have to leave it to the individual and his own sense of ethics as to what is permissible. There is no question but what the line was probably breached in both campaigns in 1972 and perhaps previous ones," Buchanan said.

Baker asked Buchanan whether "political monitoring activity, that is, keeping account of the political health and prospects of potential adversaries in a presidential

campaign is the general practice and is always done, or has been as far as I know."

Buchanan agreed that monitoring the opposition party's potential candidates was "routine."

"Do you think they are desirable?" Baker asked. "I happen to think they are."

Buchanan agreed with Baker that such monitoring practices were desirable.

Under questioning by Sen. Montoya (D-New Mexico), Buchanan conceded that he had been wrong in allowing a pamphlet to be distributed that purported to be an attack by liberals on Muskie. At the same time, Buchanan turned over to the committee a pamphlet, which he said had been distributed at the Democratic National Convention and that he attributed to AFL-CIO President George Meany, that attacked McGovern.

Dash asked Buchanan if he had other materials to turn over to the committee. "Mr. Dash," Baker interrupted, "I might say there are others and you will indeed receive copies and you will not be disappointed."

One of the major themes sounded by Buchanan in his testimony yesterday was the need, as he saw it, to place checks on major American foundations that he described as basically hostile to the Nixon administration.

Similarly, he said, he favors the establishment of a new foundation to serve as a haven for conservative intellectuals and support Republican administrations the way existing foundations

like the Brookings Institute, he said, serve Democratic ones.


In a 1970 memorandum to the President in the possession of the committee and made public yesterday, Buchanan spelled out a program "to combat the institutionalized power of the Left concentrated in the foundations that succor the Democratic Party."

He recommended that "the administration should begin . . . to initiate a policy of favoritism in all future federal grants to those institutions friendly to us . . . and we should direct future funds away from the hostile foundations, like Brookings."

At the same time, he said, "there is a clear national need for a Republican conservative counterpart to Brookings." His proposed foundation he tentatively titled the MacArthur Institute, presumably named after the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur.


"The name MacArthur Institute was taken rather than the Eisenhower Institute to prevent the co-opting of part of it by a number of liberal Republicans of the Scott variety," Buchanan's memo says. He did not say, nor was he asked, if "Scott" referred to Sen. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, the Senate minority leader.)

To finance this foundation, Buchanan said in the memo, big contributors would be persuaded to provide an adequate endowment. "All the high rollers we know would be passed



Associated Press

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino leaves meeting on Agnew's request for inquiry.



Committee Chairman Sam Ervin, as the hearing day grew long, reflected in his attitude the need for rest

By James K. W. Atherton—The Washington Post

the word that of the charities the President prefers, this one is best," the memo says.

"The Big Supporters would find themselves on White House Guest Lists, while the friends of Brookings would stay in outer darkness."

Buchanan told the committee that he has been interested in foundations since the earliest days of the first Nixon administration.

"It is my view," he said, "that, for example, the tax-exempt funds of the Ford Foundation, which is the largest of all foundations," are often channeled "into public policy institutes which (are) in basic disagreement with our own political philosophy."

He said he believes that "these tax-exempt multimillions (of dollars) have the effect, in my personal judgment, of unbalancing the political process, and that he has drafted presidential speeches—never delivered—urging reform of the foundation structure.

(The Ford Foundation denied yesterday that it has engaged in partisan politics. "Our record is an open book," said Richard Magat, a spokesman for the Foundation. "We abide by the letter and spirit of the law" and engage only in legally sanctioned educational and charitable activity.)

"The fact that the Ford Foundation is using its tax-exempt funds to fund, by and large, liberal or left institutions presents a distortion, in my judgment, of the

American political process. . . That is why I wrote the speeches and (my) investigation was not anything done covertly in any manner," Buchanan told the committee.

At one point, Buchanan asked curiously of Dash, as his questioning on the subject of foundations continued, "What does this have to do with the campaign of 1972?"

Dash responded that he wanted to know about "the Ford Foundation and the influence of foundations in the campaign."

Dash also noted that Buchanan's memo expressed a concern that there be "a strong fellow running the Internal Revenue Division and an especially friendly fellow with a friendly staff in the Tax-Exempt Office"—especially while his proposed new tax-exempt foundation was being set up.

Buchanan answered that it was his view that "the tax-exempt division of the Internal Revenue Service had been biased against conservative tax-exempt organizations and had been very lenient in regard to liberal tax-exempt organizations and their activities which crossed the boundary into politics."

The IRS, he said, "was politically controlled by Democrats, or had been at that particular time" — 1970 when he wrote the memo.

Under later questioning from Sen. Herman E. Talmadge (D-Ga.), Buchanan said that "as long as (a foundation is) educational, even if it's liberal, I've got no objection to its tax exemption."

If grants to foundations from the government are awarded on the basis of competitive bidding, then they should be given to the lowest bidder, Buchanan said.

But if they are discretionary and can be awarded by the President to any founda-

tion he chooses, "I would recommend to the President that he turn any grants for studies or projects . . . over to institutions which generally support the values and principles in which we believe, and not to other institutions, such as the Brookings Institution, which in my judgment amounts to, really, a government in exile for the Democratic Party."

Buchanan said, however, that he believes institutions that study public issues—as does Brookings—should be entitled to tax-exempt status, whether liberal or conservative in outlook, as long as they do not actively participate in politics. He said he does not believe that the Brookings Institution engages in politics.

As examples of what he called the Ford Foundation's political involvement, Buchanan said the foundation funded the Institute for Policy Studies which he said has, in turn, funded The Quicksilver Times—a now defunct underground newspaper in Washington.

(Magat, at the Ford Foundation, said that the Foundation's only grant to the Institute for Policy Studies was "a one-year grant of \$7,800 in 1964 for seminars on the subject of the Alliance for Progress.")

Talmadge at one point yesterday suggested to Buchanan that what he was really seeking was "to get unfriendly foundations in." Buchanan said that wasn't so and that what he was really after was tight controls on foundations' political activity.

"I do not see how you can outlaw liberal foundations," Talmadge said.

"You cannot, Senator," Buchanan agreed.

The committee recessed after Buchanan completed his testimony yesterday. It will reconvene next Tuesday, but the name of the next witness to be called has yet to be announced.