

for or against

Nixon is schizoid about demonstrators - any kind, demonstrating/anything.

He hates them, can't stand them, as John Dean and others testified to and as Nixon's pologists were ultra-sensitive to, seeking to apologize for it and simultaneously to make nothing of it.

Here is what Dean testified to: (Pick up excerpt)

Yet he has been careful to exploit eemontsrators for his own politkcal and campaigning end, to make himself a martyr, a dedicated man abused by the unprinciplled and uncouth.

During the 1970 campaign a clear pattern of exploitation emerged before there was an "attack" on Nixon that then gave ever sign of having been arranged and in retrospect suggests even more strongly that it was contrived. The deliberateness of White House arranging of what amounted to a false issue that coincided so neatly with another false issue, one of Nixon's more cherished, "law and order", was so apparent that no research was necessary to report this and what follows. It comes from the files of an old Nixon watcher, set aside contemporaneously.

The news accounts drawn upon are from The New York Times of October 20,22,30 and 31; and November 4,9,13; and because the alleged attack was at San Jose, California, from these California sources:The Sunday San Francisco Examiner and Chrnicle of November 1; the Chrncile of November 2,3,4,18,21 and in 1971 of January 13, October 22 and 23; and November 22, 1971; the San Fran Examiner of November 2; the Oakland Tribune of November 8; the Associated a series of particularly Press of October 30; and radio news accounts, ~~xx~~ KCBS of November 2 3, local and CBS network)3,8

~~It~~ There is a point in citing these on-hand sources aside from showing again that Nixon is transparently prediciable in his manufactures for political purposes. When his phobia about demonstrators and the extreme to which it drove him was testified to and when this contrived phoniness was used as justification for a design of the police state, the press would have served the people well to do what it did not do, consult the clippings in its own libraries.

But this was not done, not even when, on August 7, 1973, Special Prosecutor Cox was asked to investigate it by a California State senator.

Still again the parallels with Early Hitler are stark and frightening. Hitler also created distrustful disturbances for misrepresentation and exploitation. The copying could not be more faithful, save that Hitler also inveighed against "Jews". ~~Hit~~ Nixon had the long-hairs and shoeless as a substitute for Jews.

In his October 19 appearance in Chicago, Agnew portrayed himself as one victim of a "hate" campaign by the press. He went on to claim that the press practically ignored it when "the President of the United States was the atretget of a shower of rocks thrown by young radical thugs." This was an Agnewian exaggeration/misrepresentation of an incident two days earlier when at most a couple of stones were thrown by those so unidentified there were no arrests. Agnew pulled the stops to call this "obscene, outrageous conduct", a "commonpalce" created by "the atmosphere of permissiveness" and ignored by the press.

At the same time, Nixon, in ~~Kansas City~~ <sup>the mid-west,</sup> was proclaiming "a rising tide of terrorism and crime" that only a Republican victory could halt (ignoring the two years of his Republican administration). He aluded to the assassination of Pierre Laporte, Quebec's minister of labor to give his bete noir an internation cast. In commenting on Nixon's rabble-rousing, Warren Weaver said what is reported by others, including Rowland Evans, cited elsewhere to show that Nixon does these things deliberately,

"The President appeared to relish the propsect of heckling...since it underscored both his attacks on obscenity and permissiveness...When a very modest ~~voice~~ <sup>noise</sup> arose from his Grand Forks audience Mr. Nixon called out, 'I can handle it. Don't you worry. Go right ahead.'" (10/20)

He interpreted this barely-audible "noise" that was ian audible to most of "shouting down" with "onscenities". Obscenities was one of the major non-issues of that campaign.

~~XXXX~~ The next day Max Frankel referred to this and other Nixon-inspired incidents:

"Mr. Nixon surveys every setting looking for the end-the-war chanters in the crowd (or outside the hall if tickets are scarce). He listens for an obscenity or two from the chorus, which is always audible byt never really disrupting. Tjis brings up the war in a way he wants it brought up and leads to [his] appeal for the silent majority 'to stand up and be counted.' When the dissenters do not shout quite loudly enough, as in North Dakota on Monday, the President himself exhorts them, 'I can handle it, Don't worry about it. Go right ahead.'"

A week later, in St. Petersburg, Florida, where about 20 students had picked up their tickets days before to get up-front seats, this tint fraction of the audience of 11,000, marked by their long hair, were seated at the very back, where they could not be heard well enough to be dmsruptive if this was their intent. David Rosenbaum wrote, "just audible enough for the President to note them and denounce them as examples of 'those who shout down speakers, who attempt to close down schools.' The scene has been the same at nearly every campaign stop Mr. Nixon has made recently - a small corps of

young people far removed from the speaker's stand who provided the President a target for his barbs and gave the silent majority someone to shout down. There is no evidence that these hecklers are recruited. But they are planned for, welcomed in small numbers and their presence usually helps rather than hurts the President's appeal to voters."

Rosenbaum then cites "Examples from three Florida cities [to] show just how the hecklers are controlled and used." The night before, in Miami Beach, a group of protesters "standing outside the hall" were <sup>special "white</sup> // given tickets and ushered ... to an empty section at the rear of the hall" by "a man they assumed was from the White House." When "The youths performed as expected, stamping their feet and chanting", Nixon "made disparaging remarks about them before a statewide television audience."

When Wilbur Pillsbury, an investigator for the city attorney's office at St. Petersburg was caught in similar actions, in that case ~~in-the-spot searches of young men and the~~ taking of their purses from young women, at the visible order of a Secret Service agent, Pillsbury had so delayed the young people that "the only remaining seats were in the very last row of the top tier.":

"We just take our orders from the Secret Service people," Mr. Pillsbury ~~added~~ said. Asked whether the delaying tactics that forced the youths to sit in the rear had been planned in advance, Mr. Pillsbury grinned and said, "No comment." ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ .."

When a few hours later "a half dozen Florida State University students" appeared at the Tallahassee airport "long before the President's scheduled stop," they were met by a deputy sheriff who "informed them that a special roped-off area" was the only place they would be permitted to stand.

James <sup>cited</sup> Reston wrote about "new techniques designed to mislead the public" on October 30. He noted as an example "the President's staff leaks a few hecklers into the hall so that Mr. Nixon may back them down."

In that week's Life Hugh Sidey reported that "Nixon's advance men... have carefully arranged with local police to allow enough dissenters in the staging area so the President will have his theme well illustrated as he warms to his job."

(Reston was prescient in this article: "If the Nixon-Agnew-Chitiner type of scare politics works in the '70 ~~campaign~~ election, it is almost certain to be carried over into the Presidential election of 1972, dividing and polarizing... that is what this campaign is all about: it is about the integrity of our national politics...")

After Reston wrote his article and before it could be printed, on the night of October 29 there was the then-famous San Jose incident, an attack on Nixon in which he was entirely unscathed. Rocks, bricks, eggs, bottles and, a nice touch, red flags, were thrown at him.

Nixon has a thing about fires and fireplaces. It is a Washington joke that he has roaring blazes in the White House fireplaces during the summer - when he is there, which is not most of the time - and keeps the temperature tolerable by <sup>turning up the</sup> air conditioning. Well, he had a fire-place turned up in San Clemente that night, and after he left his second-~~stor~~ floor study and retired, it set the wall on fire. If it was not a serious fire and there never was any danger to him, it made a nice, sympathy-inducing story when it was reported that he was "of forced" to "evacuate" in pajamas.

What had happened at San Jose is that when he left the auditorium, in the full glare of floodlights he had climbed to the top of his car and again needled the hecklers who this time had not been kept far away. He asked for it and everyone else but him got it. His limousines and other cars in the motorcade were hit. Among the people who received minor injuries are a Secret Service agent, a TV cameraman and a reporter. Only the best and most conspicuous target was unhit.

A bus carrying his staff had four windows broken out. This made another nice touch, the quotation of his personal secretary, Rose Mary Woods, exclaiming, "Just like Caracas!". This was a reference to his being spat upon during an attack by Venezuelan students provoked by his presence in their land when he was vice president. A press bus had seven windows broken.

What is unusual about this, more than closeness to the election, which was so close that if the incident had been arranged there was no chance for exposing of it before the voting, more than all the unusual, uncharacteristic details, like letting the crowd of known and more than visible demonstrators so close, is that the place in which it happened is not a hot-bed of anti-Nixonism and student unrest but Nixon and conservative heartland. That this could happen there was in itself provocative and suggestive of

6  
prearrangement.

Nixon milked it like the experienced political milkmaid he is: "...an example of the viciousness of the lawless elements in our society...I will discuss what America must do to end the wave of violence and terrorism by the radical, antidemocratic elements in our society. The time has come to take the gloves off..."

On October 30, to exploit the "great amount of reaction and interest" (Zielger's words) the Republicans bought a half hour of prime time to telecast Nixon's speech at Anaheim, in Nixon heartland, where a friendly audience was guaranteed. By this time it was a "freedom of speech" issue in Nixon's view.

However, the departure from normal Secret Service precautions, apparent on TV and in newspaper pictures, immediately raised questions, especially because some newsmen had ~~been~~ advance warning that there would be trouble. This led to the belief that the Secret Service also knew. It had its own agents in the crowd. As The New York Times reported October 31, "The White House was unable to explain why the demonstrators had been allowed to mass so close...Usually they are kept behind barricades erected in advance, some distance away." This and many other questions, all indicative of White House desire for what happened, were given more point when several reporters were told they and the President would be stoned, as he was not on entering the auditorium.

What made spontaneity harder to believe is that it was not until after stones and eggs, the stones described by Ziegler as "small", had been thrown at Nixon without touching him that he mounted the hood of his limousine and taunted the crowd, which was, from the newspaper pictures, right up to the car. He was heard to say, "That's what they hate to see."

When Nixon got off the car, he delayed departure more by holding interviews with local newsmen, which gave ample time for the crowd to block the way of the motorcade. Contemporaneous accounts say that the mounting of the car "gave the demonstrators time to regroup." So did holding a press conference instead of leaving.

Republican governor Reagan was one of a number of candidates who openly predicted that ~~this incident~~ "the backlash to the San Jose violence will spell victory for a number of GOP candidates in tight races."

In a San Francisco interview the next day, Keagan said that he and Nixon had deliberately "taunted" the demonstrators. "...We know nothing that infuriates them more" than what Nixon did. Nixon was quoted as telling an aide about the same thing, "he knew this act angered the crowd."

Nixon's added attempt to exploit the violence he had deliberately precipitated he spelled out in Phoenix, where he went from California: "Bobody is going to tear ~~down~~ this country down as long as you are ready to cast your vote to build this country up... Never before in this campaign was there such an atmosphere of hatred." He blamed the violence on an enlarged number of "revolutionaries, ~~thugs~~... thugs and hoodlums.", the "terrorists of the far left... As long as I am President no band of violent thugs is going to keep me from going out and speaking to the people..."

Juxtaposing himself and "decent people" against the violence he had deliberately cause on election eve was unanswerable in its strong emotional appeal. His Phoenix exploitation was larded with the most inflammatory language in which he even attacked the legislatures and courts, the homes and the universities.

The later reporting re-emphasized the deliberate~~ness~~ with which Nixon precipitated this violence. Among the details that came to light are that with advance knowledge of plans to create a disturbance "the police did not have enough men" and "The placing of buses and fire trucks, under Secret Service orders, blocked any alternate route, forcing the President's motorcade to run ~~the~~ gauntlet of a hostile crowd."

The San Jose chief of police~~x~~ was then quoted as saying that "to his knowledge neither the President nor his car was struck with a missile of any kind," despite contrary reports. And, before the stoning of the vehicles, the motorcade, "without warning," led by the police, "surged into the crowd, forcing open a path." This is to say that in effect the crowd was attacked and the stoning was in reaction to the attack by vehicle.

To this and other similar details, local police added the opinion that the White House "really played it up", or seriously exaggerated what happened. A number of police officials insisted that no rocks or bricks had been thrown. By the next week the San Jose police chief and student leaders were in agreement on the exaggeration of what ~~had happened~~

had happened. The ~~police~~ <sup>chief charged</sup> ~~said~~ his force had been "smeared". Local labor leaders alleged the whole thing was a "hoax" perpetrated by Nixon himself, "there was a conspiracy at the highest level. Even pro-Nixon unions joined in this statements.

The local state senator demanded a grand jury investigation because of these "many suspicious circumstances" ~~and~~ He questioned how "hundreds of police and Secret Service agents allowed a handful of juvenile delinquents to create an international incident" and added ~~charges~~ accusations of a "shocking absence of normal security precautions."

From my earlier study of security precautions as part of the study of the political assassinations, this is what was so atypically apparent on TV when it all happened.

On November 2 student leaders, who had combed the area of the disturbance as soon as the crowd disappeared, produced in a single cardboard box all the debris collected. There were a few small rocks, several tin cans, a hairbrush and a pair of broken glasses. The found evidence of five eggs only, a statement not disputed by the chief of police, who was present at their press conference.

The White House then took issue with the chief of police on whether or not the incident had been exaggerated, inflaming it more and getting international attention his statement didn't receive.

By November 8, after the election was safely in the bag, there were reports of a meeting between the Secret Service and 25 policemen with their commanding officer prior to the disturbance at which "discussion of paid deon demonstrators took place."

There was a subsequent grand jury investigation. A professional anti-Communist, Lawrence Goff and his wife, appeared before the House Un-American committee in Washington a year later. His ~~is~~ claim that ~~the~~ "Maoists" organized the disturbance was met with student charges that at meetings in advance of the demonstration, "That guy even suggested we get some mustard gas and use it." Goff and his wife were FBI informants.

Even conservative AEL-CIO chief George Meany said, on November 21, 1971, that "the whole thing was very carefully staged."

The same state senator who had contemporaneously demanded a full investigation,



Alfred E. Alquist, on August 7, 1973, after disclosures before it that Nixon's staff welcomed adverse demonstrations, asked the Ervin committee to investigate the San Jose affair. Alquist blamed the "security directives" for what happened.

What is significant is that with all those still and motion pictures and with all the police, federal agents and reporters present, there were no indictments. Local official investigations were "inconclusive". The federal government, Nixon's own authorities, who had jurisdiction because after the JFK assassination any attack on the president became a federal crime, did absolutely nothing. ~~With the faintest prospect of a case,~~ From the record in which they took countless cases to court without obtaining a single conviction, they would not have overlooked this possibility of ~~validating~~ prosecuting if there had been the faintest whif of a case of any kind. Nor would Nixon, with his phobia about demonstrators, have permitted them to do nothing.