Campaign Contributions

Shocked by payment of legal fees of more than \$80,000 in the second quarter alone, highly irritated Republican fat cats are sending this angry message to national party officials with rising intensity: don't use the money we contributed to re-elect President Nixon to help campaign aides stuck in the Watergate scandal.

They have a partial though silent ally in Republican National Chairman George Bush. While Bush makes no public comment, he is known to feel that the Committee for the re-election of the President (CREEP) should have closed shop last Nov. 8 with its \$4.8 million surplus turned over to the party. Spurred on by the angry fat cats, Bush now is stepping up efforts to belatedly close down CREEP—which reported \$680,000 in expenditures for the second quarter of 1973. But Bush sees some merit in using

But Bush sees some merit in using the 1972 campaign surplus to pay legal fees for CREEP officials named as defendants in civil suits and appearing before congressional committees. Many party leaders and contributors disagree. "Hell, no!" one state chairman exploded to us. "Why should our money bail out perjurers? They ought to swim for themselves."

CREEP's second-quarter report shows \$80,256 in legal fees. Attorneys

for Maurice Stans, CREEP's chief fund-raiser under indictment for perjury in the Vesco case, received \$37,-000. Another \$15,000 went to attorneys for ex-CREEP deputy director Jeb Magruder, an admitted perjurer, and \$10,-000 to attorneys for CREEP scheduler Herbert Porter, who also has admitted perjury.

perjury.

CREEP ground rules prohibit payment of legal fees for defense of criminal charges. But CREEP paid \$15,700 in fees to the firm defending Stans in the Vesco case on May 11, the day after he was indicted. Stans' lawyer, Walter J. Bonner, told us he did not know whether any of this covered preindictment legal help in the Vesco case. Stans relayed word to us through a CREEP spokesman that it did not

a CREEP spokesman that it did not.
What bothers Bush much more than legal fees is the continued employment of CREEP public relations specialist Devan Shumway at \$36,000 a year. Millionaire Stans also continues on the payroll at \$30,000 a year. The residual CREEP staff includes a deputy to Stans, a lawyer and six secretaries and clerks.

9

The revenge of Senate liberals on career Foreign Service officers for faithfully carrying out Presdent Nixon's foreign policy might have been even

for Legal Fees?

worse had not elder statesman liberal Averell Harriman privately intervened.

The liberal attack by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ruthlessly cutting down G. McMurtrie Godley (former ambassador to Laos) for assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs struck new terror inside the State Department. Morale, already at its lowest since the days of Joe McCarthy, continues down.

It would have been even lower today had the committee also rejected Deputy Assistant Secretary of State William H. Sullivan as ambassador to the Philippines. That might well have happened save for the intervention of Harriman, Sullivan's longtime mentor.

Harriman, bearing gilt-edged liberal credentials himself, lobbied the liberal bloc controlling the Senate committee and managed to reduce the votes against Sullivan to three.

Still to come before the head-hunting committee is the highly-regarded Charles S. Whitehouse, returning here as acting ambassador in Saigon to run the committee's confirmation gauntlet as new ambassador to Laos. But the committee's 9 to 7 rejection of Godley may lead Mr. Nixon to change the Charles Whitehouse assignment from Laos to assistant secretary.

That's still up in the air. In either case, Whitehouse, as an old hand in Southeast Asia, will be the next Foreign Service officer to feel the smear of committee liberals, headed by chairman J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, for work performed as a public servant in the field.

Godley's rejection, for what Fulbright confided privately to high administration officials was his "overly enthusiastic" carrying out of U.S. policy in Laos, was the most overt ideological attack on a Foreign Service officer since the late Sens. Kenneth Wherry and Joseph R. McCarthy, both right-wing Republicans, crucified the reputations and diplomatic careers of the old China hands. The pretext then: revenge for their correctly reporting to Washington from pre-Communist Mainland China about the growing strength of the Communist movement.

The political guillotining of the old China hands deprived the White House of its most informed talent in the field. The same is true today. Worse, avenging liberal fury over the Vietnam war by stabbing defenseless civil servants will dull imaginative reporting from the field and turn career officers into deadbeats in a department permitted only perfunctory policymaking anyway under President Nixon.

© 1973, Publishers-Hall Syndicate