

## Paper Radio

# Interviewing Jack Anderson about secrecy

LEW IRWIN

( A continuing feature by the  
noted KDAY radio newsmen )

Henry Kissinger at a press "backgrounder" (at which he was not to be identified): "First of all, let us get a number of things straight. There have been some comments that the administration is anti-India. This is totally inaccurate."

Henry Kissinger at a top-level meeting in the low-level White House basement (as reported by Jack Anderson): "I am getting hell every half hour from the President that we are not being tough enough on India. He has just called me again. He does not believe we are carrying out his wishes. He wants to tilt in favor of Pakistan."

As Congressman F. Edward Hebert noted last week, "We now have an 'open season' on all classified information in government." The problem often is that one secret statement conflicts with another. In the case of the Henry Kissinger secrets, the statements exposed by syndicated columnist Jack Anderson usually seemed to reveal what Nixon's top presidential advisor was really cooking up in Washington.

Anderson had not merely cracked open some government secrets, as Daniel Ellsberg had done — he had cracked open the iron curtain decorating the basement of the White House. Said the pro-Nixon *New York Daily News*: "The case (of the Anderson papers) is considered of vastly greater importance than that of Daniel Ellsberg and the Pentagon Papers, because it is undeniable evidence that someone with a pipeline to the innermost White House consultations has other than the interests of President Nixon at heart."

Anderson's column on pg. 22

Anderson himself responds: "I don't see why the Nixon administration's welfare should be the primary concern of public servants. It seems to me the national welfare ought to come ahead of Nixon's welfare. The people that I've been dealing with are not particularly anti-Nixon; they're just pro-public. They feel that the public has the right to know what's going on. They don't work for Henry Kissinger; they work for the American people. Their salaries aren't paid by Kissinger; their salaries are paid by the taxpayers. And they feel that their first loyalty has got to be to the people."

This is not the first time that Jack Anderson has jolted a number-one Presidential advisor. He was once caught bugging a hotel room during the investigation of Eisenhower's

Kissinger, Sherman Adams. Anderson then was the late Drew Pearson's right legman, as he was when he received documents from employees of the late Senator Thomas Dodd, documents which eventually led to the senator's censure. He is continuing to receive documents from his sources within the Nixon administration about America's (read "Nixon/Kissinger's") role in the India-Pakistan conflict. He says:

"I am continuing to receive classified documents. I consider them a matter of public interest, and so I am going to continue to publish them. The government itself, according to the news accounts I read, say that national security has not been violated, that these disclosures are merely 'embarrassments.' That seems to me to be a tacit admission by the government that it has the right to cover up embarrassments. In a democracy, I don't think the government has that right."

In the case of our role in the India-Pakistan war, the Anderson Papers clearly reveal Kissinger attempting to contrive ways of siding with Pakistan while publicly proclaiming neutrality. During one secret meeting he suggested that one way we might get around an arms embargo to the two countries was to sell arms to Saudi Arabia or Jordan which could then transfer them to Pakistan.

"Now what Kissinger did," Anderson told me, "is to tell an outrageous lie. He misrepresented our policy. He told reporters one thing, while he was doing the opposite, while he was giving instructions to the State Department, the Defense Department, and the CIA to do the exact opposite of what he told reporters we were doing. Now the public has the right to know that. And the government does not have the right to lie to the people."

Apparently one man in the administration clearly saw America moving towards a debacle on the Indian subcontinent and publicly tried to influence the administration away from its course. The man was former New York Senator Kenneth Keating, now the U.S. ambassador to India. The administration's response to Keating's protestations: shut him up. He shut up.

But only publicly. Privately, he continued transmitting hot cables to Washington, taking issue with the statements made by U.S. officials about the India-Pakistan situation, warning that our "credibility" was at stake as much as anything else. Last week Congressman Paul McCloskey fingered Ambassador Keating as Anderson's source, then quickly retracted his statement, saying it was only a rumor that he had picked up. Was

Keating the source? Anderson told me:

"Well, I have published secret minutes of several White House meetings in probably the most secret, fabled room in all Washington. But at no time was Ambassador Keating in that room. At no time was Ambassador Keating on the distribution list of those super-secret, sensitive minutes."

Does all this mean that Keating was not his source?

"I am not going to start naming sources or even denying them and permitting people by the process of elimination to figure out who the sources were, but I am sure that the FBI knows, I am sure that the President knows, I am sure that Henry Kissinger knows that Keating is far away in New Delhi and that he does not have access to many of the documents that I published."

The *New York Daily News*, however, published a report from New Delhi indicating that Keating was "pleased" with Anderson's disclosures. "The cable that I published," says Anderson, "shows that Keating foresaw events much better than the White House. The cable also shows that Keating was outraged over blatant misrepresentations by Kissinger. I am sure that Keating ... feels that the public is entitled to this information. I am also sure that he didn't want to be the one who violated his secrecy oath."

Who is violating his secrecy oath? The government has confirmed that it has been trying to track down Anderson's sources. But it apparently is taking its time doing so, certainly a longer time than it took to track down Daniel Ellsberg. But, as Anderson points out, there's a difference:

"My sources — and they are plural — are some of their own boys. And if they want to finger them, they're going to wind up with bubble gum all over their faces."

There's also a "fundamental difference" (Anderson's words) in the kind of material being exposed: "Ellsberg's was historical; mine is current ... It shocks the government a little bit more to have its current mail aired than to have history exposed. But I think it's even more important to have the current blunders brought out, because only in this way can you get policies changed in time. If the Pentagon Papers had been published at the time those things were happening, I think our policies in Viet Nam might have been different. I think the public has the right to know what we're doing, so that the public can make the final decision, the final determination whether we ought to follow that course."

Last week an official of the Justice Department told a *New York Times* reporter that "measured, low-key analysis" might be a better way of describing its inquiry into the Anderson Papers than "investigation." He

official (nameless, of course) was further quoted as saying: "There's no banging of cymbals. Right now, we're assessing where we are."

Not without tongue in cheek does Anderson claim that he never believed the government would go after him in the same way it went after Daniel Ellsberg, *The New York Times*, and *The Washington Post*.

"I didn't think that the government in its wildest imagination ever thought that any secrecy laws that may exist took precedence over the Constitution. The Constitution clearly gives newsmen the right to uncover government errors, uncover government blunders, uncover government lies. We clearly have that right, and no law that the Nixon Administration or any other administration could possibly dredge up would ever stand up in court. Under the First Amendment we can expose the government."

What, then, about being charged, as Anthony Russo is charged, with receiving stolen government documents? The tongue in cheek remains: "I think these documents belong to the public, and I made them available to the public. The people who worked on these documents were paid by the taxpayers; the paper on which they were written was furnished by the taxpayers. How can anyone say that they were stolen? Stolen from whom? They didn't belong to Kissinger. They belong to the taxpayers. I made them available to the taxpayers. The government doesn't have the right to classify everything that goes on. I'm sure the people want the government to classify legitimate secrets, but the government is classifying everything that Kissinger does. When he blows his nose, it's a state secret. He makes no move out in the open. Everything is in the dark. The only time he ventures out of the dark is at his pleasure. Then he gives out selected quotations, and, as we have proved, misleading information to try to make the public think that something is going on that isn't going on. Now he has no right to do that. We have the right to expose him when he does do it."

Last Saturday Congressman John Ashbrook, the right-winger who is opposing President Nixon in the New Hampshire primary, called for an investigation of the Anderson Papers by the House Internal Security Committee. Ashbrook is the ranking Republican member on the committee, and he wants to have a public *tete-a-tete* with Anderson.

The committee *won't* be summoning the man the Anderson Papers are all about, Henry Kissinger. Under separation-of-powers rules, Congress cannot subpoena the President or any of his personal staff. It may summon the Secretary of State — but any Congressional session with William

Rogers always turns out to be an innocuous affair, even a bit embarrassing. Because the real secretary of state, the real administrator of foreign policy, is Henry Kissinger, and Kissinger has turned down every Congressional committee that has invited him to appear. Says Anderson:

"These minutes are the proceedings of secret strategy sessions conducted by Henry Kissinger. Henry Kissinger is the most secret man in government. And let's make it clear that Kissinger is running the State Department. He was giving instructions to the assistant secretary of state; he was giving instructions to the Defense Department; he was giving instructions to the CIA. He was clearly orchestrating our foreign policy. He was passing on all the recommendations to the President. These recommendations were funneled through him. In other words, Kissinger is responsible more than any other person except the President himself for our foreign policy, and yet Congress can't find out what Kissinger is doing. Kissinger refuses to testify.

"I've talked to people in the State Department at the highest level; they don't know what Kissinger is doing half the time. The newspapermen know only what Kissinger tells them. So I think that it's vital in a democracy that a man who has so much to say about our welfare, a man who could take us into peace or lead us into war — I think that it's vital that we know what he's doing, and I think that is the primary reason I felt it was important to throw the spotlight into those dark recesses of Kissinger's basement headquarters."

---