UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RICHARD M. NIXON, Individually and as the former President of the United States,

Plaintiff.

YS ..

Administrator of General Services, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 74-1852

Deposition of

RICHARD M. NIXON

VOLUME I

Deposition of Richard M. Nixon, plaintiff herein, called by Defendants in Intervention pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition, on Friday, July 25, 1975, at San Clemente, California, before Joseph F. Weitzen, a notary public.



WEITZEN & RUFFING
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
DEPOSITION NOTARIES
1010 SECOND AVENUE
SUITE 2101
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
(714) 236-9393

•						•
	1	I N D	EX	• •		
	2 WITNESS	EXAMIN	ED BY S	EE P. 78		PAGE
	Richard M. Nixon	Mr. Dol	provir			3
	•	Mr. Kri	ulwich			113
	;	Mr. Go	ldbloom			125
		Mr. Mon	rtenson		•	143
		Mr. Dol	provir		e a •	156
		Mr. Kri	llwich		* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	161
10 11 12 13 14 15 16		Mr. And	lerson			164
10						ч ' ,
11						
12	QUESTIONS	WITNESS INST	RUCTED NO	OT TO ANSWER		
13		PAGE	Ī	LINE		٠.
14		60		24	e e	
15		86		11		
16		94		4		
17		98	e eg	19		general to
18		99	The second water and the second	17		
18 19		100		14		
20		101		19		
21		102		22		
22		112		24		
23	• * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *					
24		-				ē
25					•	
26		2 , 2				
27						
						1

to the terminate the restriction of the state of the stat

\mathbf{E}	Χ	H	I	B	I	\mathbf{T}	S

# · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	1	EXHIBITS	
	2 DEFENDANTS' IN		
	INTERVENTION EXHIBITS	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIE
	4 A	A one-page document consisting	Common Marie Marie Common Marie Mari
	5	of a memorandum for H. R. Haldeman from Gordon Strachan	
		dated May 11, 1971, subject Timmons! Investigation of San	
	6	Diego as 1972 Convention Site.	82
	7 B	A document consisting of 124	
	8	pages listing names and contributions.	84
	9 C	A six-page document consisting	
1	0	of a memorandum dated April 23, 1969 from Richard G. Kleindienst.	
1	1	Deputy Attorney General, to John Erlichman, Counsel to the President,	
1	2	Re: ITT-Canteen Merger.	86
1	D	A ten-page document consisting of a memorandum for Bud Krogh	
1	1	from John Dean dated July 20, 1971 with attachments.	87
1	E	A four-page document consisting	
16		of a memorandum from George Bell dated June 24, 1971, for John	
1	7	Dean, Jerry Warren and Van	
18		Shumway, entitled, Subject: Opponents List.	90
19	F	A three-page document consisting	of the said of
20		of a transcript of September 15, 1972 meeting.	92
21	C	A three-page document titled,	
		"Donation of Personal Papers to the Richard Nixon Library,"	
22		dated November 1972.	157
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	Si .		1

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

-17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

RICHARD M. NIXON, Individually and as the former President of the United States,

Plaintiff,

VS.

Administrator of General Services, et al..

Defendants.

No. 74-1852
Deposition of
RICHARD M. NIXON
VOLUME I

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition, the deposition of Richard M. Nixon, plaintiff herein, was taken by Defendants in Intervention, before me, Joseph F. Weitzen, a notary public in and for the State of California, duly commissioned, qualified and acting, beginning at the hour of 9:00 a.m. on Friday, July 25, 1975, at the Coast Guard Station, in the City of San Clemente, County of Orange, State of California; Miller, Cassidy, Larroca and Lewin, by Herbert J. Miller, Jr., and R. Stan Mortenson, appearing on behalf of the plaintiff; William Dobrovir, Andrew S. Krulwich, Mark J. Spooner and Leonard B. Simon, appearing on behalf of Intervening Defendants; Irwin Goldbloom and David J. Anderson, of the U.S. Department of Justice, appearing on behalf of Defendant United States of America and Administrator of General Services; Kenneth S. Geller, Assistant Special Prosecutor, Watergate Special Prosecution Force,

appearing on behalf of Special Prosecutor, Intervenor; also in attendance, Andra Oakes; there being no other appearance; that said witness was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the testimony he was about to give; whereupon said witness was examined upon oral interrogatories propounded by counsel, and made answer thereto, under oath, as hereinafter contained; and the following proceedings were had:

.21

THE NOTARY: This is now the time and place for the taking of the deposition of Richard M. Nixon, plaintiff herein, called by Defendants in Intervention pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition.

5

7

6

9

10 11

12

13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

RICHARD M. NIXON,

plaintiff herein, called by Defendants in Intervention, pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition, and being first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Good morning, Mr. Nixon.

You were President of the United States of America from January 20, 1969, to August 9, 1974?

- A Yes.
- Q And what other public offices have you held?
- A Congressman for four years; Senator for two years; Vice President for eight years; Deputy City Attorney, Whittier, California, for three years.
 - Q And you are an attorney?
 - A No, I was. I resigned as an attorney of the Bar.
- Q You practiced as an attorney in the past; is that correct?
 - A I have practiced law in the past.
- Q As President of the United States, did you have familiarity with the various components of the Executive Office of the President?
 - A Yes.
- Q Do you include in the materials which you claim in this lawsuit all of the documents created by the Executive Office of the President during your tenure in office?
- A I think it is necessary for the record to distinguish between the Executive Office of the President and Office of the

President.

-17

With the Executive Office of the President, I am talking about a very broad spectrum of the office. For example, the Bureau of Management and Budget, the Council of Economic Advisors, and other institutions which are called or designated as being part of the Executive Office of the President, whereas the Office of the President itself is more limited than that.

The Office of the President is limited to those, and I refer now to the materials that we use in our Complaint. The materials for the Office of the President are only those that are generated throughout the government but which are sent to the President for his use in carrying out his official or other duties.

Q When you refer to the Office of the President, are you referring to what is called the White House Office in the Official Organization Manual of the United States Government? The White House Office is the term used in the Organization Manual.

MR. MORTENSON: Excuse me, Counsel. Do you have a copy of the Manual so we can check that?

MR. DOBROVIR: I am afraid I didn't bring it with me.

THE WITNESS: I am not familiar with that term. I am sorry. I know what I consider the Office of the President to be, but I am not familiar with what the White House Office would be. I can describe it only in terms of its physical location and rooms that were used.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Let me run through a list of components and see which of those you consider to be part of the Office of the President, for purpose of our claim for materials in this case.

The Office of Economic Opportunity?

Go ahead.

I am asking you, do you claim, as part of this case, the materials of the Office of Economic Opportunity?

No, only if materials were prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity. for the President.

And so as to make your task easier, all of the other, and there are great numbers of offices of this type, the other offices, commissions, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, which were set up, some of them were an independent role, some were quasi-independent role, but all of them at one time or another may have had the opportunity to assist the President in the carrying out of his duties.

What I consider to be the Office of the President involves only those materials that are prepared by, as far as government materials are concerned, that are prepared by whatever office it is, the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Council of Economic Advisors or the Environmental Products Agency. I think I have got your list. You don't need to show it to me.

Let me ask them one by one and if you could, just say "Yes" or "No," it would be helpful, as to whether or not you include within the materials claimed in this lawsuit the files of that component.

1

2

.....

10

11

12

25 26

27

THE WITNESS: The same answer. 3 BY MR. DOBROVIR: 4 The Office of Science and Technology? 5 Q Let me explain. Where we are talking in each A 6 instance, talking about Federal agencies, Federal offices, 7 the Office of Science and Technology, I think --8 I was talking before of the Office of Science and 9 Technology. That was a component of the Executive Office of 10 the President? 11 The same answer. 12 The Office of Management and Budget? 13 The same. 14 The Office of Emergency Preparedness? Q 15 The same answer. A 16 And the National Security Council? 17 The same answer. 18 The National Aeronautics and Space Council? Q 19 The same answer. Q The Domestic Council? A Yes. Q The same answer? A Yes. ' The Council on International Economic Policy? Q A The same answer. The Council on Environmental Quality? Q Yes.

2

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 The Council of Economic Advisors? Q 2 The same. A 3 Q Special Assistants to the President? 4 A Excuse me? 5 Q The Special Assistants to the President. 6 The budget shows that in fiscal year 1972 there were thirty-six individuals who had the title and filled 7 positions entitled Special Assistants to the President. My question is: Are the files accumulated by those thirty-six individuals included within the materials that you claim in 10 this lawsuit? Well, there would be a distinction there to the extent that such special assistants who had prepared materials in their own behalf, which they could do, and were not preparing materials for or at the direction of or for the use of the President, I would not consider those materials to be presidential materials. As a matter of fact, some of those that were assistants to the President and those that have since left government take materials with them, those materials they consider to be their own. Then on the other hand, materials prepared in their capacity for the use of the President in carrying out his official duties or other duties, I would consider to be presidential materials.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

-21

22

23

24

25

- 26

27

28

A memorandum received by, let's say, Mr. Erlichman, from, let's say, the Attorney General of the United States dealing with antitrust policy stating this is what -- this is a

hypothetical question -- stating this is what we are planning to do with respect to development of antitrust policy, is that the kind of document that you include within the materials that you claim in this lawsuit?

A Well, in the case of -- I cannot speak for all administrations, I can only speak for my own.

Q That is all I am asking now.

A In the case of a memorandum prepared by the Attorney General for Mr. Erlichman, in effect he would be, in effect, preparing a memorandum review for Mr. Erlichman and for transmittal for review by me. I would consider a memorandum of that sort to be one of presidential material.

Q Even though it was directed to Mr. Erlichman and nothing shown on its face and nothing on it that it was intended for your eyes?

A Yes. I say that because Mr. Erlichman, and this would be true of others, presidential assistants, not only in this administration but others, would have no power of decision to act on such a memorandum on an antitrust matter. That power of decision would be mine as President or whoever happens to hold that office at this time or in the future.

Q Now, in addition to the offices which I have named, which by no means do I intend to be or know whether it is a complete list or not, were there not during your administration a large number of ad hoc committees and commissions and task forces that reported to the President?

A Yes. Too many.

Q Does the number two hundred fifty sound right?

- A Yes. It could have been five hundred.
- Q It could have been five hundred.

Now, do you include within the materials that you claim in this lawsuit the files of those committees, commissions and task forces?

A Only to the extent that the materials were prepared for me for the purpose of making a report to me, not materials that were prepared independently in terms of developing options for the committee and so forth and so on.

Q If the sole function of the committee or task force was to prepare a report for you, would you consider that all of the files that they accumulated in the quest of that work are included in your presidential materials?

A If I had appointed a task force, talking now about one other than like the Council of Economic Advisors, et cetera, which, of course, we inherit from previous administrations and presidents and customs, but if I had appointed a task force to make a particular study for me, then I would consider those files to be part of the presidential materials.

For example, if I appointed a task force, as I did on Population Control, and this was considered, and I should point out a task force which was appointed not because congressional act required it but because I, within my own office, decided to be one should be appointed in order to carry out my official decides more effectively, then of course such materials prepared by that task force, prepared for me alone as President, I would consider to be presidential materials.

Q How about the files of the 1969 and 1973

ではなる

inaugural committees?

A The files of committees of that type I think throughout history have been considered, perhaps even more than any other files, as being particularly the materials which are the President's materials, because they have to do with his inauguration and they therefore are part of the materials that are made available to him.

Q Now, turning to what you described as the Office of the President. Approximately how many employees did that office have during your tenure as President?

- A I wouldn't know.
- Q Does the figure five hundred sound about right?
- A It might be.

Q Now, how many of the employees of the Office of the President had regular access to you for purposes of performance of their and your official duties?

A I can't give you a number. I would say any of those who needed to have access had it.

Q Now, as President, can you estimate how much of your time was spent in preparing yourself written documents?

A . I cannot estimate it in terms of a percentage of time. I can, perhaps, estimate it in terms of comparison with previous Presidents in this century.

When the presidency, as you know, became a much more burdensome office, in terms of various duties to be carried out, as you know there was a time in our history when presidential speeches might be better because Presidents like Lincoln wrote their own, Jefferson and so forth. In this

century, I would say I have spent more of my time preparing my own speeches and other public statements than any President since Woodrow Wilson. I would say he probably spent, in this century, more time than any other President for that purpose, with the possible exception of Theodore Roosevelt. But I would suggest here again that it depends on the individual. It depends on what other duties he has.

When the country was younger, when the country didn't have the responsibilities that it has in the world today, when the government was much smaller, the President had the luxury of preparing speeches and materials and did so. I had always had the custom, before I became President, of doing virtually all of my own work. I carried on as much as I could on any important speeches; I did most of the preparation myself with very good assistance from staff suggestions. But when it came to the final drafts I had to do them myself.

I realize that I am not answering your question specifically. But I cannot at this time say I spent five percent of my time or a third of my time preparing speeches. I do say, however, that I spent a very great proportion of my time, more than any President in modern history, doing my own work, because it had been my custom. And I don't say that critically of previous Presidents, because it is very likely those who wrote speeches for them may have written better speeches than they would have for themselves.

- Q There were great demands on your time; isn't that so?
 - A Pardon?

1

2

Q. There were great demands on your time?

That is true, great demands on a President's time in this period when the United States has reached the status of a full-fledged world power, particularly when other powers that used to be in that category, for example the European powers, no longer can carry their share of the load.

Were you required to spend as much as half of your time in meetings with other people or would it be more than half?

I can't give you an exact amount.

Would you say that a large portion of your time was spent in meetings?

Oh, yes. Yes.

More time than was spent in reviewing written documents or less?

> A Oh, more. More.

More?

Yes.

And more time than was spent in preparing your speeches and statements?

A Yes, although it depends on the period in which I was working. One month more would be spent in speeches and statements and another month more would be spent at meetings with people and so forth and so on.

All right. In addition to meetings and telephone conversations with other individuals and reviewing written documents that were transmitted to you and preparing written statements or statements for delivering by you, in addition

to those three things what other things did you spend your time on, and I am talking only, of course, about in performance of your official duties?

- I traveled some. A
- Anything else?
- You refer to other than meetings and preparing the speeches? I made the speeches.
 - You delivered the speeches?
- That is right. And I, of course, had the usual protocol responsibilities that falls upon a President, all of which are, of course, a matter of public record.
- Q Right. Are you familiar with the Complaint in the action, sir, Mr. Nixon?
 - Oh, yes.
- Now, are you aware that your claim encompasses what is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 42 million documents?
 - Yes.
- Can you estimate what portion of those 42 million documents you have actually seen yourself?
- No. I am a relatively fast reader. I don't mean that I have taken a reading course, but I generally can look at a document and tell what needs to be read. I have never been one of those who insisted it almost all be on one page, because I wanted the full range of options and to see the kind of reasoning that the advisor had gone through in the reasoning process in order to reach conclusions.

I would say, without telling you how many of the 42 million I have read, only a review of the file and indication

- 20

The state of the s

by checkmarks on them could tell you that. And here again it is the difference between Presidents. Some tend to prefer to spend more of their time in public meetings and private meetings, as what I call doing things, and I prefer to spend a higher degree of my time, to the extent possible, in thinking about problems. So consequently, in the many days that I spent at Camp David, in Florida, and on occasion even here in San Clemente, I read enormous amounts of material in addition to the day-to-day flow of materials that came across the desk. And that is one of the reasons that the number of documents is so enormous.

As you know, the number of documents in the Johnson Administration was approximately 32 million for the same period of time. This is 42 million. That doesn't mean that our administration was better than his, I am not contending that. It only means that it was my instructions to my own staff and others to give me the broadest range of options before I made an important decision and also because of their awareness of the fact and some of them were surprised when they came in the office and found that I had read what they had put in. Their awareness of the fact that I was one who had the habit of learning more from reading, because you can read about three times as fast as you can listen than just from what we call a bull session.

Q Would the number of documents that you, yourself saw be as many as one hundred thousand?

A Oh, at least, I would say.

Q At least. That would be approximately 50 per day

2

3

4

5

6

7

for the approximately two thousand days of your tenure in office?

- A Right.
- Does that sound about right?

Well, I couldn't hold to the figure, but I would say A that I would be surprised if it were less than that and I would be less surprised if it were far more than that.

- Q Two hundred thousand?
- A Yes.
- Does that sound right? Q

I can't answer that question. Obviously I haven't counted the number of documents.

- Two thousand would be one hundred a day. Q
- Could well be. Could be more.
- Three hundred thousand?
- Let's stop at two hundred thousand.
- All right. Now, we discussed a moment ago the fact that there were great demands on your time as there are on the time of any other President. Did you establish procedures designed to insure that you only were presented with the documents that were essential for you to read?
 - .Oh, yes.
 - What were those procedures?

Well, the procedures were to have advisors in various areas who would screen the flow of paper work coming into the President's Office or coming in for his, at least, consideration, and then to have those documents put into what I called my reading file. Some of them, of course, required

1

4

5 6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

15

17

18

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

reading almost immediately. If, for example, a veto message was involved, something of that sort, where there was a time limit. Some of them might require -- didn't have the same urgency -- decision far down the line, and I asked for that too.

So in the field of foreign affairs I would rely on Dr. Kissinger to screen the great amount of material that came in from the various agencies who had interest in foreign affairs and that included others in the State Department, as you well know, and also from various private groups and private citizens who had views which I valued. I might not always accept them.

Mr. Erlichman, he was head of the Domestic Council, and Mr. Moynihan would screen the documents in that field and in the political area generally Mr. Haldeman might screen the documents. And I also had ways in which individuals who felt they couldn't get through the so-called Palace Guard could get to me directly. And a number of friends, former advisors, when I was a Senator, Congressman or Vice President or out of office and so forth, would send their materials to my personal secretary, Miss Woods. And a great amount of material came through her to me.

So that Dr. Kissinger was responsible for screening documents, Mr. Moynihan and Mr. Erlichman were responsible for screening what we can call generally domestic materials, Mr. Haldeman was responsible for screening political materials and then Miss Woods was a channel for communications from personal friends and other associates?

3

5

4

6 7

10

11

13

14 15

22 23

24

25 25

27

28

But the communications would deal not only with personal matters, sometimes they would, quite often they would, and most often they would be intermixed with personal and public matters. These would be communications from individuals, as I said, who felt that they might not be heard.

Now, in addition to that I should say, however, that the documents that reached me were not limited to those individuals and the so-called screening process was not all that precise. For example, Mr. Ziegler, the Press Secretary, would bring in documents that, and he had the right to at any time, that had to do with relations with the press. Mr. Harlow and later Mr. Timmons often brought me documents directly that had to do with relations with Congress. Needless to say, if an independent agency were involved, like Dr. Arthur Burns, he always came in directly and he sent his things directly, not through anybody else, because of his justifiable concern about the independence of the Federal Reserve.

Various cabinet officers, including Secretary of the State Rogers, the Secretary of the Treasury, as well as heads of independent agencies often sent documents in directly to me. Sometimes they would send them through Miss Woods and sometimes they would come directly into the office and hand them to me. And the reason for this is that there is always a feeling in any administration that you can't break through this, what is called, Palace Guard. I felt very strongly that I wanted to be sure that I had all options in front of me.

Of the documents which you saw, would you say that Q. a large number of them or a small number of them were designated

4

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

-22

23

24 25

26

27

28

of either specifically or de facto as "eyes only" documents?

MR. MILLER: Counsel, could you explain to me what you mean by "large or small," in the context of your question. I don't understand it.

MR. DOBROVIR: Let me try and ask it a different way, Mr. Miller.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Were not most of the documents which you saw seen either before you saw them or after you saw them by other members of your staff?

Well, I thought I answered that question as far as to whether most of the documents were seen before by other members of the staff. I would say perhaps that was the case, but I would have to look at the various documents to be sure, because a great number of documents came directly to me and not through a member of the staff. Because when a document, for example, came through my personal secretary or when it was delivered to me personally, needless to say that document was not being reviewed by the personal secretary, that was not her .dot.

Now, Mr. Nixon, in your Affidavit you use a number of terms and I would like to ask you to define them for us so we have a bench mark for the rest of this examination.

In Paragraphs 9, 10 and 12 you use the term "political." Now, could you define the term "political" as used by you in your Affidavit.

It is difficult to separate political from official

and even from private. But the term "political" as we use it or I 2 as I use it in this Affidavit, I would say would have to do with the President's responsibility as leader, first of his own 4 political party and supporting the candidates of that party to the extent that he was able to do so. Also the President's responsibility, and here is where you get some mixture, in carrying out his official duties to discuss what would be termed rather crass political matters. For example, I was the first President, as you know, I think since perhaps one hundred years who came into office with both houses controlled by the other party. It was impossible to carry on my official duties without having a very cordial and at times cooperative arrangement with enough leaders and if not leaders people who had followers within the other party in order to get legislation through or a veto sustained.

I would say that my activities therefore in carrying out my official duties of getting approval for legislation or support on a veto, matters of that sort, that it would be necessary for me to talk what I would call politics with Deomcrats as well as Republicans. What I am indicating here, in effect, is when I use the term "political," I do not limit it to that being partisan Republican leader. If I had been only that none of the great initiatives which we accomplished during our administration could have come about.

In other words, are you saying that it is one of the normal activities of the President in performance of his official duties to take account of political considerations and made political judgments and in effect conduct politics?

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

25 27

A It certainly is or he isn't going to be an effective President.

That was the tragedy of Wilson in his last years. The first term was a good one. His second, apart from his illness, was unfortunate because it became too partisan, he did not recognize the necessity to work with both parties.

Q Would you define the word "personal," which you use in Paragraphs 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18.

A Well, here the word "personal" can to an extent overlap, needless to say, with political, because an individual who is interested in running for office may speak to a President with regard to his personal problems, with regard to the personal problems of his opponent and vulnerabilities thereof, and would present the matter, for example, to the President in somewhat personal terms.

I recall, for example, when certain members of Congress were trying to determine whether to retire or not. That, of course, is a political decision. They would be very candid and forthcoming in talking about their reasons for, with regard to their health, regard to family problems they had and with regard to financial problems they had and so forth. The latter part I would consider personal, the other I would consider political.

But as far as personal is concerned, generally speaking I am referring here to, needless to say, my family, to close personal friends, which include people within the administration, members of both parties, people in the Congress, representatives from all segments of American society, because

28

1

2

3

4

a President over the years before he becomes President, particularly while he is President, develops close personal associations and friendships with leaders of business and labor or religious leaders, educational leaders and many others of that type.

- Anything else under the category of "personal"?
- I think I have given you a general idea of it but if there is anything specific I will be glad to respond.
 - I am just asking how you would define it, sir.

Another term which you use is the term "private," in Paragraphs 11, 12, 18, and 26, and in particular in Paragraph 26 you refer to materials which you "consider to be so private and confidential that no one else should participate in the initial review."

Would you define the word "private" as you use it there.

Well, private is encompassed in personal. term "personal" is the broader term. Private would be, oh, conversations and communications that I would consider to be, that any President would consider to be totally confidential. Matters involving, for example, his own family, his wife and his children, his relatives, his very close friends and intimate friends. Needless to say, a private communication would be one involving those within individuals, an attorney when he makes up his will. A private communication would, needless to say, also involve any conversations he might have with his doctor, with his minister, areas of that type. But I would also categorize those as being personal as well as private.

I mean I am suggesting that private is somewhat a narrower, it is a part of personal but narrower in terms of the individuals that would be considered in the private category.

If I could point out, so that you can understand. I might have a conversation with possibly a political leader, a member of Congress, so forth, in which personal matters were discussed. Whether that would also be considered private would depend upon the nature of those matters.

Q So we have some documents and conversations which you have categorized as private, as you have defined it, and some that you have categorized as personal, as you have defined it, and some that you have categorized as political, as you have defined it.

Now, in addition to those three categories everything else in the presidential materials which is not either political, as you have defined it, personal, as you have defined it, or private, as you have defined it, material that relates to the performance of your official duties?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Dobrovir, I would object to that question. I think you would have to go to the specific area that you are talking about and not try to block out some document that might exist in the 42 million documents that might fall in a different category. The question is so hypothetical I have great difficulty in understanding how it could possibly be answered.

MR. DOBROVIR: Let me ask the witness.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

In addition to the three categories, political, personal and private, a fourth category I would call specifically governmental, unquestionably dealing with governmental matters, are there any other categories into which these documents might fall?

- I can think of none.
- Thank you. Q

Now, into which of those categories would fall your conversation on June 23 with H. R. Haldeman, with respect to Mr. Gray and Mr. Walters, the FBI and the CIA and their relationship to the burglary of the Democratic National Headquarters of Watergate?

MR. MILLER: Can we have the conversation, please.

MR. DOBROVIR: Do you want to be off the record?

MR. MILLER: I don't have a copy of it before me.

MR. DOBROVIR: Oh. All right.

The conversation I am referring to, I have here Appendix III to the statement of Information Hearings Before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 93rd Congress, Second Session, pursuant to House Resolution 803. I am not reading the rest of the title. A transcript of a tape recording on Page 39 of that volume, and I have reference to the conversation that begins towards the bottom of Page 40 with the words "Now, on the investigation, you know, the Democratic break-in thing," and it goes on to Page 45 at the bottom with the word "Okay."

I am handing the volume to Mr. Miller.

7

6

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

15

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

5

24

25

26

27

28

MR. MILLER: What is the question, Mr. Dobrovir?

MR. DOBROVIR: Which of the four categories, political, personal, private or governmental, does that conversation fall in?

MR. MORTENSON: Let me interrupt, Counsel. You are using the term "governmental" and I don't think that is a term used in the plaintiff's Affidavit. I think if you are looking for the terms that he used in the Affidavit, in his definition, that the fourth category as you separate them is terms related to his official duties --

THE WITNESS: Presidential duties.

MR. MORTENSON: -- and not governmental duties.

MR. DOBROVIR: I will accept that amendment.

THE WITNESS: We will have the whole record show that, because I know Counsel wants the record to be accurate, --

MR. DOBROVIR: Yes, indeed. I know the witness does.

THE WITNESS: Because we don't have a tape, obviously and can only rely on what we have here.

I would categorize this as political and to an extent personal.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

And no way related to the performance of your official duties?

- This conversation?
- Yes.

(At this time the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer.)

2

3

4

THE WITNESS: Like all conversations, this one is intermixed, I see. I see here, for example, Senator Church is referred to and also Congressman Mills. MR. DOBROVIR: What page is that on, where those two gentlemen are referred to?

THE WITNESS: Page 9.

MR. MILLER: Page 47.

MR. DOBROVIR: The conversation I specified begins on Page 40 and ends on Page 45 and ends with "Okay," on Page 45.

MR. MILLER: I don't see that in our document, Mr. Dobrovir. Would you care to examine it and point it out.

MR. DOBROVIR: Did I err?

MR. MILLER: It indicates "Okay," but then there is a question. Apparently that document contains a conversation that continues on past Page 45.

MR. DOBROVIR: The document contains some twenty more pages.

MR. MILLER: Are you taking two or three pages out of a conversation and ignoring the entire conversation? Is that it?

MR. DOBROVIR: I asked about that specific portion of the conversation. If the witness wishes to discuss other portions I have no objection.

MR. MILLER: All right.

MR. DOBROVIR: But is the witness! answer that the portion between 40 and 45, which I designated, was that personal and political?

MR. MORTENSON: If Counsel's question was limited to

24

25

26

27

ter.

those pages, I believe that the witness answered that as being political and personal. I think for clarity of the response, to say that the entire conversation looked at contains elements of all three.

MR. DOBROVIR: I understand.

THE WITNESS: The entire conversation was one about an hour. This is about five minutes. I think that is the problem we have.

MR. DOBROVIR: All right.

THE WITNESS: And I think the reason that Mr. Miller raised this point was the "okay" was not something you had marked "okay," but something that was in the file. There is no marking here.

MR. DOBROVIR: I didn't mark the page, I just asked you to --

THE WITNESS: No problem.

MR. DOBROVIR: Thank you very much...

THE WITNESS: I am not trying to expedite the matter.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q So that we have a complete set of bench marks here, you have defined for us political, personal and private and we have a fourth category I will call governmental, and which Mr. Mortenson corrected me to read as official. I wonder --

MR. MORTENSON: Let me correct the record again. I believe what I said in the Affidavit, the plaintiff has used four terms for categorizing the materials and one of which is materials related to official actions. I don't believe ...

THE RESERVE THE PARTY OF THE PA

anywhere in the Affidavit there is a reference to official materials.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q So the term is materials related to official action; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I would insert in there, if I might, presidential materials related to official actions. Is that correct?

MR. MORTENSON: Yes.

THE WITNESS: That is the accurate description, I think.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Can we have a definition, Mr. Nixon, of that term "Presidential materials related to official action."

A As a matter of fact, that is what we have been discussing as to the questions that you have asked up to this point.

- Q I wonder if you could give us a definition in the same way that you have defined the other terms.
 - A Presidential materials related to official action?
 - Q Yes.

A Well, this would cover all of the official actions of the President; those imposed upon him by the Constitution and particularly, for example, the preparation of the State of the Union message; reporting from time to time to the Congress; the recommendations to the Congress for legislation; obviously the veto of such legislation; appointments made by the President

10

11

12

13 14

15

17

16

18

19

20

23

25

26

27

28

which cover, of course, his Cabinet. But I would say in constitutional terms, as I recall the Cabinet is not referred to but by precedent it has become, through one of our Presidents Madison, one of the official responsibilities and perhaps even more important where lawyers are concerned, appointments to the judiciary and in addition to all the appointments the President makes as Commander in Chief of the Armed Services.

And does it include those materials that relate to your general supervision of the administration of the Executive Branch of government?

What do you mean by "general supervision"?

Well, you are the Chief Executive. As President you were the Chief Executive of the United States; isn't that right?

Yes.

And in addition to appointing the Cabinet officers, you also were responsible, under the Constitution, to take carethat the laws were faithfully executed, you were responsible for overseeing what all of these persons that you appointed did and how they carried out their duties; isn't that so?

Well, it would be dependent upon what duties are involved.

As Counsel is quite aware, the Congress has moved into these areas in some instances and it has that certain duties shall be carried out by people in the Executive Branch independent of the President.

Aside from those specific matters in which Congress has done that, you do have supervisory responsibility for

· 中华记书 2000年 Yes, that is true. That is true. Q. Very well. Now then, included in the category of the presidential materials related to official actions, do we 4 have documents that are prepared in or by an agency or a 5 commission or a department with respect to its own functions, of which a copy is transmitted to the White House for the White 7 House Staff and your information? Well, the situation here is that whether it would be a department or an independent agency or an ad hoc commission 10 or special commission or what have you, except for those 11 commissions that we delineated a moment ago, that are appointed 12 directly for the President, for the purpose of reporting directly 13 to him, that the records of those agencies are in those agencies 14 and belong to those agencies. That is, when those agencies 15 have recommendations to make to the President they, of course, 16 come to him. But they, of course, retain in the agencies and 17 they continue through other administrations as well. 18 So those documents which come from agencies to the 19 Office of the President or go from the Office of the President 20 to those agencies are not considered part of your presidential 21 materials? 23 MR. MILLER: Would you repeat it. 24 THE WITNESS: I think I have answered that three, four times but I will do it again for the fifth time. 25 MR. DOBROVIR: No, once is enough. 26 27 THE WITNESS: At least four times is enough. 28 Now, I don't mean to haggle about it, because it is

Cabinet officers and other appointees; isn't that so?

一方の あるがっている いちないないかい かんしゅう

a rather novel matter that hasn't been discussed before.

The way it happens, a specific department, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Agricultural Department, has a whole mass of paper work that is prepared in the Department. Very seldom does anything come to the President that has to do with the work of that Department unless it requires Presidential action or decision.

For example, a recommendation on the Food Stamp Program legislation, extension thereof increasing it, or when we initiated it, what kind of program should it be. That is a matter that would come to the President.

But as far as the Department papers are concerned, materials are concerned, those are in the Department. It is only when a department or an agency, an independent agency or other agency has a direct responsibility or relationship with the President in the carrying on of his official duties, that whatever is prepared then becomes not only, I would say acquires basically a dual personality, if we are going to distinguish in this instance, because needless to say each department also keeps its copy and the original comes to the President.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q So is the copy in the department considered an ordinary agency document then?

A It is not quite ordinary. No, the reason if it were ordinary it would not come to the President. If it comes to the President, it takes on a different aspect.

Q But the copy that remains in the agency is an agency

4 5

interest in preparation by you of your memoirs, for which I have Paragraphs 22 and 23; and the last one I have is the creation of a presidential library and the preservation of these materials for the use of scholars, for which I have Paragraphs 23, 24, 26 and 30.

Now, is there any other interest that is not listed in your Affidavit, which you are seeking to protect with regard to the materials.

MR. MILLER: Do I understand the question to mean is there any other interest other than what you have characterized the Affidavit as covering or the Affidavit itself, besides from your characterizations?

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Why don't we say any interest, other than those which I have specified, which is based on any interpretation of your Affidavit.

A No. I would say that I would stand on the Affidavit It would be, of course, bad to answer questions with regard to your interpretation.

Well, I don't want to be repetitious. But are you seeking to protect any interest in regard to the materials, in addition to the following five interests: First, the interest in nondisclosure of personal and private matters; second, the interest in nondisclosure of political matters; third, the interest in the confidentiality in matters relating to official action; fourth, interest in preparation of your memoirs; and fifth, the interest in the relation of a presidential library

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

and preservation of materials for scholars?

- Yes. Far more than that.
- Would you please give them to us.

I would suggest counsel refresh his memory by reading the pleadings. The pleadings are set forth on other grounds, of course, and the Affidavit addresses itself only to certain specifics. But I would not want the record to show that the case, from the factual standpoint, is based solely on the affidavit.

- Can you tell me what other interests you are seeking to protect in addition to those five which I have listed?
- Do you have the Complaint, Counsel? While they are searching for it, because you probably read it, --
 - I am familiar with it.
- I would suggest having read the Complaint, that from Page 16 through Page 18 we list the reasons for the invalidity of the act and that, of course, the Complaint itself goes beyond that. But this is a summary of the reasons for the invalidity of the Complaint and broader than the Affidavit. That is the only point I am making.
- I would like you to tell me what those additional interests are, please.

(At this time plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer.) THE WITNESS: Well, this is perhaps covered better in the pleadings than I will cover it orally.

To me this suit involves, as the last paragraph of the Affidavit indicates quite clearly, not simply my interest

alone, the ownership question as far as presidential materials are concerned. My primary interest is the institution of the presidency itself and of the ability not only of a President but of any official elected or appointed at the Federal or Stat level to carry out his official duties.

In my view, from my experience, the carrying out of official duties involves, and this is more true of the Presiden than anybody else but it affects members of the Judiciary, it affects Cabinet Officers, it affects members of Congress, Governors and State Legislators and even people down the line at the City and County level.

As far as public office is concerned, and particular. where the Presidency is concerned, the most important consideration is that he make the best decisions possible. different Presidents have approached this problem of how to make the best decisions in different ways. I was influenced to an extent, I must say, not only my rather extended experiences with President Eisenhower, when for eight years I saw how he made decisions, but by a conversation that I had just before I became President, just before my inauguration, with Dr. Arthur Burns, who had served in the Eisenhower Administration and in a very consultative capacity for the administrations thereafter and who, before I appointed him as Chairman of the Fed, was my chief advisor in the domestic area. And Dr. Burns said that the problem with most Presidents and, of course, most officeholders, particularly Presidents, is that everyone who comes to see him, be he a staff member, Cabinet member, Congressman, Senator, business or labor representative or

1

2

13 14 15

16 17

18

19

23

24 25

26 27

1

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

25 26

27

23

what have you, tries first to find out what the President wants or thinks and then does his best to present a case on all fours with what the President is thinking or wanting.

He said the most important prerequisite for good decision making is for a President to have before him all possible options, a wide range of options. And he said in order to get that kind of advice, first he said you must tell your Cabinet that, which I did at our first meeting. Second, you must tell your staff that, which I did very early in our administration, telling them in effect that I was interested in their views, that I could not always assure them their views would be accepted but that I wanted them to present their views with all the bark off so that I could, in making up my own mind, have the full range of options in front of me.

I also did this in my relationships with people outside of government, they were quite aware of this, which had frankly been my practice long before I became President and one which I implemented in many instances quite successfully when I was President. People outside of government were willing to write in what they might consider to be unpopular views, even views which in the light of history might prove to be stupid but they would do so usually only if they felt they were not going to be held accountable therefore in the public forum. They did so and I got advice of that type, because individuals knew I could keep a confidence and, of course, I felt that they could as well.

In my view this principle of confidentiality, which I realize is not in vogue these days in many quarters, is

19.670 2 113

indispensable for making of great decisions. There would have been no opening to China without total absolute secrecy and confidentiality. Not because anything wrong was involved but because any leak would have destroyed the fragile framework that we had built up over a period of years starting from the time I ventured that opinion, before I became President, in an article to Foreign Affairs.

There was a situation there would have been also in the domestic field very great difficulty in implementing the program that we had for desegregation of schools in the south unless it had been done with some degree of confidentiality and the assurance so that a President could have candid, very frank discussions with people on both sides with regard to the problem and by gaining their confidence then be able to make decisions which would enable him to move forward on an issue.

There also comes to mind the new economic policy, which was announced on August 15th, 1971. It was developed in the first instance in a long conversation that I had with Senator Connally in the Oval Office. It was discussed in great length in memoranda from people within the Administration who had diametrically opposed views and who wrote those memoranda to me, all of which I read, and who then when they were together, when we met at Camp David, expressed those views. I made the decision. The views resulted in the floating of the Dollar/Wage/Price Controls, the Freeze.

And the other matters, particularly the imposition of 10% Import Duty, as you recall, on foreign cars and so forth.

I give those two examples and there are others,

only to show that while the word secrecy is one to us in a free society is abhorrent, that in terms of decision making it is indispensable.

For example, the long and tortuous process which resulted in ending the Draft and ending the American involvement in Vietnam and ending the press of war required secret negotiations over many, many months. At any time had there been disclosure thereof or if at any time the individuals with whom we were in contact had thought that their preliminary reviews would be made public, the American involvement I think would not have ended as soon as it did.

I am not suggesting that as far as a President or any other officeholder is concerned that to the greatest extent possible not only his decisions but how he reaches those decisions should be made public, but I am suggesting that, and I know that if individuals who advise a President do not assume that their advice is going to be given in confidence they are going to be giving advice that has a unique quality. Some did anyway. But the best advisors I had, I must say, were those who expressed views far, far apart. And without belaboring the subject too much, the great debate over Welfare Reform which, as you know, I finally approved the Family Assistance Program. And in this instance, since it has become -- oh, since it has now been written in a book by Mr. Moynihan, but long after the issue is no longer lively and therefore it is proper for him to write it, but in this instance my top economic advisors for Domestic Affairs were poles apart, but I had to see and hear their views in order to make what I believed to be the right

3

1

2

5

7

9

10

11

paterior and an extended

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

Section of the

23

24

25

26

27

1

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

decision, even though it was not implemented by the Congress, if they had not felt they were expressing them in confidence.

And I speak here not only for my own office, my own tenure in office as an individual but for the Office of the Presidency in the future and for that matter for all of those who hold office, because once this precedent is established of appropriating not only the President's private thoughts and papers and diaries, et cetera, but also all of the information that comes in to him with the assumption that it is to be secret, once it happens here then inevitably, in my opinion, it will move on and affect future presidencies. It could move over possibly even to the Judiciary, very unlikely to the Congress because the Congress, as you know, is quite jealous of its prerogative, in a sense.

You are speaking of contemporaneous confidentiality, are you not? That it would have been destructive had there been a leak of your preparation to establish, to reestablish relations with China before the fact?

Oh, no. No. It affects the individual involved who gives the advice for years to come. Individuals like Dr. Kissinger, who was very active in those negotiations, will probably be, and I would hope he would be, in public service for many years to come. And the conversations that he had here, and I realize that under the statute there are certain safeguards that are provided for national security, but here again what we are talking about is how those safeguards are to be implemented. But you will find that as far as individuals are concerned, that they are thinking of their future.

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

.20 21

22

23 24

25

27

, e 26

A Congressman or Senator doesn't give advice without thinking of what is going to happen to him in the next election or if he is planning to move up from House to Senate or from House to Governor or whatever the case might be or down, he doesn't want anything in the public's, spread in the public record that might later prove to him to be embarrassing, not in a personal sense but would inhibit his freedom of expression.

As a matter of fact, --

- You indicated --
- Go ahead, interrupt.
- I am sorry, I thought you had completed your answer. Q
- I don't mind being interrupted, I am used to it.
- You indicated that you had no objection to Mr. Q Moynihan's revelations with respect to the Family Assistance Planning, because it was long after the fact; is that correct?
 - Yes, that is true.
- Did you have any objections to Mr. Kissinger's revelation of conversations with you by his biographers-Messrs. Kalb, as they appeared in their biography of him?

I frankly haven't had an opportunity to read No. those.

I see. Did you forbid Mr. Safire to report conversations with you that he had attended in his book before the fall or was there no objection to those disclosures?

It is inevitable that individuals who are in the administration, who leave it, are going to write their memoirs with regard to their role in the administration and they will see it from their vantage point.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Mr. Shirer did in his Thousand Days and Mr. Sorensel did and others will do so. So as far as I am concerned, but the is far different from what the statute provides. Each of them, like a fly on a wall, sees only or hears only part of the story. The full story is something else again and the full story is something that can only be obtained from the whole range of presidential materials. That is the subject of this suit.

For example, I note the Reporter's Committee have placed apparently considerable stock in affidvaits by Mr. Novak and Mr. Lisigore and that after all they are ready to release anything, why should they worry? I am shorthanded what I understand the advantages are.

. Let me say, I have great respect for both of those individuals as being good investigative reporters. They think they know but in some instances they know what they know is inaccurate and in other instances -- and in all instances it is only a very -- it is only a part of the story. A good newsman has the responsibility to develop, as he can, his so-called sources just as a good -- as any individual attempts to develop a line of communication with individuals that can be helpful to But as far as those that we call "leakers" are concerned, anybody who is sophisticated in the political area and who has been in it as long as I have is usually able to make a pretty good guess as to, when he reads an article which does contain a leak, who the leaker is and his remedy, while it is not a legal remedy, is a very effective one. The individual who is a leaker doesn't find out things in the future.

28

1.

Did anyone who participated in conversations about

what you describe in Paragraph 20, and let me get the page because that is a long paragraph, Page 15, which you describe as "dramatic changes in foreign policy" and conversations with respect to crucial domestic issues, if any individual states and disclosure that would inhibit that person from giving what you say or what you describe in your Affidavit as "free-wheeling, candid, and often blunt or critical advice."

A It was implicit in the conversations that I had with them. After all, as I pointed out, I indicated for every individual who came into possession of responsibility with me and to several members of the house and several democrats and republicans, whom I often talked in confidence, that they could tell me anything and it wasn't going to get out as far as I was concerned. Sometimes it got out as far as they were concerned.

Now, I would say also, in answer to your question, that it had an enormously inhibiting effect on what a foreign leader might say to a President of the United States. I had the custom of what is called a "one-on-one." It was not always followed. Sometimes we would have what we call plenary sessions.

Q Sir, let me interrupt.

23 24

. 25

A Let me finish the answer, then you can interrupt. I found that because I had developed a reputation, going back over twenty-five years, of never disclosing a confidence, or at least not knowingly doing so unless I had the implied or expressed permission of that leader, that that leader would talk very frankly with me. It was on that basis that we were able to develop not always a friendly relationship but at least a relationship of negotiation rather than confrontation with

the People's Republic of China, with the Soviet Union, leaders of the Mid-East, with the leaders of Europe as well as other nations throughout the world, and that is invaluable to a 3 4 I know, for example, that what we call the Pentagon Papers came out, that we received a number of cables from 5 countries abroad concerned that their private conversations and 6 so forth, even though that dealt only with the war in Vietnam, 1 16 17 18 7 it might become public. The same is true when the so-called -what has been called the taping system, not so-called it was a taping system. This had a chilling effect, certainly in terms 10 of what they might say in the future. And, of course, having in 11 mind that this legislation, potentially due to the fact that it 12 set up a commission to deal with future presidencies, that this 13 legislation would tend to open the door for further disclosure 14 and in future presidencies and probably even in past presidencies 15 of what had been assumed to be confidential information, I think will inevitably have a chilling effect not only on those who advised the President, but also on those who, I might suggest, and I am speaking of those who had advised the President in his 19 official family but in the broader context of the political 20 主 21 arena, House and Senate and Governors, et cetera, in the private 23 sector, and I cannot emphasize in terms of the President's foreign policy responsibilities, even in the foreign policy area, recognizing that the legislation purports to cover the National 25 Security area in a way that would not inhibit in that concern but also recognizing that as far as any individual is concerned, while they might trust a President or former President's discretion with regard to revealing a confidential discussion, they 28

- 26

7

15

16

17

18

19

£ 22

24

- 25

-26

27

1

2

would not have the same confidence in a bureaucrat's decision on a matter of that sort. An example is, and this letter just arrived yesterday from an individual I haven't heard from perhaps for one or two years, but I have known him as I entered public life twenty-seven years ago, Mr. Morris Ernst, and you can tell he is an old friend because he refers to me as Dick. He says "Dick, I see in the New York Times that there is an attempt to get from you your personal mail. You may recall that for some years I had put on the top of my letters, 'Burn before reading. I am quite sure that I would have written differently if I would have thought that my random letters would have become public. Best regards. Please return all my letters."

Now, that is we take a Morris Ernst, we take, for example, one in the economic community who is not a favorite with Pierre Renfret. What individuals like that would do in the future, with regard to giving their very learned advice to_ the President, I don't know, in the event that this legislation is upheld and then is made to apply to future Presidents. I do know this, that to me, in the conduct of a Presidency, it has been invaluable to have views on the domestic scene, in the foreign scene, from the broadest possible spectrum. one of the reasons why when people have come into my office I have the reputation of being the devil's advocate and I will present a view as being my own, remembering what Dr. Arthur Burns told me, to see whether the individual concerned is there just to pander to the President's views or to express his own. Good lawyers do the same thing.

6

7 8

9

11

10

TO SECURITION AND A MENT OF THE PROPERTY OF TH

12 13

14

1 1: 16

-24 1 3

20 7

I am convinced, as far as future decision makers are concerned, that the quality of the decisions will reach the lowest common denominator in the event that the confidential ity of the dicussions that takes place is impaired and inhibited or for that matter destroyed.

I take it the answer to my question, which was: Did anyone ever specifically state that the disclosure of the conversation would inhibit them from giving candid and blunt or critical advice? And the answer was "No, it was implicit"?

I read this letter from Mr. Ernst from the outside. I would say, and I know Counsel would not want to try to put words in my mouth, but I used the word "implicit" but then went on to say that because I had so informed my staff and because I had a reputation over the years of being, frankly being very closemouthed about advice that I had received much, incidentally, to the disgruntlement of the members of the press. because they felt that all of the foreign and domestic policies and advice that inevitably goes on, conflicts and competition in the official family, should be presented in the public record. Some should, sometimes it is healthy, and some should not. And in the cases where it should not be spread in the public record is where an individual who gives advice, thinking it is going to be confidential and then feels that he would be inhibited from giving such advice in the future if he stays in an advisory position, if we want to talk about his First Amendment Rights, I would think that he would feel very concerned that he would be embarrassed politically, not embarrassed personally, by the fact that he had written or expressed views

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

> 26 27

. 28

that historically is later seemed so outlandish at the time.

Mr. Nixon, the deposition will be shortened considerably if you can just answer my questions as asked. Obviously you are entitled to explain your answer, but I hope that we can move on a little more rapidly now.

MR. MILLER: My silence is not an indication that I accept your characterization of it. It seems to me the answer was precisely what you called for.

THE WITNESS: As I recall, Counsel asked me if I had any other selective areas outside of the deposition. He said is your case based only on this and I proceeded to take one area which went far beyond that. Now Counsel can go on with specific questions and get specific answers.

MR. DOBROVIR: I will endeavor to do that.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

A

In your affidavit, on Page 13, you refer to a conversation with "the ranking minority member of a House Committee." And you state "I do not believe the ranking minority member would have felt free to discuss this delicate situation if he had believed that his communication would later be made public."

> Did the ranking minority member say that to you? Say that to me?

Did he say that he would not have felt free to discuss this delicate situation if he would have believed that his communication would later be made public?

> Let me read from the Affidavit. A

1

2

It was important that I be aware of this in order to be in a position to determine what the cause of action would take in a particular legislation. I do not believe the ranking member would have told me or discussed this delicate situation if he had believed that his communication would later be made public.

7 8

My question was: Did he say that he would not have felt free to discuss the situation if he had believed that his communication would later be made public?

10

11

9

I have no recollection of his having said that, but I am confident that he would not have said it because we had that kind of relationship.

12 13

> Q Thank you.

14

15

And also it would have destroyed him politically if it had been public, self-interest would be involved.

16

Was that conversation taped?

17

- A -- -It was.

18 19

Did he know it was being taped? Q

20

A No.

21

22

Was the principle of confidentiality to which you referred, breached by John Dean in his testimony before the Senate Watergate Investigating Committee?

I think, as I recall, that I waived the attorneyclient privilege in his case. He was counsel to the White House, as you may recall. They asked for a waiver and I gave it, I granted it. Obviously the attorney-client privilege does not hold once the waiver of confidentiality is not an issue.

24

25

27

2

Q Did you not state, on April 29, 1974, and I am quoting from your speech to the nation on television that "I am making a major exception to the principle of confidentiality, because I believe such action is now necessary in order to restore the principle itself, by clearing the air of the central question that has brought such pressures upon it and also to provide the evidence which will allow this matter to be brought to a prompt conclusion"?

A Yes, I made that speech.

Q Do you still hold to that view, with respect to the events commonly denominated as Watergate?

A Yes.

Q Then do you agree with the Congress of the United States that there is a need to provide the public with the full truth at the earliest reasonable date of the abuses of governmental power, popularly defined under the generic term "Watergate"?

A Do I -- may I have the first part again.

Q Do you agree with the Congress of the United States, that there is a need to provide the public with the full truth at the earliest reasonable date of the abuses of governmental power, popularly identified under the generic term "Watergate"?

A Would you like to be more precise as to what is
popularly known as "Watergate," apart from the so-called legal
matters that are in the courts? Do you want to comment on those?

Q I am referring to Section 104-Al of the Act which you were challenging in the lawsuit as unconstitutional, an act which was signed by President Ford.

5

4

7

8

6

9 10

11 12

13

16 17

19

20 21

23

74... 77. 25

26

27

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, it is a matter of position taken by Counsel for plaintiff that the term is not reasonably definable and you ask this plaintiff whether he agrees with what Congress states. It is not reasonably definable and puts him in an impossible position to answer.

MR. DOBROVIR: Let me try and ask it another way then.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Do you believe that the full story of the activities carried out by you and members of your staff, that had to do with the concealment of various aspects of the Watergate matter should be made public in their entirety?

The Affidavit, I believe, answers that question, A pointing out that we have cooperated with the Special Prosecutor and as of this time we have satisfied all of the requests of the Special Prosecutor for documents, tapes, that he has made. In addition, of course, I have given testimony to the Special Prosecutor Task Force on a number of the issues other than those covered by the matters currently in court.

So my answer to the question is that in view of that cooperation, I believe we have complied with the spirit of the statement that I made on April 29th and also with the Congressional statement that you have just read.

Do you believe that the public at large, as opposed to the Special Prosecutor, has a right to know the complete story?

> MR. MORTENSON: The full story of what?

MR. DOBROVIR: Watergate.

2

3

4

5

6

7

MR. MORTENSON: What do you mean by "Watergate," Counsel? The building?

MR. DOBROVIR: No, I mean by Watergate, I am asking the question in this sense: All the activities that occurred after June 17, 1972, up through August 9, 1974. I only use that date because that was the date Mr. Nixon resigned from office. Relating to what is popularly described as the "cover-up."

Now, if the witness knows what I mean by that, I would like him to answer the question.

MR. MILLER: The witness may know what you mean but I don't.

MR. DOBROVIR: Well, if the witness knows, I would like the witness to answer.

A. Counsel has given you the answer.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Counsel has said Counsel doesn't know what is meant by "Watergate."

If my Counsel doesn't, I would never put my wisdom above his.

Do you know what is meant by "The Watergate cover-Q up"?

- I know what several people have written.
- Can you tell me what you understand it to mean?

I can only tell you that we have cooperated with the Special Prosecutor in all of his requests and that insofar as any activities on my part are concerned, that they have been disclosed to the Special Prosecutor, who is responsible in this

3 4

5

6

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

17

And beyond that, I have nothing further to add.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, you are putting the plaintiff here in an impossible position to answer your questions, because of the fact that in cooperating with the Special Prosecutor's Office and providing the Grand Jury, through the Special Prosecutor's Office testimony and documentation, that that material becomes subject to the Grand Jury's proceedings and the laws regarding disclosure thereof. And to ask the plaintiff if he believes the American people should have access to these items, which pertain to what we don't seem to be able to extract as a definition of Watergate, would require him to conclude that he disagrees with the laws that provide for the Grand Jury. And I think that is an impossible task for him.

MR. DOBROVIR: My question and the whole examination relates not to what the witness has stated to the Grand Jury or to any other law enforcement body, but rather to what is contained in the presidential materials that are the subject matter of this lawsuit, Mr. Mortenson.

Let me try another definition, what I am talking about, to see if this will help the witness to answer.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Do you believe, Mr. Nixon, that the public is entitled to full disclosure of everything that is in the presidential materials, that relate to the break in at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters on June 17, 1972, and subsequent efforts by anyone to conceal the involvement of the Committee for the Re-election of the President, with that break-in.

A Well, the answer to your question at this point is not at this time, in view of the legal proceedings that are underway and in view of, as we have already indicated, when I speak of legal proceedings, including the Grand Jury proceedings. However, I would anticipate that in the future, that in the presidential library, that all of these matters would be made public, because they are not in the provided -- they were not in the category of the -- let me put this more precisely.

These matters, in which there was a public interest since the tapes as well as the documents, et cetera, would be delivered to the library. It would be my intent that, except where there would be a violation of the guidelines, that former Presidents under the Presidential Library Act of 1955, which passed when I was Vice-President of the United States, and that under those guidelines that matters involving Watergate would be among those made public.

I should point out what we are talking about here is, well, of course of great public interest, in view of how much has already been made public and in view of the present status of the matter. I find that less than one percent of the presidential materials, the number 42 million documents, conversations and so forth, is Watergate-related in any respect. But we are not talking about a great deal of material.

Q If I can summarize your answer. You are saying that you agree it should be made public but not at this time?

MR_ MORTENSON: I think the answer stands for itself in

MR. MORTENSON: I think the answer stands for itself in the record as stated. If you want the reporter to read it back

2

so you can get it, --

THE WITNESS: The reporter can read it back.

MR. MORTENSON: Let that stand in the record or not to agree or disagree with your characterization.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

- When do you think that this material should be made public?
 - Pardon?
- When should this material be made fully public? You said not at this time.

Well, first of all we have to get the decision made A with regard to this action that we have brought so that I can have the opportunity to obtain the material and to segregate those portions that are private and personal. And, of course, whatever portions that might involve the national security there has to be a check.

I notice, for example with regard to tapes, that President Johnson placed a 50-year limitation, as you probably know, with regard to his tapes.

- My question is still with Watergate.
- I am not quite through and I have not interrupted Counsel in his, Counsel's questions. And if Counsel will show me the same regard I would appreciate it.

President Johnson has placed a 50-year limitation with regard to any materials that were on tapes and now that he has passed away, of course whether or not members of his family or others may decide to move before that time, to make

16 17

12

13

14

15

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

some of them public, remains to be seen. But I think that is too long.

In the agreement that I have, that I will eventually work out, the letter of intent with the University of Southern California and so forth, I intend to provide for making first, of course, for proper review of the tapes, which can only be undertaken by me and members of my family, because of the private and personal considerations that are there and for making them public as soon as those reviews are completed.

MR. MORTENSON: Let us take a brief recess.

(A brief recess is taken at this time.)

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q Let me ask the question then, Mr. Nixon. Do you have a time period that you expect, within which to make full disclosure of all the Watergate matters?

A No.

A I can't tell until I see how big the task is.

Most of the tapes are not as audible as the one you played at that cocktail party.

Q How long do you expect it will take for you and the members of your family to review all the tapes, Mr. Nixon?

A I don't know. But we will do it as expeditiously as possible.

Obviously, as Counsel is aware, we won't have access to the tapes until this case is decided, which, as I understand, at the earliest will be next spring. But by that

27

28

I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

time the tape review process could begin and I have some ideas as to how it could be expedited and I do want, because of the great interest in the tape material, I want it to move as quickly as possible. What is the Supreme Court's statement? With all the deliberate speed. A little faster than that, particularly as it applies.

But only yourself and Mrs. Nixon and your daughters will be listening to the tapes; is that correct?

Yes. Well, --

MR. MILLER: May I ask, Counsel, what the relevancy of the time period is to this lawsuit?

MR. DOBROVIR: Well, we are discussing a section of the statute with which Mr. Nixon disagrees, which provides that the public should be provided with the full truth at the earliest reasonable date. And I am just trying to get some information.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, you are characterizing --

MR. DOBROVIR: Let me finish. Please don't interrupt, Counsel, we must have this evenhanded so that we can have some basis for understanding what the witness' plan is with respect to the time frame for release of the full story of Watergate.

MR. MORTENSON: I don't believe that your characterization of his agreement or disagreement with the statement contained in the statute is accurate and I just want the record to reflect that.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Do you believe that the President has an ongoing constitutional responsibility to protect the confidentiality

1

of communications?

I certainly do.

And does that responsibility extend to communications with former Presidents -- of former Presidents?

It always has.

And did you not seek to protect that interest when Q. you sought, when you authorized the litigation to prevent the publication of the Pentagon Papers?

> Yes, that is correct. A

I should point out that from a political standpoint, some of the members of my staff totally disagreed. In fact, most of them were my decision to litigate on the Pentagon Papers matter, because it was no skin off our back. After all, when we came into power there were 300 men being killed every day and 550,000 in Vietnam at that time. We were drafting 34,000 a month, and this all reflects on the previous administration.

Well, the way I saw it was that far more important than who the Pentagon Papers may have reflected on, as to how we got in Vietnam and what we had done in Vietnam was the Office of the Presidency of the United States, that is why I felt that for the individual who removed the papers, top secret papers, although most of them were not particularly important some were vitally important, should not have been given a badge of honor and the paper that published them should not have received the Pulitzer Prize.

But you felt it was part of your responsibility to protect the confidentiality of communications in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations; isn't that correct?

(At this time plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel confer.)

MR. DOBROVIR: I would like the record to show that Mr.

Mortenson is whispering to the witness.

THE WITNESS: Yes. What Mr. Mortenson just pointed out to me was exactly the point that I was going to make and that is that what I was protecting here was the classification system itself. These were classified documents. If classified documents are leaked out in an administration and if no action is taken against those responsible for that leak, it becomes pervasive, confidentiality is destroyed and the ability to conduct the Presidency is seriously eroded. And this is particularly true in the foreign policy field. But as I say, it is also true in the domestic field where you have such issues as Monetary Reform, International Trade, et cetera, involved.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q But it is the responsibility of the President, is it not, --

MR. MORTENSON: It is, is it not, --

MR. DOBROVIR: -- of the President in Office --

MR. MORTENSON: -- to protect classified documents?

MR. DOBROVIR: To protect.

THE WITNESS: I consider it to be that, to be my responsibility.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q And it is presently the responsibility of President

Ford, is it not?

A To the extent that he agrees with that, yes. Each President views the situation from his own likes. From my experience I had felt very strongly on this issue at that time. I should point out we were engaged in a very difficult war. That war slopped over at home and erupted into violence and was tearing the country apart. And I felt that at that time. Also we were engaging in initiatives not only to bring that war to a conclusion, as far as we were concerned, but initiatives to avoid that kind of action taking place in the future with those issues and for that reason I felt perhaps more strongly than even a peacetime President might feel, that confidentiality was absolutely imperative.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, let me interject for the record here that I object to the question as calling for legal conclusions of this witness. The record, I believe, made in this case is such that there is no claim that plaintiff, as a former President, claims the right, the duty under the Constitution, or statute, or any other basis, to either classify or declassify documents. And I believe that it is a matter of law, the question of whether the encumbent Administration, the encumbent President is charged with the responsibility of protecting classified documents.

So to ask this plaintiff whether or not he views himself as having that responsibility or not is a matter of legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: As I understood the question, the question related only to what was my responsibility at the time of the

4 5

1

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

Pentagon Papers and I intended my answer to be directed to that question.

MR. DOBROVIR: My further question --

THE WITNESS: Incidentally, could I ask, for the record, because I wouldn't want Counsel to feel we are violating any of the rules, I have, of course, no objection whatever to indicating that I consult with Counsel from time to time. Does Counsel suggest that is not to be allowed? What was the purpose?

MR. DOBROVIR: I have no objection to you consulting with your counsel with respect to such matters as to whether or not you are to answer a particular question or whether it is a proper or improper question. It is my understanding of the procedure in a deposition, however, that it is not proper for a witness to consult with his counsel with respect to the substance of the answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, I should point out to counsel that, as Mr. Mortenson has just stated, the question on which Mr. Mortenson was advising me was one that involved a legal interpretation as well as substance and many times it is not. But let me say on our part that I would like for the reporter to put down every time there is any kind of this thing so that Counsel does not feel that the record is inadequate in showing that I do consult with counsel. I will consult with counsel only when I feel there is a legal matter involved. But I have no objection whatever to that and so Counsel need not raise that question again, I mean in any way that he wants.

Let's go forward with the questions.

MR. DOBROVIR: Thank you.

STATES OF SAME PARTY OF THE SAME OF THE SA

1

2

3

THE WITNESS: At any time Counsel objects to my consultir with Counsel, I wish he would say so rather than making a remark as he did to the reporter, that let the record show that he consults with Counsel.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

On April 16, 1973, did you say to John Dean, and I quote, "Nothing is privileged that involves wrongdoing".

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, let me interrupt. Is Counsel quoting from a document and if so let us enter the document into the record.

MR. DOBROVIR: This is a quote from Submission of Recorded Presidential Conversations to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives by President Richard Nixon, April 30, 1974. It is a blue book, paperbound, approximately two and a half to three inches thick and I am quoting from Page 802. I would be happy to show it to the witness if he would like.

THE WITNESS: I do not recall the conversation specifically. I would not affirm nor deny that is the case, but I do not recall the conversation.

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Do you believe the proposition to be true, the statement "Nothing is privileged that involves wrongdoing"?

MR. MORTENSON: Again, Counsel, I object to the question as calling for a legal conclusion of the witness.

MR. DOBROVIR: I am asking the witness to do no more than

27

22

23

24

25

26

是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们也没有一个时间,我们也没有一个时间,我们也没有一个时间,我们也没有一个时间,也可以是一个时间,也可以是一个时间,也可以是一个时间 第一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们就是一个时间,我们

27

28

1

2

3

4

tell me whether or not he believes that that is true or not. And if you are instructing the witness not to answer, that is fine, we will let the record so reflect.

THE WITNESS: What is the definition of "wrongdoing"?

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

I am quoting your words, Mr. Nixon.

I am asking you, what do you say is wrongdoing? don't know.

MR. MORTENSON: Counsel, you are stating that the witness has said he does not recall the conversation. You have then asked the witness whether or not he believes the general proposition and you have stated a general proposition. We need to know, in order to answer that, first of all because it calls for a legal conclusion, what interpretation of that proposition you are making.

MR. DOBROVIR: I am making no interpretation of the proposition. The question is clear. If the witness is unable to answer it as stated let the record so reflect.

THE WITNESS: Is Counsel's interpretation of wrongdoing an engaging in illegal activity?

MR. DOBROVIR: I have no interpretation of the word, I simply ask the question.

MR. MORTENSON: I will instruct the witness not to answer the question because it calls for a legal conclusion stemming from the Fifth Amendment and a variety of other privileges that might apply, depending on what the definition of the proposition is and you are unable to or unwilling to state that, so I cannot

let the witness speculate what that means.

THE WITNESS: I would like to add to that, even though a Counsel instructed me not to answer, as far as wrongdoing is concerned, I am not trying to debate with Counsel on the subject of what wrongdoing is and particularly in the present day, it is a very broad term that in the eyes of some is very limited. Lawyers usually interpret wrongdoing as being matters of which involve breaking the law. Others might consider wrongdoing an American, for example, in 1945, as many of them did, support: the DeGaspary Government in order to avoid a communism overthrow.

The point that I make is that in terms of wrongdoing unless the question is put more precisely I shall have to follow counsel's direction in order to respond.

MR. DOBROVIR: Very well.

THE WITNESS: I can also say that I should also point out that not only with regard to the Johnson tapes, in which there is a fifty year, as you know, restriction with regard to their being made public but also with regard to the Kennedy tapes, of which there are several hundred in Hyannis Port, as I understand, they obviously, their families now, and the President's at the time that they set up there or made plans for their library, wrote their letters of intent, each have had a right to place such conditions on their release as they thought were proper.

Implicitly saying that as far as I am concerned, that I have always felt that an administration, after a President leaves office, a President or Congressman or Senator

or Vice President, should be very forthcoming with regard to conduct of his office. And in my review of the tapes I shal of course, follow that policy.

1 |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1990年,2000年的特別的新聞的日本時代中華的新聞的新聞的 1800年的1990年,199

I should also point out that when Counsel earlie as he very properly did, went into the subject of what is cal the Watergate tapes, then, of course, limited it to what he called the Watergate cover-up, that here we have two differer First we have what is basically a legal question, and that is whether or not a President or former President should waive privilege, which I have done, where illegality is charged. We have done so. The Special Prosecutor has been appointed and we have cooperated with the Special Prosecutor.

Now, with regard to the situation on any further 13 release of material in what is called Watergate, I want to 14 leave no implication of any intention of what Counsel has referred to as cover-up or nondisclosure or what have you. However, I cannot at this time and will not violate the legal procedures with regard to a Grand Jury, with regard to defendants who are on appeal. And all that I can do is to cooperate with the Special Prosecutor, which we will do after that period is completed. Then I shall determine, but not the Congress, I shall determine what can appropriately be made public. And as far as that matter is concerned, I shall follow the same guidelines that all former Presidents since the Library's Act was passed in '55, President Hoover, President Kennedy, President Johnson and President Eisenhower followed, except that I will be as forthcoming as possible, particularly with regard to the tape matter.

BY MR. DOBROVIR: 2 Do you claim --3 As I say, what I have just said I do not mean to 4 imply any criticism of President Johnson and I don't know what 5 President Kennedy's decision or his family's decision with 6 regard to the release of their tapes. That is a decision for them to make, because those conversations, conversations that 7 are more than anything else in the President's materials, are 8 his and his alone not for profit but because they are so intima 9 because they go far beyond what a note taker might write and 10 under those circumstances therefore the President should have 11 a right to make a determination as to whether or not and how 12 and when there should be a disclosure. And in my case I am 13 indicating my own intent to disclose, to make public the tapes, 14 having in mind the national security problem, the embarrassment, 15 the private issue. By "embarrassment," I am speaking of persona 16 embarrassment and not speaking of embarrassment with illegality, 17 of course. 18 19 With respect to the question of privacy and embarrassment, besides yourself who had knowledge of the taping 20 system, that is when the taping system was in operation? 21 22 The Secret Service operatives, Mr. Butterfield and Mr. Haldeman. I don't believe any others knew. 23 24 Did Mrs. Nixon know? 25 A No. 26 Did either of your daughters know? Q 27/ A No. 28 Q Did your personal physician know?

2 Q Did your attorneys know? 3 A No. 4 Q Do you claim --5 Incidentally, my secretary didn't. A 6 Q Did not? 7 A No. 8 Q Miss Woods? She didn't know. 9 A Do you claim, as part of the presidential materials 10 included in this lawsuit, documents prepared by members of your 11 White House Staff for their own use? For example, handwritten 12 notes that Mr. Erlichman would take of meetings with you. 13 For my use or his? 14 For his use. 15 Well, handwritten notes that he made of me would 16 be made for my purpose and for my files. Those were the 17 instructions. If he was the notetaker, those notes were made 18 for me and they became part of the presidential materials. 19 on the other hand he was doodling, which he might often do, 20 or making a note to himself, they belong to him. 21 Do you claim as part of the presidential materials 22 included in this lawsuit recordings that either Mr. Erlichman 23 or Mr. Colson made of their telephone conversations? 24 A. 25 No. The answer was "No"? 26 MR. MORTENSON: 27 Are you asking of all records? THE WITNESS: What are you talking about? 28 Recordings of

1

A

No.

_

-- 4

- 5

大學學院 医阿里氏病 医阿里特氏 医多种胆囊医疗病 医多种性病 医阿里特氏征 医多种

BY MR. DOBROVIR:

Q The record is that Mr. Colson and Mr. Erlichman sometimes recorded their telephone conversations from their end and that those telephone conversations, after being recorded, were sometimes transcribed. I am asking you if those are included in the presidential materials which you claim ownership of in this lawsuit?

A I would have to differentiate. If the telephone conversation was a private conversation that they were having, with regard to their own business and so forth, that was one thing, that is theirs. If the conversation had to do with a direct presidential assignment for the purpose of the President, the telephone conversation and its transcription would be part of the presidential materials and in such instance the decision would depend upon the subject of the conversation.

Q Do you claim --

A As I should point out, Counsel, I think the record will show that their conversations, that the only, I believe, made records of conversations on official business and not personal, but it could have been otherwise. I don't know. They never told me.

Q But the records of conversations on official business are included in the materials which you claim?

A On official business having to do with the presidency, yes.

Q Do you claim FBI records of electronic surveillance

£.,

.

of seventeen individuals, which was ordered in May of 1969, to be part of the presidential materials included in this lawsuit?

A Well, if any FBI records -- I think perhaps we can shortcut just a bit here by going further than that. The FBI not only furnished such records but they furnished highly classified records whenever we made appointments through the Judiciary to the Cabinet, et cetera. So-called raw files were sent to us and all of those, all of the record that the FBI made, where we requested them, I would consider part of the presidential material; yes.

Q On April 30, 1973, did you order that the FBI records of the surveillance of these seventeen individuals be placed among your papers?

A I don't know. I can't recall it.

Q All right. Do you claim as part of the presidential materials involved in this lawsuit documents transmitted to members of the White House Staff, not addressed to you, from foreign governments?

A Excuse me. Whether members of the White House Staff?

Q Documents transmitted to members of the White House Staff not addressed to you, which came from foreign governments, do you claim that those are part of the presidential materials which you claim ownership of?

A It would depend again, Counsel, on the nature of the correspondence. For example, such correspondence would primarily come to Dr. Kissinger or sometimes General Haig and in most instances that I can recall, while the correspondence went to them, the correspondence went to them with the thought that it

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

was part of our ongoing dialogue and that it would be made available to me for my consideration. If it was correspondence of that type, yes, it is part of the presidential material. If it is, however, personal correspondence with regard to a trip of a member of the White House Staff, for example Mr. Rumistina Runsfield took a trip to Asia which was part official and part personal, and Mr. Finch went with him. They had a lot of correspondence. I would not consider that correspondence as part of the presidential material.

On the other hand, their report on the trip, the conversations that they had and any communications that they had thereafter dealing with the substance of their trip, even though this was in a domestic area, would be presidential area.

When you refer to correspondence addressed to you, do you mean correspondence addressed to you with your name or as President, or do you also include correspondence addressed to your principal aides without specifically designating addressedto you?

The way it worked is that many private citizens in this country and some foreign officials often addressed their correspondence to an aide because of his desire to be sure that it came to my attention. If it was addressed just to me it might get in the mill and they felt, sometimes justifiably, it might not be brought to my attention, so it came both ways. But the substance of the correspondence would determine whether or not it was presidential material or whether it was their materials.

Do you claim included in the presidential materials

26

27

in this lawsuit documents prepared by members of the White House staff for internal use that were not intended to be transmitted to you and that were not transmitted to you which dealt with government business, their official business?

A It is very difficult to separate that out from official business, what we call presidential materials, because within the White House Staff there might be a memorandum that was written from one staff member to another but because the staff member, say at a lower level, might not think a memorandum written directly to the President would get to him. I recall one in particular, because it has become rather famous, a memorandum a Mr. Liddy, whom I didn't know, wrote to Mr. Bud Krogh, in which he recommended strongly that Mr. Hoover resign. Normally such a memorandum would never come to my attention, but Mr. Krogh showed it to Mr. Erlichman and Mr. Erlichman thought at least it was something I should consider and it came to me. I would consider that to be presidential material, because the purpose of the memorandum basically was to affect presidential action.

Any memorandum that is supposed to influence presidential acts, presented by a staff member is presidential material.

Q The Paragraph 23 of your Affidavit, you indicate as a reason for installing the tape recording system a recommendation that you received from President Johnson by way of a close mutual friend. And you indicate that President Johnson urged you to do so because the taping system he had installed had assisted him in writing his memoirs. Who was that close

THE PERSON OF TH

28

mutual friend?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- Mr. Don Kendall.
- How did he communicate President Johnson's recommendations?
 - A Through Mr. Haldeman.
 - In writing or orally?

Orally. Basically I can explain it quickly and probably answer all your questions.

Mr. Kendall was a member of the Nixon Foundation and along with several others who were members of the Foundation visited various presidential libraries and President Johnson graciously asked him to come visit, to give advice with regard to the libraries.

At the time they made their visit to the library, President Johnson in a discussion with Mr. Kendall, and whether others were present or not I do not know, at least in a discussion with Mr. Kendall I can say firsthand and not hearsay, said that he had noted, President Johnson had noted I had ordered all electronic equipment out of the White House. think what he was referring to was the fact that I had gotten rid of the television sets and so forth and so on. And there was a lot of equipment I didn't know about, other equipment was there. But I said to clean it all out, we want to run our own show.

In any event, President Johnson said to go back and tell President Nixon that it is vitally important that he install or reinstall, what term was used I do not recall, but a system for taping, because he said he found it proved

とうまとの大きな一般できると言う小と言うに意味をいくというたがい

invaluable in writing his memoirs and also he thought very important in terms of a presidential library to have this kind of material in it.

Mr. Kendall came back and reported the findings of the Committee to Mr. Haldeman. Mr. Haldeman came in to see me. This I recall quite clearly, it was a very brief conversation, and he said President Johnson had recommended that we put in a taping system. And I said to limit it to the offices and not in the residences and no taping of staff members' telephones and so forth and so on, which apparently, at least I cannot say this for sure, but apparently had been part of the Johnson system. It has been alleged by some, whether that is true or not I do not know.

But in any event, the taping system was then installed, my memory, the reason I use Mr. Kendall's name here, is not that I independently recollected that Mr. Haldeman told me Mr. Kendall was the one who came in to see him but Mr. Kendall, oh, two, three months ago was a visitor here at my house and told me that he was the one that had recommended the taping system and for that reason I can say that Mr. Haldeman's recommendation to me had come from Mr. Kendall and Mr. Kendall had gotten it from Mr. Johnson. And Mr. Kendall recounted in detail his conversation with Mr. Johnson and Mr. Johnson's concern about my not having any taping system whatever.

Q Did you ever speak to former President Johnson at any time subsequent to your receiving this communication?

A No, not about that.

Q My question is: Did you ever speak to him at all

28

1

2

3

4

subsequent to that communication with former President Johnson?

A Yes.

And in none of those conversations did you mention the taping system?

- I am sure he assumed we took his recommendation No.
- But you never discussed the matter with him?

Incidentally, when I saw President Johnson on No. two occasions in the period between the nomination and the election, he did not mention the conversation was taped. Also when I saw him and members of the National Security Council after my nomination but before the election, just as he saw Mr. McGovern and also Mr. Wallace, he did not mention that the Cabinet room was taped. It would have been quite interesting to have that tape.

So one reason for installing the taping system was to have a record for your use in writing your memoirs; is that correct?

That was a reason that Mr. Johnson, President Johnson had indicated to Mr. Kendall, was a good reason to put it in. I frankly was not thinking of writing memoirs at that time. I had in mind at some day I would. I had other things I was thinking of. This is early 1971. My reason for approving it was that was primarily because of the historical significance. I knew of it, particularly in the foreign policy area, of the conversations that were taking place and I felt having those conversations taped for purpose of history would be very, very useful and that it why it was done.

That was the reason?

このでは、これのでは、日本の一般の一般を表現している。

4 5

. 7

是可以使用的更加,从其中,是国家的人们的

AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER

とないというには、 ちゅうちょうない

Q That is right. Mr. Ellsberg's psychiatric profile is what I had reference to.

A Well, I would suggest first that that material, it seems to me, would come under the provision, the guidelines that I intend to lay down in my letter of intent in regard to what I consider to be private or embarrassing material. And I am speaking in terms of its disclosure, and to the extent that it involved Mr. Ellsberg's activities and their removing top secret documents from the various places he was employed within the government. That would fall within the strictures of the National Security test, except, of course, to the extent that the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals' opinion and the Pentagon Papers case makes that no longer a National Security item. I have not seen his profile, incidentally.

Q Are you familiar at all with the General Services Administration regulations under the statute that is in issue in this case?

A Yes, I am familiar regulations were issued. I have not studied them carefully; no. I have not done so because I feel that we should first try to prevail in the suit and if we do not prevail I, of course, will study them very carefully.

Q Are you aware that the regulations provide expressly for your access to the materials, the statute and the regulations so provide?

A Access under certain circumstances, as I understand. Certain conditions and access also by others.

Q Would your interests be satisfied, Mr. Nixon, if either a complete copy of all of the Presidential materials were

3

5

6

8

10

9

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

made and transmitted to you for your use here at your home or if the originals were transmitted to you and a complete copy remained to be administered as provided in the statute?

No, that misses the point of the whole case. Because the point of this case is not just access for me for purposes of writing my memoirs, the point of this case is much more fundamental and profound. It goes to the issue of -- a number of issues, but particularly the separation of powers issue. principle of confidentiality, which I have addressed directly earlier and access to me, when coupled with access to government bureaucrats on a wide-scale basis, individuals who even with the best of intentions would not be able to make the fine judgments which, and by fine I mean the delicate judgments with regard to what is private and what is personal and what is political and what is embarrassing, what is National Security, et cetera. In other words, I believe that the Federal Libraries Act which, as I say, was passed in 1955 during the Eisenhower Administration, very appropriately considering a precedent that was not in law but just understood since the presidency came into being two hundred years ago, the Federal Libraries Act provides that a former President first has the discretion and the sole discretion to make decisions with regard to the disposition of materials that were accumulated during his presidency.

MR. MORTENSON: I want the record to reflect that in counsel's position, counsel for the plaintiff's opinion, the question was replete with requests for legal conclusions by the witness. I think the pleadings in this case are clear, to

the extent that plaintiff does not believe that this statute adequately protects his rights; his rights, for example, under the First Amendment. I believe it is a legal conclusion to be decided by the Court, whether the provisions of the statute do adequately protect that interest.

Plaintiff is on record with filing the Complaint that the statute does not in any way, in his opinion, protect his interests as set forth in the Complaint.

MR. DOBROVIR: Thank you. It is time for our noon recess. We will convene at one o'clock.

(The time is 12 m. At this time the noon recess is taken.)