

Youth traditionally has been close to motherhood as a purity issue in American politics—shining faces pointed toward the future and all that. Although recently there has been some ambivalence on this due to radical bouffies, long hair and pot, there was none at the Republican National Convention at Miami Beach last summer. The President, anxious not to cede all the first-time voters to Senator McGovern, embraced all the youngsters there with great enthusiasm. When he spoke to a young voters rally just after his nomination, he said:

"Some of you may go into some other kind of activity where somebody is going to come up to you one election year and say, 'Stay out of the campaign because you might risk some money, you might risk some customers or clients or whatever the case might be.'

"And I just want to urge you, don't ever do that because what you do for America is more important than anything you do for yourself. That is really what counts."

Now, nobody could really argue with this clarion call to young people to take up political service, and never mind the personal risk. What some sticklers for decency and purity might wish to argue with, however, is the way that ubiquitous and inexpressible organization, the Committee for the Re-Election of the President, put the President's fine philosophy into practice. The more you hear about it the more you begin to comprehend what the President might have had in mind when he spoke of the risks entailed in political activity. In January, we all became familiar with the story of young Tom Gregory, the Brigham Young University student who was hired to spy on Senator Muskie's campaign and then enlisted in the abortive effort to burglarize and to bug Senator McGovern's headquarters.

Now there is even younger Theodore Brill, who was a 20-year-old junior majoring in history at George Washington University and chairman of the student Republican group on the campus. He was hired for \$150 a week by Mr. Nixon's campaign committee to go out and infiltrate peace groups. In accordance with the terms of his employment agreement with the committee, he went out and passed himself off as a member of a peace group holding a vigil in front of the White House. He reported on their activities and, on one occasion, helped set them up for a drug bust.

Mr. Brill was told that his assignment was "super-secret" and he was paid in cash in clandestine circumstances except for one time when somebody made a mistake and paid him with a check. He was fired two days after the Watergate break-in case broke because, as he says, "people at the White House were upset."

All of this may sound like nothing more than campus politics as practiced at the University of Southern Cali-

fornia in the early '60s by Messrs. Chapin, Segretti, et al., only transferred to the national scene. To us, however, it is a bit nastier than that. It certainly doesn't measure up to Mr. Nixon's lofty rhetoric in Miami Beach and on close examination, it doesn't even seem to be legal. Attempted burglary—which would seem to be involved in Mr. Gregory's case—is pretty serious business. And though Mr. Brill classifies his work as "a little unethical," there are more serious questions beyond ethics, about the money with which he was paid. It was never reported to the General Accounting Office, as is required by the campaign finance law. Thus, no one knows whether Mr. Brill and Mr. Gregory were the only young people introduced to American politics in this fashion, Mr. Brill's controller, George Gorton, national college director of the Committee for the Re-Election of the President, first told *The Post* that he had young people picking up information in 38 states. Later, he said Mr. Brill was the only one.

That's a pretty important point for a couple of reasons. First, it would be interesting to know how many youngsters were given this kind of civics lesson by people who represented the highest level of political leadership of our nation. And second, it reopens the whole question of the secret cash that was stashed away in the offices of Mr. Nixon's campaign committee—the fabled fund that brought us both the Watergate case and the money laundered through Mexico. Questions on this score remain and abound. The main ones are where the money came from and where it went. The disclosure of the \$200,000 cash contribution by financier-in-trouble Robert D. Vesco and Mr. Brill's activities have given us some pretty good recent hints. But the refusals of Maurice Stans, the President's chief fund raiser, and of Paul Barrick, former Nixon committee treasurer, to give the GAO affidavits about the fund hint that there's a great deal more still to come.

That leaves it squarely up to the Department of Justice. The GAO, which has done an admirable job to date, has asked Justice to look at a possible prosecution growing out of the Vesco transaction and to investigate the secret fund. Only the most thorough job by Justice on those two requests can eradicate the aroma surrounding the FBI's investigation of the Watergate case and around the kiddie corps to re-elect the President. This is of more than passing importance because Mr. Nixon said something else to young people in Miami Beach. He said: "... We want an administration after the election, in the next four years, in which we can be worthy of the enthusiasm and the trust and hopes and ideals of young Americans."