THE ANDERSON PAPERS

FROM THE FILES OF AMERICA'S MOST FAMOUS INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER

JACK ANDERSON

WITH GEORGE CLIFFORD

ANDERSON PAPERS

by Jack Anderson

with George Clifford

Manufactured in the United States of America

A COMMUNICATION FROM INSIDE THE WHITE HOUSE

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington
February 11, 1971

CONFIDENTIAL
MEMORANDUM FOR H. R. HALDEMAN
FROM: JACK CAULFIELD
SUBJECT: *ANDERSON LEAKS AND ALLEGED ACCESS TO PRESIDENTIAL MEMORANDA*

During his recent appearance on the Dick Cavett Show, Jack Anderson made the following comments:

"I have access to intelligence digests because people show them to us."

"—some of the President's private memos, some of the transcripts of confidential minutes."

"Two thirds of the State of the Union Message two or three days before it was delivered."

"I can assure you that if the President knew who was leaking these memos, he would be fired tomorrow."

Writer has analyzed the Anderson column for the three month period preceding the State of the Union leak, as well as discreetly conferring with selected White House staff members. Resultingly, the following observations are offered:

A) Anderson does, indeed, have access to intelligence digests, and he proves it on a daily basis. It also appears his reference to private Presidential memoranda is valid, but most likely when such material leaves the White House and is circulated on an agency level. On more than one occasion, examination of a Presidential quote in context indicates strongly that the leak came not from within the White House, but from the agency concerned with the subject matter.

B) Anderson's comment regarding "some of the transcripts of confidential minutes" possibly refers to verbatim quotes of comments made at White House leadership meetings.

Two of the White House staff members interviewed independently expressed the view that Senator Hugh Scott or a member of Scott's staff are suspect. If you were not aware of this possibility and wish the names of the staff members, they will be furnished to Larry Higby upon request.

Examination of the Anderson columns of January 21, 22 and 23, all of which are concerned with the reorganization of the federal government, apparently refers to his State of the Union comment indicated above.

In this connection, it has been determined that *all of the above information* contained in those three articles appeared in our black bound, working looseleaf booklet. Further, that twelve late copies of such booklet were prepared and forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget from the Domestic Council under strict security conditions in advance of the Anderson leak.

An examination of the subject document, along with a studied review of the subject Anderson columns indicates that the book was made available to Anderson, most likely in its entirety.

Domestic Council members interviewed make a valid case for the leak to be pinned on OMB, Bureau Resources Section. I, personally, wish to reserve judgment until more evidence is at hand. It has been brought to my attention that George Shultz has been apprised of these suspicions, and has taken the position that a "smoking out" type investigation would be inadvisable.

Resultingly, I do not feel it proper to proceed with this aspect of the inquiry, unless or until you so advise.

Having looked at this matter with all its serious implications for the future I feel it advisable to immediately suggest that all of the section chiefs on the White House staff be briefed by your office with a view towards a minimization of leaked material and comment. I also suggest that an overt firing of a person directly connected with a leak would go a long way towards making the ability of the Andersons of the world to gain White House information both difficult and hazardous.

Please advise.

This memorandum touched off an intensive investigation to uncover my sources. Government security men, including FBI agents, were unleashed. They questioned suspects, used lie detectors, posted watches on Xerox machines. In the Pentagon, suspects

were grilled behind the doors of Room 3E993. Orders went out not merely to find and fire one of my sources but to prosecute same as an example of what can happen to an individual who divulges unauthorized information.

The authorities selected as the sacrificial lamb a bespectacled, $13,500-a-year Pentagon employee named Gene Smith. He was hounded, badgered, threatened and cursed until his health was affected. His neighbors were asked nasty questions about his loyalty, his associates, his drinking habits. At last, he was hauled before a federal grand jury in Norfolk, Virginia, and questioned under oath. U.S. Attorney Brian Gettings concluded from the inquisition, however, that Smith was the wrong man.

This was the atmosphere in mid-1971 as the events chronicled in this book began to unreel.

—Jack Anderson

Contents

PROLOGUE

A Word about Power and the Press

Presidents and policy-makers, like other people, can be what they choose to be. They can serve the nation or they can serve themselves. For many men in public life the mere possession of power is an end in itself. For them the struggle to the top is expensive, both in dollars and a more precious currency—human integrity. The values of even the most honorable are under constant assault, like boulders on an ocean beach. Erosion seems inevitable.

Power is Washington's main marketable product. Those who come to the capital to serve the government, and those who come to manipulate the servants, strive for power to accomplish their goals. Power is the driving force that brings together people of different philosophies and varying interests in the constantly evolving battle for control. Alliances are conveniently arranged and are seldom permanent, shifting with the pressures of the times and the advantages of the moment.

Honest men will lie and decent men will cheat for power. Few reach the political pinnacles without selling what they do not own and promising what is not theirs to give. In the great and grueling quest for power it is easy to forget that power belongs not to those who possess it for the moment but to the nation and its people.

While power need not be corrupting, it is impossible to deny that the American political system invites corruption. Men must

accumulate funds to campaign for office. Those who finance the campaigns expect a return on their investment. Those who are elected must listen to the special interests while they preach about the public interest. To lead they often must follow men whose motives are self-serving.

To keep the White House, Richard Nixon raised more campaign cash than it cost him originally to gain the White House. His agents systematically contacted the nation's great corporations and gave them campaign quotas for their executives to raise. Some paid their allotments hoping it would keep the government off their backs. Others, like International Telephone and Telegraph, sought to make a deal in return for a campaign commitment. Only a few, like American Motors, refused to ante up. Staggering sums were raised to reelect the President. The cost to the people of the United States, and to the free enterprise system, is still being paid in installments.

Only a few men can survive the crawl to the top with their values unimpaired. These values can become even more tarnished by the heady, rarefied atmosphere on the mountaintop. The dazzling heights separate and estrange the President from the citizens below, until the mighty voice of the nation becomes stilled to a whisper.

The powerful everywhere are surrounded by fawning servants, obedient aides, and the symbols of success. In the most powerful nation, those who reach the mountaintop are so pampered and so insulated by the trappings of power they can easily forget they are servants, not masters, of the nation.

High fences, patrolled by armed men and sophisticated electronic devices, keep the President remote from reality. Bulletproof limousines move him over the highways. Helicopters are always ready to lift him above the traffic snarls, which irritate most of us, above the stink of the cities and the heads of the people who live in the squalor. On short notice, specialists can assemble hordes of sycophants to render homage, while other specialists keep critics at a distance. Every public gesture and every public utterance is reported in print and on television as though it all carried some genuine importance. At his whim, the President can command the nation's communications and project his image and his words into

every American home, or to any spot on earth, or—in the historic moments of discovery—to the moon.

The homage and the emoluments could turn the head of a saint, and few men who occupy the White House are saints. It is little wonder that the President, elected to serve the people, does not always feel like a servant. On the contrary, he often feels that the people should serve him. In Washington, with its adulation of power, few like to acknowledge that power rightfully belongs to the people.

The experience of ascending the pinnacle of power changes the men who must exercise power. Some men can grow and be strengthened by the process. Most are diminished. When Lyndon Johnson was President, it was possible sometimes to glimpse the gangling adolescent from the Texas dirt farm. And somewhere under the brittle shell of Richard Nixon lurks the quiet, studious youngster in Whittier who wanted to be a railroad engineer. But in the White House, they no longer were the men they once had been. The aging process for all human beings tends to replace idealism with cynicism; for the powerful the change is often more pervasive.

The men of the press seldom remind the leaders of their obligations, nor the citizens that they are the true owners of power. All too many who write about government have been seduced by those who govern. The press, like the powerful, often forgets its obligations to the public. Too many Washington reporters consider it their function to court the high and mighty rather than condemn them; to extol public officials rather than expose them.

It is far more pleasant to write puffery about the powerful, of course, than it is to probe their perfidy. Public officeholders are usually likable; that is why they got elected. Many reporters are taken in by this personal charm, are awed by the majesty of office; and they become publicists rather than critics of the men who occupy the offices.

The political pundits and big by-liners consider themselves journalists, not reporters. The powerful men of the press develop close and cordial relationships with the powerful men in government. They converse together; they dine together; they party together. The experience is enough to convince some reporters that

they are architects rather than chroniclers of policy. Yet those who hobnob with the great learn little more than the lesser reporters who take notes at press conferences and rewrite press releases.

Those taken in adopt the attitudes of the people they cover. They become the lap dogs of government instead of the watchdogs over government. They wag their tails and seek approval instead of growling at the abuses of power. The reporters who go along with the powerful, and act as explainers and apologists for those who violate the public trust, must be considered accessories to the pillage. Like the politicians and the special seekers, these men sell a little of themselves each day; and the chumminess between the power structure and the press apparatus robs the reporters of integrity.

The need for the press to occupy an adversary role was clear to America's founding fathers. That is why they made freedom of the press the first guarantee of the Bill of Rights. Without press freedom, they knew, the other freedoms would fall. For government, by its nature, tends to oppress. And government, without a watchdog, would soon oppress the people it was created to serve.

Thomas Jefferson understood that the press, as the watchdog, must be free to criticize and condemn, to expose and oppose. "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter," he wrote. Nor did he retract this statement after he, as President, had been abused by irresponsible newspapers. Rather, as he neared the end of his first term, he wrote to a friend: "No experiment can be more interesting than that we are now trying, and which we trust will end in establishing the fact, that men may be governed by reason and truth. Our first object should therefore be, to leave open to him all the avenues of truth. The most effective hitherto found, is the freedom of the press. It is, therefore, the first shut up by those who fear the investigation of their actions."

We have tried, in our own way, to become a watchdog of Washington, to be numbered among the few investigative reporters who seek to discover what is really happening in the nation's capital. It is seldom what the press spokesmen and the public relations experts say is happening. There are no press secretaries to brief

those who search after concealed facts, no hucksters to package the suppressed details in attractive press kits. We have never known a government official to call a press conference to confess his wrongdoing, nor a government agency to issue a press release citing its mistakes.

Men in power, and men seeking power, do not relish having their cozy relationships exposed, their sources of money bared, and their blunders brought to light. Rather than cooperate, they obstruct investigative reporters. Doors are closed; files are locked; phones are slammed back into receivers. The last thing people at the top of government want to see are stories about government wrongs. For they know that exposure can bring an end to power.

Investigative reporters grate against the political conviviality and easy friendships of official Washington. They avoid the social entanglements that inhibit straightforward reporting about the high and mighty. They are not impressed with the Henry Kissingers and William Rogerses and Elliot Richardsons whom the establishment reporters cultivate. The pashas of the press consider good journalism to be an appointment once a week with Henry Kissinger. But investigative reporters know that Henry Kissinger is never going to tell them anything the President doesn't want them to know.

At the time President Nixon was secretly supporting Pakistan, for instance, Kissinger and Rogers deliberately misled the reporters they saw. They swore the Nixon Administration was neutral in the India-Pakistan conflict. They denied the Administration was secretly shipping weapons to Pakistan. They pretended that a naval task force was not dispatched to bring military pressure upon India. These were all lies. They lied because the President wanted them to lie.

The top officials and the authorized sources will always say what the President wants them to say. They will not disclose the real policy that is often hidden behind the stated policy, nor will they reveal the backroom deals that promote and protect the privileged. Investigative reporters, therefore, must rely more on unauthorized than on authorized sources.

The most reliable sources are the professional, nonpolitical public servants whom the public never sees. Their first loyalty is to the

citizens who pay them, not to their political superiors. The professionals know what the intelligence reports really show and what the Administration's policies really are. These career people implement the policies and therefore know the truth about them. Some are willing to tell the truth, at considerable risk to themselves. The information they possess, and the documents they produce to back it up, are often exactly the opposite of the kind of news that is officially leaked or passed out at press conferences or printed in press releases.

Unquestionably, the way an investigative reporter is compelled to operate is an imperfect system of newsgathering. Sometimes the sources do not have all the details. Sometimes the jigsaw pieces of information do not form a complete picture and the missing pieces are buried too deeply. Investigative reporters must work without the power of subpoena. They lack the money and manpower that the government can marshal to counter their efforts. The authority to classify embarrassing facts, the ability to shut off channels of information, the power to intimidate sources who could tell the truth—all these are on the side of the government.

It is not altogether surprising, therefore, that investigative reporters do not always get all the facts. They can uncover enough hidden scraps, however, to cast light on a blunder or an embarrassment or a scandal that the people in power had conspired to conceal. If our society was as free and open as it should be, and if government officials fully subscribed to their oaths to protect the public interest, there would be little difficulty in quickly establishing the truth. But officials all too often cover up the facts and then lie to the public.

Investigative reporters must work harder, dig deeper, and verify their facts more carefully than establishment reporters. Preposterous lies can be told to make the powerful look good; grievous blunders can be committed by officials in the name of the government; the public can be cheated by men sworn to uphold the public trust. But let an investigative reporter make a mistake and there will be howls of outrage. There can be a good word for a Lyndon Johnson who sent boys to die in a senseless war, or a General Motors which releases unsafe cars upon the highways, or a Richard Nixon who condones lawlessness while preaching law and order.

But there is no good word for an investigative reporter who wrongly condemns someone in authority.

We have made our share of errors, despite our pains to avoid them. Most of them could have been avoided if we had been willing to report only the news that is produced at press conferences or printed in press releases or whispered to chosen reporters by officials. We believe it is better to err on the side of freedom, however, than to submit to such censorship.

Time and again, meanwhile, our leaders have used the stamp of official secrecy to protect themselves. This is censorship at the source. There are relatively few documents that must be kept secret in the interest of national security. The number does not even begin to approach the twenty million documents and papers the government hides from the people.

There is nothing sacred about the secrecy stamp. The President does not hesitate to release classified information if it will win support for his policies or help him squeeze money out of Congress. Often secret papers are shown to reporters by the same officials who prosecute others for leaking those papers which reflect unfavorably on themselves. Like dictators, our leaders stay in power by barring the public's access to unfavorable facts. We are free to select our leaders, but this freedom is constantly abridged by leaders who seek to curtail our knowledge of their activities.

The question of how much truth government spokesmen should give out—and how much the people are entitled to—may never be precisely defined. Most people would probably agree that the government, for the protection of its citizens, need not always tell every last detail about every situation. On the other hand, it should not lie or mislead lest it lose the trust of the very persons it is seeking to protect. In a democracy, when the government cannot tell the whole truth, it should stand by its privilege to be silent.

The reporters, for their part, should never accept as final the government's refusal to comment. And those who publish official, selective facts as the whole truth do themselves and their nation a disservice. Newsmen are out of their element when they share with the governors the view from the mountaintop upon the governed below. A reporter should keep on the same footing with the peo-