

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

file

January 25, 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. HALDEMAN
FROM: W. RICHARD HOWARD **WRH**
SUBJECT: Buckley and Noyes' Columns
and the Communist Atrocities
Fact Sheet

The Crosby Noyes and William Buckley columns were widely distributed by Bob Dole to our friends, including: favorable anchormen and columnists, Administration spokesmen, Republican party officials and staffs across the country as well as elected officials. In addition, Congressman Ford read both the Noyes and Buckley columns into the Congressional Record.

At about the same time, Congressman Ford also sent our fact sheet, "Communist Terror Attacks on Civilians in Vietnam" to all members of Congress with the attached cover letter. Chuck Colson distributed the fact sheet to the top Administration spokesmen.

Republican
National
Committee.

January 15, 1973

MEMORANDUM FROM BOB DOLE:

Both Crosby Noyes and William Buckley have put forth excellent explanations as to why the President's course of negotiating with Hanoi instead of the Senate or the press is the only way we are ever going to see the lasting peace in Vietnam we all so desperately want.

Attached are copies of their columns. I urge you to take the necessary time to read them.

With best wishes,



1/7/73

Opinions of Our Columnists

CROSBY S. NOYES

Nixon Keeps Us Guessing—and Maybe He Should

My friends are all furious about the way that democracy is going to the dogs in this country. A good many of them are paid to know what's going on. And when they can't find out, it gets them very upset about the people who aren't telling them.

You really can't blame them. A good many things are obviously going on that people are interested in, and President Nixon hasn't been willing to give them the time of day. Apart from George Allen, the only person he seems to be talking to these days is Henry Kissinger. And Kissinger is a genius at talking to people at great length without telling them anything that they want to know.

Congress, apparently, feels the same way—sort of left out of things.

Naturally it makes people frustrated and annoyed, and there is a lot of talk going around about how the system is being perverted by one-man rule.

The only trouble is, of course, that the presidency has been the dominant force in the government for close to 200 years now and there isn't very much that Carl Albert or anybody else is likely to be able to do about it.

Nixon may be somewhat more secretive than some of our presidents in the past and he doesn't seem to care very much about his relations with Capitol Hill, but he hardly can be accused of inventing the idea of an independent executive.

Come to think of it, quite a lot of things have happened that we weren't much consulted about beforehand. I don't recall being asked, for instance, what I thought about invading Normandy, or dropping an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, or sending troops to Korea, or invading the Bay of Pigs.

It could be that the notion that this country normally operates by a system of unrestricted information, consultation and consensus is something of a myth. Most of our recent presidents, at any rate, have had a way of acting first and consulting afterward in matters of primary importance to the country.

It may be that Nixon is more susceptible to this use—or abuse—of presidential authority, being at the beginning of his last term and therefore less "accountable" to the Congress and public opinion for what he does. One suspects, however, that this

supposed non-accountability is more impressive to the anxious critics of Nixon's policies than it is to the President himself.

Any president, including this one, is ultimately accountable for everything that he does. If his policies fail, no amount of prior consultation and public relations will redeem his reputation and historical standing. If they succeed, it will probably make very little difference that the country was largely in the dark about what he was up to at the time.

The people's much-asserted "right to know," furthermore, has never been fully subscribed to by any government that ever existed. What the people don't know much of the time is a lot. And quite often there are perfectly valid reasons, aside from the natural furtiveness of chief executives, that make it imperative to leave them in ignorance.

Something of the sort may be the case today. What everybody is so worked up about, of course, are the negotiations on Vietnam and the chances of reaching a settlement of the war in the near future. Among other things,

they want to know whether and why it was necessary to bomb the hell out of Hanoi and Haiphong at such a high cost in lives and public anguish. They are asking what or who it was that blocked the settlement that Kissinger said was at hand and what the real prospects are today.

The questions are pertinent and so, perhaps, are the reasons for not answering them. The most detailed knowledge by the public and the Congress on the state of the negotiations probably would not bring a settlement nearer. And indeed, it might foreclose the possibility of arriving at any settlement at all.

It is hard to ask people to live with their frustrations and their ignorance, but for the time being it may be necessary. Because the simple fact is that Nixon and Kissinger are not negotiating with the White House press corps or the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but with the North Vietnamese.

Everything that has been said and left unsaid so far is a part of that negotiation. Until it is concluded, the President has the right—and perhaps the duty—to keep the country guessing.

WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY JR.

1/17/73

Why Shouldn't the President Remain Aloof?

On the whole, it is sensible to take the side of Congress against the Executive, up until you come close to spilling over into the kind of chaos mercifully ended by Charles de Gaulle when he filled up the great cavities of the Fourth Republic. We are not near to that kind of anarchy in the United States, and it is therefore the operative presumption that the White House has entirely too much power.

That said, one makes the distinction. The Congress of the United States has luxuriated in hypocrisy for a very long time.

On the one hand it resents characteristic executive usurpation, on the other hand it (a) does nothing about it; and (b) is always there strengthening the hand of the executive.

The typical bill passed nowadays by Congress gives the President the power to invoke or not to invoke this or that measure; gives him the responsibility for naming the members of this or the other board; passes sense-of-the-Congress resolutions while

ignoring the simpler remedy of decreeing how things shall be.

And of course in matters economic, it is particularly fond of passing lazy inflationary bills and expecting the President to veto them; or, if he fails to do so, contriving somehow to blame the President for the inflation that ensues.

The focus of Congressional resentment, at this writing, is the recent bombing of North Vietnam, and the refusal of Mr. Rogers and Mr. Kissinger to appear before a Senate committee to "explain" the President's decision. All kinds of things are being deduced from the President's recent reclusiveness, but a few critical observations are usually left unmade, to wit:

(1) A president who plays with the press, as kittenishly as FDR or JFK, is potentially more dangerous than the President who is aloof from the press. Better that the press should be presumptively skeptical of presidential operations—than that it should

treat the President unctuously, in reaction to his charm oropenhandedness.

(2) What is it expected that Mr. Nixon could have said to the press to explain his decision to proceed with the bombing?

"Mr. President, do you really believe that the carpet bombing of North Vietnam is going to bring Hanoi to the negotiating table with further concessions?"

How would Mr. Nixon have answered that question responsibly?

If he had said that he did believe the bombing would work, he'd have strengthened North Vietnamese resolution to resist the pressure of the bombing.

If he had said that he did not believe the bombing would work, he'd have raised the question why he had resorted to it.

If he had said that he did not know whether the bombing would work, he'd have said in effect that he was indulging a petulance.

(3) But if he had looked calmly at his tormentors and said:

"Nemo me impune lacessit," and walked back into the Oval Room, why he'd have been arrested moments later as the murderer in cold blood of Tom Wicker and Anthony Lewis. There are things you simply don't say: even though you give them expression.

"NO MAN WHO TRIFLES WITH ME DOES SO WITH IMPUNITY." That is the national motto of Scotland, and it is a maxim appropriate not to Dr. Strangelove, but to Aristides. It is a personalization of the rules of good international behavior which support the peace. But it is uncouth to invoke such truisms, in mid-discipline: and the wise ruler will avoid the temptation to sin, even rhetorically.

It is altogether obvious what Richard Nixon is up to. Those who disagree with his decision are perfectly free to do so. Why should he give them a more elaborate scaffold on which to hang him? He is right, at this moment, to be silent. Who wants a chatty executioner?

which their brand of football has brought to my home State of Florida. In their 7 years in Miami, they have deftly captured the hearts and allegiance of the entire populace and brought great pride to the State of Florida.
Hail to the Dolphins.

MARTIN LUTHER KING: BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today millions throughout America, will in some manner—privately, publicly, or otherwise, observe and pay tribute to a great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, on the 44th anniversary of his birthday. Dr. Martin Luther King was not only a renowned clergyman but a national leader who fought for the principles of peace, justice, and equality for not only all American citizens but for all humanity.

When Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated, the crime did not terminate the great causes for which he was devoting his life, it resulted in an expansive force that has increased immeasurably the success of all the humanitarian principles he espoused. Many Americans who had not been apprised of the humanitarian work which he was advocating became sympathetic and converted to aid in his great program of racial and civic equality for all citizens of our Nation.

By reason of his tragic death, the message he gave at the Lincoln Memorial in the summer of 1963, at which he elaborated on his slogan, "That Great Dream," instilled into the minds of millions the justice of his cause which they can never forget.

When word went out over the Nation of his tragic assassination, the bell tolled for all Americans and for all people everywhere who believed in human justice, dignity, and brotherhood. His great faith in mankind—in the people's capacity to do what was right—sustained this great leader in his crusade for the rights of all our citizens. He had a dream that all men could live as brothers and as he so eloquently expressed led many, including his detractors, to join the cause for equality and civil rights.

He had a deep faith in America, in freedom, and representative government and led millions of his fellow citizens to join in a crusade to follow the principles of the U.S. Constitution that all American citizens must enjoy the rights provided in that great document without discrimination, injustice, and persecution.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that men who fight for these great qualities of equality, liberation, and freedom should meet such a tragic termination of their consecrated work for the goodness of mankind. To mention but a few—Presidents Lincoln and John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Mahatma Gandhi—and many others over the centuries.

THE DEBATE OVER THE RELATIVE POWERS AND PROGRAMS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate over the relative powers and prerogatives of the President and the Congress—a debate which I believe to be a healthy one if it does not take on a wholly partisan tone—two interesting columns appeared in the Washington Star and Daily News on January 7. Without necessarily subscribing to every punctuation mark and innuendo in either column, I insert in the RECORD the observations of Columnists Crosby S. Noyes and William F. Buckley, Jr., who provide perspectives that differ somewhat from those of the pack:

NIXON KEEPS US GUESSING—AND MAYBE HE SHOULD

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

My friends are all furious about the way that democracy is going to the dogs in this country. A good many of them are paid to know what's going on. And when they can't find out, it gets them very upset about the people who aren't telling them.

You really can't blame them. A good many things are obviously going on that people are interested in, and President Nixon hasn't been willing to give them the time of day. Apart from George Allen, the only person he seems to be talking to these days is Henry Kissinger. And Kissinger is a genius at talking to people at great length without telling them anything that they want to know.

Congress, apparently, feels the same way—sort of left out of things.

Naturally it makes people frustrated and annoyed, and there is a lot of talk going around about how the system is being perverted by one-man rule.

The only trouble is, of course, that the presidency has been the dominant force in the government for close to 200 years now and there isn't very much that Carl Albert or anybody else is likely to be able to do about it. Nixon may be somewhat more secretive than some of our presidents in the past and he doesn't seem to care very much about his relations with Capitol Hill, but he hardly can be accused of inventing the idea of an independent executive.

Come to think of it, quite a lot of things have happened that we weren't much consulted about beforehand. I don't recall being asked, for instance, what I thought about invading Normandy, or dropping an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, or sending troops to Korea, or invading the Bay of Pigs.

It could be that the notion that this country normally operates by a system of unrestricted information, consultation and consensus is something of a myth. Most of our recent presidents, at any rate, have had a way of acting first and consulting afterward in matters of primary importance to the country.

It may be that Nixon is more susceptible to this use—or abuse—of presidential authority, being at the beginning of his last term and therefore less "accountable" to the Congress and public opinion for what he does. One suspects, however, that this supposed nonaccountability is more impressive to the anxious critics of Nixon's policies than it is to the President himself.

Any president, including this one, is ultimately accountable for everything that he does. If his policies fail, no amount of prior consultation and public relations will redeem his reputation and historical standing. If

they succeed, it will probably make very little difference that the country was largely in the dark about what he was up to at the time.

The people's much-asserted "right to know," furthermore, has never been fully subscribed to by any government that ever existed. What the people don't know much of the time is a lot. And quite often there are perfectly valid reasons, aside from the natural furtiveness of chief executives, that make it imperative to leave them in ignorance.

Something of the sort may be the case today. What everybody is so worked up about, of course, are the negotiations on Vietnam and the chances of reaching a settlement of the war in the near future. Among other things, they want to know whether and why it was necessary to bomb the hell out of Hanoi and Haiphong at such a high cost in lives and public anguish. They are asking what or who it was that blocked the settlement that Kissinger said was at hand and what the real prospects are today.

The questions are pertinent and so, perhaps, are the reasons for not answering them. The most detailed knowledge by the public and the Congress on the state of the negotiations probably would not bring a settlement nearer. And indeed, it might foreclose the possibility of arriving at any settlement at all.

It is hard to ask people to live with their frustrations and their ignorance, but for the time being it may be necessary. Because the simple fact is that Nixon and Kissinger are not negotiating with the White House press corps or the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but with the North Vietnamese.

Everything that has been said and left unsaid so far is a part of that negotiation. Until it is concluded, the President has the right—and perhaps the duty—to keep the country guessing.

WHY SHOULD NOT THE PRESIDENT REMAIN ALOOF?

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

On the whole, it is sensible to take the side of Congress against the Executive, up until you come close to spilling over into the kind of chaos mercifully ended by Charles de Gaulle when he filled up the great cavities of the Fourth Republic. We are not near to that kind of anarchy in the United States, and it is therefore the operative presumption that the White House has entirely too much power.

That said, one makes the distinction. The Congress of the United States has luxuriated in hypocrisy for a very long time.

On the one hand it resents characteristic executive usurpation, on the other hand it (a) does nothing about it; and (b) is always there strengthening the hand of the executive.

The typical bill passed nowadays by Congress gives the President the power to invoke or not to invoke this or that measure; gives him the responsibility for naming the members of this or the other board; passes sense-of-the-Congress resolutions while ignoring the simpler remedy of decreeing how things shall be.

And of course in matters economic, it is particularly fond of passing lazy inflationary bills and expecting the President to veto them; or, if he fails to do so, contriving somehow to blame the President for the inflation that ensues.

The focus of Congressional resentment, at this writing, is the recent bombing of North Vietnam, and the refusal of Mr. Rogers and Mr. Kissinger to appear before a Senate committee to "explain" the President's decision. All kinds of things are being deduced from the President's recent reticence, but a few critical observations are usual and left unmade, to wit:

(1) A president who plays with the press, as kittenishly as FDR or JFK, is potentially more dangerous than the President who is

aloof from the press. Better that the press should be presumptively skeptical of presidential operations—then that it should treat the President unctuously, in reaction to his charm or openhandedness.

(2) What is it expected that Mr. Nixon could have said to the press to explain his decision to proceed with the bombing?

"Mr. President, do you really believe that the carpet bombing of North Vietnam is going to bring Hanoi to the negotiating table with further concessions?"

How would Mr. Nixon have answered that question responsibly?

If he had said that he did believe the bombing would work, he'd have strengthened North Vietnamese resolution to resist the pressure of the bombing.

If he had said that he did not believe the bombing would work, he'd have raised the question why he had resorted to it.

If he had said that he did not know whether the bombing would work, he'd have said in effect that he was indulging a petulance.

(3) But if he had looked calmly at his tormentors and said: "*Nemo me impune lacessit*," and walked back into the Oval Room, why he'd have been arrested moments later as the murderer in cold blood of Tom Wicker and Anthony Lewis. There are things you simply don't say: even though you give them expression.

"No man who trifles with me does so with impunity." That is the national motto of Scotland, and it is a maxim appropriate not to Dr. Strangelove, but to Aristides. It is a personalization of the rules of good international behavior which support the peace. But it is uncouth to invoke such truisms, in mid-discipline: and the wise ruler will avoid the temptation to sin, even rhetorically.

It is altogether obvious what Richard Nixon is up to. Those who disagree with his decision are perfectly free to do so. Why should he give them a more elaborate scaffold on which to hang him? He is right, at this moment, to be silent. Who wants a chatty executioner?

MILITARY RETIREES DESERVE BETTER

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years, America's retired military men and women have suffered from an unjust system of computing their retirement pay that leaves them the victims of an ever-soaring cost of living.

Prior to 1958, their retirement pay was recomputed to keep pace with increases in the pay of military personnel on active duty. However, Congress abandoned this plan in favor of one that supposedly was tied to increases in the cost of living.

It simply has not worked out. The cost of living has soared, yet the retirement pay has not kept pace and the gap between active duty and retirement pay has grown wider and wider.

Like many others trying to live on a fixed income, our retired military personnel have been hard hit by inflation. Many live in my own Sixth Congressional District of Florida, and I can personally attest to the hardship they are forced to undergo. Our military retirees, who have devoted many, many years of service to their country, often at great personal

sacrifice, are now being forced, along with their families, to live a very marginal existence.

For this reason, as one of my first acts with the opening of the new 93d Congress, I introduced H.R. 221, the Uniformed Services Retirement Pay Equalization Act, which calls for a return to the former program of equalizing retirement pay with the pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

This policy had been followed for more than 90 years, and many people entered the service confident in the belief that the law would be followed and their pay upon retirement would be adjusted to keep pace with the pay of our active forces. I personally feel it was a breach of faith to change this system and tie retirement pay to the cost of living.

Two years ago, I introduced a bill to return to the former recomputation system; while approved as an amendment in the Senate, the measure, unfortunately, was not accepted by the conference committee.

I hope the Congress will promptly adopt my new bill, thus giving deserved recognition to the men and women who served their country so gallantly over the years. The Congress, and a grateful Nation, owe them no less.

FROM BAD TO WORSE

HON. E DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, mail service in the United States is the worst I have seen in my lifetime. I daresay it is the worst the Nation has known since the railroads knit our country together.

The mail is not going through—at least not on a timely basis. I am sure that every Member of this body has his own collection of horror stories about the slowness and unreliability of mail service. It is not unusual for regular first class mail from my district in south Texas to reach my office a week or 10 days after it was dispatched. Even the use of airmail does not guarantee fast delivery. The special delivery system is a farce.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for a moment that the House of Representatives, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and definitely this Member, ever intended that the Postal Reorganization Act, which created the U.S. Postal Service, should destroy mail service in the United States. But that is the direction in which we are going.

We were promised much, but the promises have not been fulfilled. I believe it is time to concede that a mistake was made in the creation of the U.S. Postal Service. And it is time, in my opinion, to rectify that mistake. What we have now is inferior to what we used to have. And, no one is happy—none is getting what was promised—not the post office employees, not the patrons.

For these reasons, I am introducing today legislation to abolish the U.S. Postal Service by repealing the Postal Reorganization Act and to reestablish the U.S. Post Office Department as an executive department of the Federal Government. I offer this measure as a vehicle which will enable the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to start all over in establishing the kind of modern, efficient postal system that the American people want and which they are entitled to have.

The state of the present mail service is a matter of serious concern to almost every individual in the United States. This body has a responsibility to improve it. Abolition of the U.S. Postal Service is a necessary first step in that direction. I hope we will take it.

HOUSE SADDENED BY LOSS OF DISTINGUISHED MEMBERS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress has opened without several familiar persons. All of us are particularly saddened by the loss of three distinguished Members.

In October, Congressmen Nick Begich of Alaska and Hale Boggs of Louisiana disappeared during the course of an air flight over Alaska, while Mr. Boggs was campaigning for the reelection of Mr. Begich. To date, no trace of them, their pilot, or their aircraft has been found.

In December, Representative George Collins of Illinois was one of many people killed in the tragic crash of a commercial airliner in Chicago.

These three men, from different districts and States, held a common respect for the national legislature and for the good of the people of their home district.

George Collins led to his district on Chicago's West Side almost every weekend as his way of keeping in close touch with those he represented. He was a tireless champion of the rights of all Americans, and the Seventh District of Illinois has indeed lost a good friend and public servant.

When Hale Boggs came to the House of Representatives in 1941, he was just 26 years of age, the youngest man in Congress. In the long and eventful years since he first came to Washington, he has risen to positions of authority in the various committees and forums of the House. As majority leader, Hale Boggs provided the leadership for his party, and he served the people of Louisiana well.

Nick Begich came to the House 2 years ago as Alaska's Representative-at-Large. He quickly moved to take on many issues confronting the Congress, and served ably on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. His knowledge of Indian affairs, national parks, and public lands has been of great value to his colleagues.

These men are certainly going to be missed by the 93d Congress. I know I speak for all my colleagues in extending our deepest sympathies to their families.