

Part of the Richard Nixon Oral History Project

An Oral History Interview with ROBIN JOHANSEN

Interview by Timothy Naftali
October 28, 2011
San Francisco



The Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum
18001 Yorba Linda Boulevard
Yorba Linda, California 92886
(714) 983-9120
FAX: (714) 983-9111
nixon@nara.gov
<http://www.nixonlibrary.gov>

Descriptive Summary

Scope and Content

Robin Johansen worked with the library staff on the Impeachment Inquiry staff of the House Judiciary Committee in 1974 under Maureen Barden. In the interview, she discussed her early career as a high school English teacher and press person for the McGovern Campaign. While working for the Impeachment Inquiry staff, Ms. Johansen discussed organizing documents from the dairy industry used in the Milk Fund investigation and preparing the Statements of Information for the members of the House Judiciary Committee. Ms. Johansen also discussed the working relationships of the library staff and her dealings with John Doar, Bert Jenner, Maureen Barden, Bob Owen and Chairman Peter Rodino. Other topics included visits by G. Gordon Liddy and George Schultz to the Impeachment Inquiry staff offices for interviews, the role of women on the Impeachment Inquiry staff and her personal reactions to President Richard Nixon's resignation and the pardon issued by President Gerald Ford.

Biographical Note

Robin Johansen was a Research Assistant to the U.S. House of Representatives Impeachment Inquiry Staff in 1974. Prior to joining the staff, Johansen worked as a school teacher, a press representative for the McGovern Campaign in New Jersey, and on the state's Democratic Central Committee. A graduate of the University of Illinois (B.A., 1968) and Stanford Law School (J.D., 1977), also became a founding partner of the law firm, Remcho, Johansen & Purcel, a firm based out of the Bay Area that specializes in constitutional and public policy law. A member of the California Academy of Appellate Lawyers, Johansen also became a member of the editorial board of *The Journal of Church and State*.

Administrative Notes

About the Richard Nixon Oral History Project

The Richard Nixon Oral History Project was created in November 2006 at the initiative of Timothy Naftali to preserve the memories and reflections of former Nixon officials and others who had been prominent in the Nixon era by conducting videotaped interviews. Naftali insisted from the project's inception that it be a serious, impartial and nonpartisan source of information about President Nixon, his administration, and his times. A second goal of the project was to provide public domain video that would be available as free historical content for museums and for posting on the Internet. Donors to the project neither requested nor received a veto over interview questions or interviewee selection. Accordingly, the project includes interviews with former staff members of the Nixon administration as well as journalists, politicians, and activists who may have been opposed to the Nixon administration and its policies. Taken as a whole, the collection contributes to a broader and more vivid portrait of President Nixon, the Nixon administration, and American society during the Nixon era.

Copyright and Usage

Robin Johansen has donated her copyright in this interview to the United States government with no restrictions.

Suggested Citation

Robin Johansen recorded interview by Timothy Naftali, October 28, 2011, the Richard Nixon Oral History Project of the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum.

Duplication Services

Contact the Richard Nixon Presidential Library for information about duplication of DVDs and original master tapes.

Disclaimer

Oral history interviews are expressions of the views, memories, and opinions of the person being interviewed. They do not represent the policy, views, or official history of the National Archives and Records Administration.

The following is a transcript of an Oral History Interview conducted by Timothy Naftali with Robin Johansen on October 28, 2011 in San Francisco, CA.

Naftali: Hi, I'm Tim Naftali I'm Director of the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum in Yorba Linda, California. It's October 28, 2011 and I have the honor and privilege to be interviewing Robin Johansen in San Francisco for the Richard Nixon Oral History Program. Robin, thank you for doing this.

Johansen: My pleasure.

Naftali: Let's take you back to the early 1970s. What were you up to in the early 1970s before you started working on the impeachment inquiry staff?

Johansen: In the early 1970s I was still a high school English teacher, and then decided that wasn't my calling and ended up in 1972 as a press person for the McGovern campaign in New Jersey as a statewide rep of the McGovern campaign. After that then I worked with the Democratic Central Committee or State Committee, I guess it was called.

It was through that work that I met Peter Rodino and his staff because we were fortunate enough to get Mr. Rodino to help us put together a program for local candidates who wanted to run for public office. He chaired this program and I got to know him and attended events with him.

Around, well, toward the end of 1973 then Mr. Rodino's Chief of Staff asked if I might be interested in coming down to the impeachment inquiry to help out. That was a tough decision. My husband had moved to California and I was just finishing up my work there in New Jersey and had then to decide whether I would be apart from him for another long period of time.

Ultimately, the two of us decided that this was just not something that I should miss. I'm so grateful to him for his open mindedness about it, his willingness to put up with yet another separation so that I could be there. That's how I ended up at the impeachment inquiry.

Naftali: Did you know how long you were signing up for when you said yes finally?

Johansen: Well, no, I don't think any of us did. As it was I was only there for about six months because the separation had gotten to be too much. I ended up coming back to California in June of 74 which was, you know, hard to do

but also it was, I just had this push pull with my family commitment. I felt that it was the time I needed to go.

When the President resigned August 9th I believe it was, then I returned within a week or so to try to help pull things together in the Library where we had worked. So I was there for another couple of weeks in August I think.

Naftali: Tell us about what it was like, I assume this would be January when you started, how many of you, you must have been one of the earliest to be hired.

Johansen: I may very well have been. I know that Maureen was there. I came, I think, in early January. There were I think other Library staff members there. But people were coming all the time and I have some memory of when Bob Sack came and Dick Gill and some of the other lawyers so I think I must have been there a little bit before they did, they came.

I was amazed to find that one of the lawyers had actually been a fourth grade classmate of mine. He somehow remembered me and that was quite a surprise. But it was very much in the kind of we were in the organizing stage and trying to, for me, figure out what it was I was going to be doing was pretty difficult.

Maureen was a superb leader for us and she was able to give us all a sense of okay this is what our task is going to be at least for the next week or so and somehow keep all of these very inexperienced people, at least inexperienced at impeachment inquiries, headed in the right direction. John Doar was also, of course, a superb leader and he was extraordinarily open to being with all of us young people.

In fact I think in many ways the Library staff was a comfortable group for him and late at night, for example, John would come in and just kind of sit down and talk. For those of us who were young, not even lawyers at the time, it was a superb, a wonderful opportunity to see and really get to know one of the best lawyers in the country.

Naftali: Let me ask you a bit about that because some of the lawyers all shared tremendous respect for Mr. Doar. Some of them describe him as a little removed but in your instance, your recollection, he gravitated more or felt more at ease with the young Library staff.

Johansen: Well, I don't know. It could have just been the time of night, I mean, I'm talking midnight. Obviously, we didn't see him all the time during the day, he had a lot going on and I think perhaps these late night sessions were just, you know, a way for him to relax a little bit. In a way with a group that he didn't have to just try to deal with meeting after meeting after meeting. This was just kind of end of the day and he was comfortable with us. Then, of course, we were thrilled.

Naftali: Do you remember some of this, what you might talk about or what he might share with you?

Johansen: You know I can't remember specific things. I do remember, I don't know if it was one of these late night conversations or not I don't know. John was very, very skeptical about the use of computers and at that time the Senate Watergate Committee had a primitive but certainly computerized data base for all of their facts. I can remember how for security reasons primarily John just wanted nothing to do with that.

I'm sure that you heard about our five ply cards or seven ply cards that all the facts were written down on and then distributed into different almost like shoe boxes. They weren't but for purposes of making the physical data base that our facts were worked off of. Probably we talked about those kinds of things, I don't know.

Naftali: I find it interesting that Mr. Woods whom I interviewed yesterday talked about John Doar's opinion of or skepticism toward computers. That's what led to a project that he and Hillary Rodham worked on to figure out how to sort through the information. Were you immediately assigned to Maureen when you started?

Johansen: Yes and I think the best analogy I can make to what we were doing would be a kind of paralegal status. But we were Library staff and our job was really to work with this very fact intensive set of documents that we had from the Senate Watergate Committee and, you know, documents from all over. Try to get them into some kind of comprehensible order.

Eventually I was assigned to work on the dairy industry scandal or whatever you want to call it. The contributions from the dairy industry and spent probably weeks working up exactly how those contributions came into being and whether there was a link to then changes in the milk price supports. That was something that I worked closely with Fred Altshuler on and Bob Sack.

Naftali: Fred mentioned the fact that at a certain point it was you determined or he determined and Bob Sack determined that this wasn't going anywhere this particular inquiry, and then he switched to other duties. What did you do after working on the milk fund issue?

Johansen: Oh boy, I'm just not sure. I remember spending a great deal of time with Richard Kleindienst I think it was, with his calendars. Trying to track his movements throughout a particular period and I remember thinking at the time how odd it was that, you know, wondering how he would feel if he knew that someone was looking at all of his daily calendar and trying to figure out where he had been on what day. In terms of other topics of the inquiry the dairy one is the one that stands out and we ultimately did present some evidence on it. But, yes, it was certainly not included among the Articles of Impeachment.

Naftali: Tell us about the Library, did you have a carrel in the Library? I mean how was this organized and how many of you were there?

Johansen: First the number fluctuated. Some people came in around, oh, toward May or June. A couple who had been in graduate school and then finished their class work and came, JoAnn Woods, Joe Woods' daughter came for a while. So I think our number was between eight and ten but I'm not sure. It was a large open room with library tables and chairs and I don't recall that we had any specific spots.

They certainly weren't carrels. But any specific spots that was kind of claimed as a desk it was just that was where we happened to be working that day. We did spend time then in the offices with the other lawyers with the lawyers when they were working on a particular thing so we would be included in those meetings.

In even the drafting meetings if it was something we had been working on then we would be in the meeting with John Doar and Bert Jenner and Bob Sack and Fred until late at night working on getting the actual sequence down so that we had it absolutely accurately for purposes of the Statements of Information.

Naftali: What do you remember of Bert Jenner?

Johansen: Oh, wonderful man. Just a very cordial, very good lawyer, obviously, very good lawyer and a very open kind of person. He also had a very colorful taste in clothing so that we would come in and the word would go around

– you really have to see what Mr. Jenner's shirt looks like today that kind of thing. He was a very fine person.

Naftali: Tell us a bit about the effect on staff cohesion and moral of the secrecy that you had to maintain.

Johansen: The effect was, of course, to make us very close and because we couldn't talk to anybody except the group. We all, I think, library staff and lawyers alike tended to, if we were going to go out to dinner the lawyers would include us or vice versa. It was, you know, it's the old in the trenches kind of thing and it was a profoundly influential time for me in the sense of really learning what it meant to keep things confidential.

Even to this day when you contacted me about doing the interview I checked with Maureen and some of the others if anything still off limits. There just were things that we never did talk. There was a definite concern obviously and it was everyone was trying to find out what was going on. We were in the old Congressional Hotel and I remember that you come down in the elevator and Jack Anderson had a guy there who just hung out in the lobby and tried to get us to talk.

He'd sort of accost us as we came off the elevator. It was just so completely inbred into us through John and his example and through Bert Jenner that to this day I'm amazed, but very proud of the way everyone, everyone just kept everything confidential the way it should have been.

Naftali: As you said you had worked for Senator McGovern's campaign and I know that Mr. Doar sought a completely non-partisan atmosphere. How did he reinforce that, keep the partisanship to the extent that would have been out of?

Johansen: I think a couple of things, first he made he was very careful to have people from both parties. We were all working together, we were all a team. I think the example that he and Bert Jenner had, of course, both of them are Republicans but, you know, they were working very carefully together. Then I think Mr. Rodino and Mr. Hutchinson were also working closely together. You have that kind of example. The other thing is just the culture, for example, John would never allow anyone to refer to the President other than as the President. He wasn't Nixon, he wasn't any of the other names that were bandied around at that time. He was the President. Again, to this day, I can't refer to Richard Nixon as anything other than President Nixon. That kind of mind set really, really affects

how you do what you're doing. Then, of course, it was so important that it be viewed as above partisanship and we all felt the importance of that as a historic moment. This was something that hadn't been done before and it had to be done right and I think it was.

Naftali: Let's take some, let's try to see if we can evoke some of the historical moments. Do you remember the big push for finishing the Statements of Information? Maureen talked about just the amount of work to put all those binders together. You worked hours didn't you?

Johansen: Yes, yes.

Naftali: Tell us a little bit about what you remember about sort of the feverish activity.

Johansen: Well I remember the lack of sleep, we were going on three, four, five hours of sleep a night at best. I remember people became aware that on less sleep I become quite clumsy. We had papers stacked all over the room and after about eleven or twelve at night people would say, "Robin you stay over there I'll bring it to you," because nobody wanted me knocking over all these stacks of paper.

I can remember going over to use the Xerox machines late at night in probably the Canon Office Building trying to get everything copied. Because everybody did everything, it wasn't that there may have been lawyers that came with us but it wasn't that you gave it to somebody else to go copy this. If it needed to be copied and there wasn't anybody then we went and did it.

I can remember in there with these huge copy machines trying to get these things done at one or two in the morning. It was exhausting but again it was something that everyone was part of it wasn't that we in the Library staff felt their leaving us with the grunt work. Everybody was there late at night just trying to get everything done.

Naftali: Your work exists as this huge really sort of library of Statements of Information. What do you remember of the process and your role in it in determining what made it into the book and what didn't make it into the book?

Johansen: My role in it was very small obviously because that wasn't my call. To the degree that I was sitting in on meetings where they were trying to decide what made it into the book and what didn't. I remember those as very

much a group dynamic kind of thing where perhaps the lawyer who had been working on that particular set of facts would present or have a draft. Then John and Bert Jenner and whoever else, Bernie or Bob Sack or somebody, would be working just to try to distill it to the essence of that.

My only role as far as drafting was to do a first draft of the facts on the dairy scandals. Then Fred and Bob took that with me I mean we were all part of and kind of worked it into okay lets, we had to completely check our facts over and over and over again. But then also distill it into just the facts there couldn't be anything in there that was the least bit judgmental or speculative. It was just alright this is the fact and here's the support for it.

Naftali: Did Mr. Doar, again I know it's hard to remember, but perhaps this will evoke it, when he would come and talk to you did he talk to you about, did he tell you any war stories from his time in working with Civil Rights cases because it seems to have been very influential in his thinking about how to handle at least the information.

Johansen: I think he did, you know, I these things get mixed up because after I went to law school my first job was with the predecessor law firm working for Thelton Henderson who is now a retired District Court Judge. But who was with John at the Civil Rights Division in those days. It gets a little confusing as to where I first heard something.

Then Bob Owen who, I think you've probably heard about, and Owen I'm trying to remember if Owen Fiss was at Civil Rights Division, I'm not sure he was but Bob Owen for certain were also there. Yes, that whole period was something we were all, I found fascinating and wanted to hear as much as I possibly could about.

Naftali: Please tell us a little bit about Bob Owen.

Johansen: Oh, another wonderful man; Bob would come in, he wasn't on staff the way the other lawyers were, but what did they call him, the icebreaker, the log jam, or something like that. He would come down for days at a time from New York and work with the lawyers and it seemed as though when maybe when something had kind of hit a snag that was when Bob would parachute in and help out. He was just a great human being.

Naftali: What role did Dorothy Landsberg play?

Johansen: Well you know I didn't have that much contact with Dorothy and so it's a little hard for me to talk about that other than to note how she and Bob Shelton I think were both working very carefully to keep the office running in a functional way. When you think about, you know, put together a law firm in effect or the equivalent of it in a few weeks and just get it staffed and get it running and get it functional.

That's a remarkable achievement. All of that was happening kind of outside of my little world. But all I knew was if we needed paper it was there, if we needed phones they were there. Somebody and I assume Dorothy and Bob were instrumental in making sure that happened.

Naftali: When you left in June what did you think, I mean it's a long time ago, but what did you think was going to happen? Because you knew you had to go back but where did you think this was going to go?

Johansen: I was convinced that something was going to have to happen as far as Articles of Impeachment being voted upon and approved. I felt that the President was going to be impeached. As we watched with the tapes case and, of course, then the smoking gun and the whole bit that became pretty obvious to everyone including the President which is the reason why he resigned. But I really did feel that there would be the Articles passed, which they were.

Then, of course, for me the question of wow gee there's going to be a trial in the Senate can I miss that. I had already been accepted to law school and was ready to go and, of course, my husband was in California. That was going to be another, you know, hard decision. Luckily I didn't have to face that one.

Naftali: Let's talk about your decision to go to law school. You had decided to go to law school before joining the staff?

Johansen: I had and had taken all the LSATs and things like that. For a very different reason and I think what really changed for me was the work with these really fine lawyers. I had been in New Jersey politics and felt that and I thought I wanted to stay in politics and campaigns and that as a woman in those days it was going to be important for me to have a credential.

I saw the law school degree as just really a credential for a different career. Then I saw what these really good lawyers are like and what they do and I said I want to be like that. I got my law school acceptance as

well. I was there and it was very clear to me that law school was going to be a different kind of avenue for something different.

I've been lucky enough to stay in the public policy realm as a lawyer and in the political realm. We do a lot of election law and things like that. I was able to marry those two concepts but in a way that is much better than being a campaign consultant.

Naftali: Tell us a little bit about what you remember of Chairman Rodino since you knew him from before.

Johansen: Again, another wonderful, wonderful man – he was so down to earth there was no sense of hierarchy for him and no sense of what can you do for me. He was just a wonderful warm human being who coming out of a state, where there had been a lot of problems shall we say, had a very fine reputation.

That spoke volumes about him and he was kind enough to write a recommendation letter for me for law school and he was just the kind of person who would do things for people. I think that's why he was so well loved. He was the perfect person for this job in my view.

Naftali: What do you remember of Francis O'Brien, did you know Francis at all?

Johansen: I did and it was really through Francis I think that the invitation came and Francis was kind of the opposite in personality from Mr. Rodino and still is. He's a very intense energy field and exactly what the Chairman needed in terms of Chief of Staff and that kind of thing. I to this day think Francis is great, I really enjoy him.

Naftali: Because people who will watch this now and in the future may not be aware of the 60s and 70s as a turning point for women in government and the law tell us a bit about the role of women on the staff? How many were there, I mean not the exact number but where were they. Of course, people have talked about Hillary Rodham, later on Hillary Rodham Clinton, we've interviewed Maureen. Tell us about the role of women on the staff.

Johansen: Well, I have to say that there more women non-lawyers than there were women lawyers. There's no doubt about that. Again I don't think that's a function of any kind of discriminatory animus on the part of John Doar or Bert Jenner. I think the fact is there just weren't that many lawyers at the time, particularly women who could give up what they were doing and hop on a plane and go live in Washington for nine months.

But again, there was hardly I imagine because we were so isolated we were all just very close. I don't have any memory of any kind of gender bias one way or another. Out in the world yes, when I began practicing certainly there was some of that and probably still is. But not there.

Naftali: What percentage of your law school class roughly was female?

Johansen: I think we were about 30%. You know there was a generation of women ahead of us who really paved the way. I want to Stanford, Sandra Day O'Connor had been there. When you read about her graduating at the top of her class and the only thing she was offered was a secretary's position.

You know what she had to deal with. I didn't have to deal with that kind of stuff because of her and because of others like her. We were kind of at the vanguard but not the cutting edge not the people who really had to put up with the worst of it.

Naftali: What was the mood like in the Library and the staff when you came back in August to help them clean up?

Johansen: Now that's an interesting question because I remember just how happy I was to see all of my friends. I remember just being, you know, really happy to be there and I don't recall, you know, I really don't know. I think it was probably a real mixture of emotion that this thing that we had all been part of was now going to come to end. A great deal of pride for having done it the right way.

Probably a great sense of relief for the country that we hadn't had to go through this terrible time with a trial and all that might mean. There were times in the middle before the tapes case and things like that was resolved where people were really wondering whether there would be a constitutional crisis.

Whether the Presidency was out of control to the point where the Executive Branch might not listen to the courts. We had the Legislative Branch knocking heads daily with the Executive Branch on disclosure and things like that of evidence. I think for all of us to have come though that and be able to say whew, that one, it worked and we were part of helping make it work. That was a real sense of pride and relief.

Naftali: Did you work with Michael Conway?

Johansen: Sure.

-
- Naftali: At that point, because he was working on finishing the final report.
- Johansen: Yes, although I don't think I was working with Michael on the final report I think we were trying more to deal with what are we going to do with all this stuff and where does it go and how do we preserve what needs to be preserved. I think Michael and the other lawyers were off doing that part of it while we were doing the more archival tasks.
- Naftali: Just so that people who go to our Legislative Branch that this material actually is not at the Nixon Library, it's at our facilities in Washington DC. Tell us about how we should use the cards?
- Johansen: Are they still legible? Alright I'm going to have to try to remember what the various categories were that each card went into. I frankly cannot remember
- Naftali: Well that's okay.
- Johansen: what they were, but what, if I have it correctly, the idea was to be able to figure on any particular date at any particular time who was where. Therefore, and who was doing what so that you could say alright John Ehrlichman was meeting with Charles Colson and but Haldeman was off doing something else. I think they are given how accustomed we have become to working with search able data bases.
- I think the cards will appear as a real anachronism almost like an abacus or something in comparison to what we can do now. But how you should use them it's really more of an artifact I think because they then became the basis for the Statements of Information and the Statements of Information then are now scanned, I assume, and search able.
- Naftali: Did you listen to any of the tapes? Was that part of your job?
- Johansen: Just one, it was a meeting in the Oval Office with members of the dairy industry. We really worked on a need to know basis particularly with the tapes. I needed to listen to that one because it was the only one that concerned the dairy contributions.
- My memory of that tape is mostly of coffee cups and spoons clinking because it was pretty clear that the microphone was under the coffee table. It was very difficult to hear the conversation, the quality was poor enough to begin with but then with all this background noise which of course grabbed the mic and took it over I couldn't get too much of it.
-

-
- Naftali: Did you, when you worked late did you all bring food in or did you, because I've heard you talking about living on very little sleep, did you have a lot of pizza, I mean, how did you guys survive?
- Johansen: Well I remember that we would go out I can remember going at lunch time to the cafeterias in the House Office Buildings and getting lunch. So we did see the light of day occasionally. Occasionally we would go out to dinner because I can remember at one restaurant in particular it's probably no longer there and I don't remember the name of it. But a very crowded restaurant on the Hill and it was not uncommon to see some of the people there that we were actually writing about.
- We had to be very careful what we said so we would talk about anything, of course, other than what we were doing which meant that the conversations were rather limited since we weren't doing anything other than impeachment work. Yes we must have brought pizza in. If I recall, you know the offices were in the old, oh what was the name of that,
- Naftali: Congressional
- Johansen: Congressional office building and they had been apartments so I think we had refrigerators and things like that and we probably kept food there as best we could.
- Naftali: Did you help prepare for the interview of Herbert Kalmbach since he was involved to some extent in the milk issue?
- Johansen: You know I'm not sure, I'm pretty sure I never met him and I don't know whether at the time he was interviewed whether I had been assigned to this or not. I never participated in any of the interviews with any of the figures in the events. We would see them occasionally coming through. I can still remember when Gordon Liddy came through and Secretary Shultz came through.
- Naftali: Tell us about, since you remember it, tell us why you remember when G. Gordon Liddy came through.
- Johansen: His whole demeanor was very challenging and he just was kind of surveying the group of us just walking through. I remember thinking he's got an attitude. I never spoke with him so I don't know what he's like.
- Naftali: And when Secretary Shultz came through?
-

-
- Johansen: I just remember that a much different presence obviously and then afterwards I can remember the people and I couldn't tell you who it was that interviewed him. But people saying you know how decent he seemed and just seemed like a very good man.
- Naftali: What was it like to work for Maureen?
- Johansen: Oh, wonderful; as you know Maureen had worked with John before and so she had experience in doing an investigation which was great. She was, she is a leader who makes very clear what her goal is and then really trusts staff to get there. If we were squabbling over something she would very much break the tie and she was our leader there was no doubt about it.
- But she was also one of us who worked at least as hard if not harder than the rest of us. The only time when you knew that Maureen was upset was when occasionally you would hear this Jesus, Mary & Joseph and that was about the worst that you got.
- Naftali: There was squabbling?
- Johansen: Oh no actually we had I'm sure just the usual disagreements among a group that had to spend eighteen hours a day together. Just questions about who was going to do what, that kind of stuff. I don't mean squabbling in the sense of people not getting along because I do remember us being a remarkably compatible group there in the Library.
- Naftali: Have I not have I evoked your, I know what I'd like, let me ask you about the pardon. What do you remember by this point I believe you had gone home again because you were there only until the middle or end of August. What was your reaction to when you heard about the pardon?
- Johansen: It was mixed. I really felt that the President had a lot that he had to answer for and that it was necessary, it was important for us as a society to know that no one was above the law. I had a strong sense that of regret that he was not going to have to answer. However, very pragmatically, I understood the need to move on.
- Whether there was a deal or not as people have conjectured I wasn't particularly interested in that, it was just really more interested in making and as a society having us learn a collective lesson about the dangers of a strong executive and how the checks and balances really are extremely important. In that sense I felt that the impeachment process had in itself
-

brought about the resignation. I don't think it would have happened without it.

That was a very strong part of the lesson that we all learned as a society. That the Legislative Branch does have a role and must keep track of the Executive Branch or else we are going to have an Imperial Presidency. Whether, did I want to see Richard Nixon go to jail, no. I didn't think that was necessary or important, but I wished that there could have been more of an accounting.

Naftali: Are there any stories anecdotes that I haven't listened to that you'd like to preserve?

Johansen: Small thing, contextually one of the things I remember about those late nights there, was that the Washington subway was being built. In addition to trying to get our work done there would be the pile drivers that usually started up around six or so and went all night it seemed. That added, of course, to the stress level.

I think the main thing that needs to be preserved is what we talked about at the beginning. That is the sense of the culture that John Doar and Bert Jenner, Peter Rodino and Edward Hutchinson instilled in their respective staffs and/or committee was unique and necessary to have the legitimacy behind this kind of procedure. Of course, I couldn't help but compare that to what happened with the Clinton impeachment which I feel was very poorly done, very badly handled, very bitterly partisan.

If we are going to take on this, to me profound task, of bringing in a President we owe it to the institution to do it in the way that it was done in 1974. We owe it to the country to do it that way because if we don't then we're going to be left with the sense of that we've cheapened all of the institutions. That's not something I think that any of us want.

Naftali: Did you ever interact with Sam Garrison?

Johansen: Yes, yes, and you know I always remember him as being civil. You know we weren't close by any means, but I don't have any specific memories of him.

Naftali: What did this period in your life teach you?

Johansen: It taught me what really good lawyers can do. It gave me a sense of the profession as a really fine thing to be part of. As I said I think that was

very important in terms of my career as a lawyer but it also it really taught me as I just said the dangers of one branch of our government of the balance getting out of whack. Much of my work as a lawyer since has been working with the legislature here in California.

I've really I think come to view that branch, as dysfunctional as it often is both here and in Washington, as an extremely important part of what keeps us together. What keeps us from having, what keeps our faith and that's why it's so, to me, very disheartening that legislatures in general ours in California, the Congress have such low opinion ratings because in many ways they are the branch that need to keep things under control.

Because they have this process of impeachment and share with the courts then the ability to make the other branch comply with the Constitution. I think it's just terribly, terribly important. As a lawyer and as a person who has worked with the legislature all these years I think that the first impeachment really taught me the importance of the Legislative Branch.

Naftali:

Robin, thank you for your time today. Thank you, gentlemen.

Johansen:

Well, thank you.