

# NEW LEADERS

## A Worried Look At The Nixon Administration

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ SHORTLY after his election last November, Richard Nixon assembled a brain trust to staff the Elephant Administration. Mr. Nixon had campaigned to bring "new leadership" to America, and most who voted for him expected he would do exactly that.

Such persons are still waiting.

One of the key men working behind the scenes for Nixon on the selection of talent to staff the new Administration was Joseph E. Johnson, a member of the Board of Directors of the notorious Council on Foreign Relations (C.F.R.) and President of the grossly misnamed Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.\* Johnson is a former chief assistant to, and close friend of, Soviet spy Alger Hiss. When Hiss was indicted, he was President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; he was succeeded by Joseph E. Johnson.

According to the internationally respected journalist Edward Hunter, Johnson was "actively engaged in preparing alternative Republican personalities to

replace top Democratic Party officials," in a Nixon reorganization "to bring in precisely those Republicans as successors who are most similar to those being displaced."

Associated Press notes that another of Mr. Nixon's chief talent scouts was Dr. Glenn Olds, who (says *Human Events*) conferred over appointments for the Nixon Administration with a former member of the Young Communist League named Adam Yarmolinsky. It was Yarmolinsky, the son of two well-known Comrades, who according to *U.S. News & World Report* had earlier engineered the appointment by President Kennedy of Robert Strange McNamara as Secretary of Defense. No doubt Yarmolinsky, now a professor at Harvard, had some fascinating suggestions for Olds. As *Human Events* lamented:

*Dr. Glenn Olds, a chief talent scout for the Nixon Administration, continues his liberal ways. Having previously suggested that Nixon tap LBJ rejects Robert McNamara and Arthur Goldberg for the Cabinet, Olds has also recommended that the President-elect bring George Ball back into the government.*

Just how Dr. Olds, who says he "was involved in helping to get the Peace Corps going," and who worked with Sargent

\*For background on the C.F.R., see *American Opinion* for April 1969. The Leftist origin and nature of the Carnegie Endowment is covered in Rene Wormser's *Foundations: Their Power And Influence* (Devin-Adair, New York).

Shriver in setting up V.I.S.T.A., became a Nixon talent scout is a mystery. Olds' own explanation is rather hazy: "Mr. Nixon said, 'Glenn, I don't want you to be concerned with political partisanship. . . .'" He obviously wasn't.

The man in charge of top Nixon appointments was an international banker named Peter Flanigan. Stuart Loory notes of him in the *Los Angeles Times*:

*The keeper of the document known in the Nixon Administration as "The Plumb Book," one of the most powerful men in the capital during these early days of the new Presidency, has no official title, draws no salary and is preparing to leave town soon as quietly as he came.*

But, instead of leaving town, Flanigan joined the White House staff. He is used to such heights. Peter Flanigan is a senior partner in the international banking firm of Dillon, Reed & Company, where he works for former Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon, a member of the Board of Directors of the *Insiders' Council* on Foreign Relations. Columnist Loory suggests that Flanigan was playing Colonel House to Nixon's Woodrow Wilson:

*He was never appointed to a government position. Yet his office can be reached quickly by calling the White House switchboard. One White House official calls Flanigan's relationship to the White House "bizarre" and says objections to it were raised shortly after the inauguration. The objections were considered and rejected, however . . .*

*And along with submitting a sampling of evaluations by others to the President, Flanigan also expresses his own opinion on each applicant. As an aide said, "His power of suggestion is considerable."*

Yet another of the President's top procurers of talent for the Administration was Leonard Garment, a former Nixon law partner who, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, "considered himself a very liberal Democrat — until his conversion to the Nixon candidacy." The *Los Angeles Times*, in an article curiously titled "Outsider With Inside Ties," says of Leonard Garment:

*There are times in the White House when the discussion among President Nixon's staff reaches a point where someone will say:*

*"What does Len think about this?"*

*So someone will pick up a phone, dial 298-5970, and get Leonard Garment . . . [who] is only a half block from the White House; and, if necessary, Garment can get from his desk chair across the street and through the southwest gate of the White House (where he is not likely to be spotted entering) within a few minutes to render his advice in person.*

*Garment's name appears on no White House roster. He is not on federal salary. Yet he is one of the key men in the Nixon Administration.*

*He needs no clearance to get through the gate. He wears no Secret Service badge as other visitors must . . .*

*Garment studiously avoids interviews, preferring to stay as far behind the scenes as possible.*

That half-block walk must have been getting to be too much. Leonard Garment, "the very liberal Democrat," has now moved into the White House and, says *U.S. News & World Report*, is regarded as Nixon's "No. 1 idea man." Labor, according to columnist Victor Riesel, considers Mr. Garment a strong supporter of the "Left" inside the Presi-



dential councils. "Officially," writes Riesel, "Garment is special counsel to the President on the arts, voluntarism and minorities — reminiscent of a [Franklin] Rooseveltian aide, Dave Niles." That is an unfortunate comparison (unless Riesel is trying to tell us something) because David K. Niles was a White House contact man for Soviet agents. Others are calling Mr. Garment Nixon's Harry Hopkins — another unfortunate comparison, since Hopkins, too, was for all practical purposes a Soviet agent. (It was he who cleared the sending of key nuclear parts to the U.S.S.R. through Great Falls, Montana.)

The screening of thousands of prospects for rank-and-file jobs with the Nixon Administration was handled by Harry Flemming, age twenty-eight. He is the son of the radical Arthur Flemming, Leftist President of the National Council of Churches and head of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare under President Eisenhower. *Human Events* reports that Master Flemming's friends say he "is an out-and-out liberal who actually preferred Rockefeller to Nixon."

Young Flemming, hardly experienced enough at twenty-eight to be an authority on national talent, sent letters to all seventy-thousand persons listed in *Who's Who In America*\* soliciting suggestions for Presidential appointments. Neither Party nor ideology was a barrier, and many Republicans complained about the large number of jobs Flemming was handing out to "Liberal" Democrats. So bad was the situation that the witty Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, laughing lest he weep, urged Republican lawmakers to include this line in any letters of recommendation for a Nixon appointment going to Master Flemming: "Even though Zilch is a Republican, he's highly qualified for the job."

**Personal Staff:** Robert F. Ellsworth, a former Kansas Congressman defeated in a race for the Senate because of his militant "Liberalism," has served Mr. Nixon as a top White House Assistant for both do-

mestic and foreign affairs. Ellsworth was considered an expert on the International Monetary Fund engineered by Soviet agent Harry Dexter White. He has also been a Congressional sponsor of Atlantic Union legislation to create plans for merging the United States into a federation with Western Europe; a plan the President has vociferously backed. So interested is President Nixon in this project that he has now named Ellsworth to be U.S. Ambassador to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In a statement of September 1, 1966, to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Nixon said: "The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption." As early as 1951 Richard Nixon had co-sponsored the Atlantic Union Resolution in the U.S. Senate.

This attack on American sovereignty is no joke. The open plan is to use N.A.T.O. as a base for merging the United States into a regional world government. Ellsworth is set to play a key role. *Freedom & Union* magazine of May 1969 notes: "As President Nixon put it in stressing this appointment's 'significance,' Mr. Ellsworth, when 'in Congress, showed a particular understanding' of NATO problems. Noting that he was also his 'close personal friend and associate,' Mr. Nixon added that this appointment 'should signify to all' in NATO and the U.S., the 'deep personal interest that I as President' have in NATO.

"Mr. Ellsworth welcomed his post because of 'the President's deep interest and commitment' to 'an expanding and intensifying political dimension' for NATO."

A rising star in the Nixon constellation is Harry Dent, former administrative assistant to Senator Strom Thurmond. Dent's

\*The editors of this volume have exhibited a marked bias in listings to favor the Left.



job, according to the Allen-Goldsmith Report, is "smoothing Southern feathers, mollifying Southern critics and keeping Southern votes in line . . ." The *Chicago Daily News* reports that the appointment of Harry Dent was considered by anti-Thurmond Republicans as "merely a minor payoff to Thurmond for his prodigious labors for Nixon during the 1968 campaign." The *Daily News* adds: "Like Nixon, Dent is a political pragmatist. Like Nixon, he is a political animal who vastly enjoys the game . . . Dent has confided to friends that he and the President seem to 'mesh' instinctively in their approach to politics." Many felt that the Dent appointment was a victory for "Conservative" principles, but the "Liberal" *Daily News* says that is not so:

*Because Thurmond is regarded as a right-wing ideologist, many people have assumed that Dent, for so long his alter ego, is also an ideologist. But he is not . . . he apparently has had no trouble shifting his total allegiance to his new boss.*

The President has a five-man staff responsible for turning out his speeches and statements. Journalist J.F. Ter Horst, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, has reported that this team is "headed by James Keogh, a former executive editor of Time magazine." Serving as a key speech writer and policy advisor is Ray Price who, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, is "one of the more liberal Republicans." Says the *Journal*: "A former editorial writer for the now-defunct New York Herald Tribune, he [Price] wrote (and believed in) an editorial backing Lyndon Johnson in 1964."

Whenever Nixon needs an anti-Communist speech for (say) the American Legion, he turns to Patrick Buchanan, a former editorial writer for the conservative *St. Louis Globe Democrat*. Buchanan's job is to placate dismayed Republi-

cans who believed the campaign rhetoric he wrote for Mr. Nixon.

Another Nixon speech writer is Lee Heubner, former president of the ultra-Leftist Ripon Society. Heubner is quoted in the *Nation* as claiming, "We lost the struggle with the conservatives over the tone and content of Nixon's campaign. Now we've got to win the struggle over his Presidential policies; and, judging from his appointments and actions, I think we're doing all right."\* Accompanying Heubner on the White House team in other capacities are Leftist fellow-Riponers John Price, Christopher DeMuth, and Bruce Rabb. The "Conservative" Young Americans for Freedom is unrepresented.

**Henry Kissinger:** Mr. Nixon's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry A. Kissinger, is by far the most important man in the Nixon Administration. When President Nixon appointed Kissinger, America's Far Left went into a catalepsy of ecstasy. Professor Adam Yarmolinsky declared: "I will sleep better with Henry Kissinger in Washington." Arthur Schlesinger purred: "I think it's an excellent appointment. It's very encouraging. He's the best they'll get. He asked for my advice a few weeks ago and I urged him to accept." Even George F. Kennan "applauded." And John Kenneth Galbraith "called the appointment of his friend 'a good one.'" Also gushing over the naming of Kissinger were such stalwarts of the Left as James Reston, Max Lerner, and Joseph Kraft.

The *Wall Street Journal* says that this

\*In this *Nation* article, one of the Ripon Society's remaining officials, aging "youth-leader" Bruce Chapman (author of the incredibly vicious anti-Goldwater book, *The Party That Lost Its Head*) spells out how Ripon intends to take over: "At last we have a chance to have our people in government, actually making some of the decisions we've been advocating, or at least advising the decision makers . . . Nixon has already shown his sympathy with some of our ideas. Now they can be implemented."



German-born Harvard professor, referred to as "impatiently arrogant" by one colleague, "has been an intimate advisor on world affairs to New York Gov. Rockefeller since the 1950s." The *Journal* also says that Kissinger was "really bitter" at Nixon's nomination and felt he was incompetent in foreign affairs. According to *U.S. News & World Report*, Kissinger "was a professed admirer of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy."

The *New York Times* maintains that Nixon had only met Kissinger at a party the year before, and we are told that on the basis of that meeting the President selected him for the most important slot in his Administration. Obviously Richard Nixon made the appointment on the advice, or at the persuasion, of others. Just who those others were is not clear, though *Times*man James Reston notes:

*Dr. Kissinger, who took his doctoral degree at Harvard under McGeorge Bundy, has been . . . at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York and it is significant that he has the respect of most of the foreign policy experts who have served the last three presidents.*

Of course, it was the policies of those "experts" which Richard Nixon, the candidate, promised to repudiate.

The Council on Foreign Relations, on whose staff Kissinger served as a senior fellow, is the *Insider* organization dedicated to world government whose members have steered American foreign policy from one disaster to another for twenty-five years. Presidential Advisor Kissinger succeeds Walt Rostow and McGeorge Bundy, both C.F.R. activists, who held the same position on the White House staff under President Johnson. As Joseph C. Harsch, himself a member of the C.F.R., writes:

*Politically, Professor Kissinger belongs to the "Eastern Establishment" . . .*

*Kissinger has grown up in the foreign policy group which revolves around the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. He came to know, and work with, the whole cluster of top men in banking and industry who make up the true inner core of the so-called "Eastern Establishment."*

*A few names in the group are sufficient. It includes John J. McCloy, Douglas Dillon and David Rockefeller.*

*The Kissinger selection is reassuring to the men who backed Governor Rockefeller against Mr. Nixon.*

For the rest of us, however, it is not at all reassuring! Especially when one notes that Kissinger is now *The Man* in control of the Nixon foreign policy. Columnists Evans and Novak explain:

*Kissinger's influence, as a direct result of Mr. Nixon's wishes and Kissinger's own unique expertise . . . has also been extended over Secretary Melvin Laird's Defense Department. But his sway is far more apparent over State's traditional role as maker of foreign policy than over the Pentagon's defense role.*

Whenever the President travels it is Kissinger, not Laird or Rogers, who is strapped to his side, whispering in his ear. *U.S. News & World Report* quotes a White House staffer:

*Kissinger briefs the President every morning, and they generally talk things over at the end of the day. On a typical working day, they may also confer half a dozen other times.*

*Kissinger is one of the few men with instant access to the President at any hour of the day or night.*



Henry A. Kissinger also heads the twenty-five man National Security Council charged with forming U.S. defense policies. He helped President Nixon bring "new leadership" to America by picking twenty-three holdovers from the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations for that Council — a little fact almost totally ignored by the media. Columnist Anthony Harrigan, who did comment, noted: "The Kissinger selections would fit in nicely with a Hubert Humphrey or Edward Kennedy administration."

Kissinger even worked on a report for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace which opposed Nixon's campaign appeal for "nuclear superiority." He has also sounded the trumpet which is blowing retreat instead of victory in Vietnam. Columnist Jules Witcover wrote on June twenty-fourth of a private briefing dinner with Kissinger and eight of the nation's highest ranking columnists and news commentators. He says Kissinger "suggested strongly that the Nixon Administration is not unalterably opposed to an eventual Communist takeover in Saigon so long as the Administration isn't blamed for it."

While opposing "superiority" over the Communists, and promoting surrender in Vietnam, the President's alter ego favors disarmament and *détente* with the Kremlin. It is, alas, not an unfamiliar attitude. Indicative of Kissinger's C.F.R.-style objectives is his shocking attitude toward proposals in a new book called *Progress, Coexistence And Intellectual Freedom*. By a Russian named Andrei D. Sakharov, with an introduction by Harrison Salisbury, the volume has apparently been sent free and unsolicited to all members of the Book of the Month Club. Yet, according to a recent review in the *New York Times*, Sakharov predicts:

... peace and freedom through:  
(1) the victory within the Communist world by 1980 of liberalizing "realists" over the Maoists and Sta-

linists; (2) the triumph outside the Communist world by 1985 of "leftist reformist" elements over "the forces of racism and militarism"; (3) the diversion by 1990 of the economies of the converged social systems of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. into massive aid for the third world; and, (4) the emergence by 2000 of world government.

Now, here is the clincher. On the back of this volume of blatant Communist propaganda is a glowing *recommendation* of the book by Professor Henry A. Kissinger, stating in part: "The Sakharov document is . . . one of the most important documents on Communist affairs of recent years."

Anti-Communists have long claimed that the ultimate goal of the *Insiders* was convergence of the United States and the Soviet Union. Obviously, top Nixon advisor Henry A. Kissinger is wholeheartedly for it.

**Daniel P. Moynihan:** Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who by comparison makes Gore Vidal appear to be as masculine as John Wayne, is a primary architect of what *Newsweek* has called "Nixon's New Deal." Formally, he heads the new Council for Urban Affairs.

The *Chicago Tribune* says "Nixon stressed that Moynihan's post would be as important to the country in domestic affairs as is the planning of the national security council in foreign affairs . . . He said Moynihan would have the same access to the President as would Kissinger in foreign affairs." The *Indianapolis Star* quotes President Nixon as claiming: "Now we will have central advice and central planning." *Central planning*, of course, is a term used in Communist and Socialist countries where the authority of bureaucrats has replaced the free market.

Moynihan betrayed his Marxist convictions when he told the *Indianapolis News* that the proper federal role in



domestic social action is "redistributing income as between different levels of government, different regions, and different classes." Marx said it differently; he said it in German.

Moynihan is well qualified to be a "central planner." He was educated as a Fulbright fellow at that international mecca for "planners," the Fabian Socialists' London School of Economics. In fact, at the time of his appointment he was a member of the national Board of Directors of the Fabian Socialists' Americans for Democratic Action.

Before joining the Harvard faculty, Dr. Moynihan served three years on the staff of Leftist Governor Averell W. Harriman; was a writer of position papers for John F. Kennedy; and, served as Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations. It was in the latter post that *this* example of Mr. Nixon's "new leadership" assisted Sargent Shriver and Adam Yarmolinsky in writing the original Act which created the wildly Leftist Office of Economic Opportunity.

Moynihan criticized some of those running the War on Poverty for "not knowing what they were doing." That, we are asked to believe, made him acceptable to a Republican Administration.

There is no idea this side of Mao's communes that is too far Left for "The Incredible Mr. Limpet," as he is called in Washington. One discouraged White House advisor told a reporter for the *Los Angeles Times* that Moynihan and his Leftist team had developed "proposals that would curl your hair." Since that time, many have been adopted by the President himself. For example, the "guaranteed annual income" so often denounced by Richard Nixon in his campaign oratory has now been accepted by the President under the euphemism "family maintenance." If accepted by Congress, it will mean that one American in every nine will be the beneficiary of a federal Welfare cheque. Under the Nixon plan the total number of persons on the

federal Welfare dole by 1971, according to *U.S. News & World Report*, would be 22,443,000 — *double* the number currently receiving federal Welfare handouts.

Nixon's New Deal (which is really Moynihan's) is extravagantly praised by Establishment spokesman James Reston:

*A Republican president has ... come out in the end with a policy of spending more money for relief of more poor people than the welfare state Democrats ever dared to propose in the past.*

*This is beginning to be the story of American politics . . .*

*... he [Nixon] changes the rhetoric, the philosophy and the administration, but proposes more welfare, more people on public assistance, which will take more federal funds than any other president in the history of the Republic . . .*

*Nixon has taken a great step forward. He has cloaked a remarkably progressive [Leftist] welfare policy in conservative language . . .*

*He has repudiated his own party's record on social policy at home and even his own hawkish attitudes abroad, and this tells us something both about the President and the country.*

*For he has obviously concluded that the American people are for peace abroad and for a more decent distribution of wealth at home . . .*

The Establishment has spoken. Daniel Moynihan has fashioned for Mr. Nixon a Welfare program which, if not stopped by the Congress, will in coming years be expanded to proportions undreamed of since the fall of Rome. But Mr. Moynihan is far from through presenting his ideas for a Marxist America. The camel is in the tent.



**Arthur Burns:** Presidential Counselor Arthur Burns is a key if enigmatic power in the Nixon Administration. According to columnist Victor Riesel "he comes as close to being the nation's basic policy-maker as any presidential 'assistant' ever has been." The *Christian Science Monitor* says: "For the first time ever the United States has an official with the title Presidential Counselor — with cabinet rank, Dr. Arthur Burns...." White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler has referred to him as the "ranking member of the staff."

The job of Arthur Burns is coordinating, evaluating, and proposing domestic policies. Like Nixon's key advisor in foreign affairs, Dr. Henry Kissinger, Dr. Burns is also a member of the *Insiders'* operational center, the Council on Foreign Relations. Like Kissinger, too, he was born in Europe, at Stanislau, Austria. Nonetheless, Burns belongs to the Pilgrim Society, a secret group of Leftist international financiers dedicated to re-uniting the United States and Great Britain. The radical *Freedom & Union* magazine of February 1969 adds of Dr. Burns that "since 1961 he has been a charter member of the international movement for Atlantic Union."

As a young man, Arthur Burns became a *protégé* of Wesley C. Mitchell, a notorious supporter of Communist causes who headed the National Bureau of Economic Research, in which post Burns succeeded him. The two authored a book together and worked in close cooperation with the National Research Project, headed by a former employee of the National Bureau of Economic Research named David Weintraub. Mr. Weintraub, who like Burns was born in Austria and received his M.A. at Columbia, was identified by Whittaker Chambers as a Communist agent. In 1937 Burns became a research consultant with the U.S. Treasury Department. The Department's Assistant Director of Research at the time was Harry Dexter White, another Soviet agent. By

1941 Burns was made Chief Economist for F.D.R.'s Railway Emergency Board.

Yet, though an active Democrat, and having served Franklin Roosevelt in the New Deal, it was Arthur Burns who was the first named by President Eisenhower to the Council of Economic Advisors. In a statement displaying the utmost Christian charity, the *Christian Science Monitor* says Burns seemed "almost a flaming liberal" even in the Eisenhower Administration. But times change, and Dr. Burns has since been the recipient of a Madison Avenue build-up as the "Conservative" among Nixon's top advisors. Either Burns is playing a role, or this Administration is so far to the Left that a Roosevelt New Dealer seems conservative by comparison. After all, Dr. Burns is a trustee of the ultra-Leftist Twentieth Century Fund. Serving with him there have been the late J. Robert Oppenheimer, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., and John Kenneth Galbraith — none known for fits of Rightwing Extremism. The Fund is, of course, an assembly of Fabian Socialists dedicated to promoting national and international "planning." It has bankrolled Fabian projects in the United States for years.

Nonetheless, we are asked to believe that Dr. Arthur Burns carries on a running battle with admitted "Liberals" Robert Finch and Daniel Moynihan. One can only say of such press agency that for the man who is supposed to be the most influential of Mr. Nixon's advisors, Burns seems to lose with uncommon regularity. In view of his background, it is hard to believe Dr. Burns puts up much of a battle over increased spending and the growing centralization of power in Washington.

**Robert Finch:** "I know I am basically a political animal," says Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch. And, there can be little doubt about *that!* Yet, Finch turned down a Nixon offer to be Vice President and gave up his post as Attorney General of California and a long-time mistress (who



was quickly married off) to join Nixon's "new leadership" team as Welfare Secretary. A former Nixon assistant and campaign manager, Robert Finch is probably the President's closest personal friend and has been mentioned by *U.S. News & World Report* as Mr. Nixon's top choice for his replacement after two terms.

Mr. Finch joined Flanigan, Garment, Johnson, and Flemming in the post-election selection of staff for the Administration. He took his pick of posts, and now heads a bureaucracy spending more than \$50 billion annually. Finch administers federal programs for education, school desegregation, Welfare, Social Security, Medicare, and public health which ultimately have power over every citizen. Most Nixon voters felt that spending would be pared under the G.O.P., but Bob Finch quickly announced there would be no cuts. "One of my passions," Finch writes in *Republican Battle Line*, "has always been that we must rebuild the Republican party somewhat closer to the Democratic party." His passion has not been unrequited since joining the "new leadership." After interviewing him, the *New York Times* commented: "Gone is the old Republican dream of slowing the outgush of Federal funds."

Mr. Finch began his "crash program" of training for his new job last November by going through tutorial sessions with ultra-"Liberal" John Gardner (a member of the C.F.R. and L.B.J.'s first Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare) and then with the openly Marxist Wilbur Cohen, who had succeeded Gardner. John Gardner, Finch told the *New York Times*, was sounded out about a post in the Nixon Cabinet, but refused. And, reports *Republican Battle Line*, Finch also "pleaded with Cohen to stay on in the Nixon Administration in some capacity." Wilbur Cohen declined and became Welfare aide to Nelson Rockefeller, who has regularly conferred with Finch on new ways to increase Welfare spending.

After twelve hours of briefing from

numerous "experts" assembled at Nixon headquarters last January, Secretary Finch emerged to inform the *New York Times* that while most of his instructors were "Liberal" Democrats, there was "widespread consensus on our set of priorities." Though the Great Society's socialist schemes had been opposed by a majority of Congressional Republicans, Finch made it clear that he would support the Great Society programs, and add to them with his own ideas. As columnist Jack Anderson observes: "It wasn't too many years ago that talk of federal welfare spending from a card-carrying Republican would have resulted in his demotion to a stamp lick in some obscure county headquarters." But, under the "new leadership" of the Nixon Administration, all that has changed as Finch and Nixon "rebuild the Republican Party . . . closer to the Democratic."

Robert Finch's one apparent defeat in the Nixon Administration came over the refusal of the President to approve the appointment of socialist John Knowles to be an Assistant Secretary.\* Much was made about Nixon "moving to the Right" and capitulating to the American Medical Association, but it was a propaganda show. The appointment went to Dr. Roger Egeberg, a "Liberal" Democrat to the Left of Knowles.

The Secretary's greatest dilemma has been how to regulate forced integration of public schools in the South without alienating needed Southern voters. Here, political realities clash with Leftist dogma. Breaking yet another campaign "promise," the Nixon Administration has nixed the "freedom of choice" proposals because not enough Southern school children were making what federal guideline writers felt was the right choice.

It was Secretary Finch, along with Daniel Moynihan, who was responsible for selling President Nixon on the new

\*After his defeat, Dr. Knowles posed for *Life* photographers delivering a clenched-fist salute. (*Life*, July 11, 1969, Pp. 30-31.)



Welfare program which will admittedly double the number of Americans on Welfare and probably quadruple the number of federal social workers. The *Indianapolis News* quotes Finch as saying:

*Sure, there are always those who are going to say "... given any amount of money, a guy is going to prefer to lay on his duff and drink beer." But we are betting that most guys, just in terms of self-respect and the work ethic of this country, they want a job.*

Mr. Finch should check the want ads in any metropolitan newspaper against the list of those already being paid by Welfare to lay on their duff and drink beer. "Ethic," indeed!

Of course, Secretary Finch picked as his chief assistant James Farmer, behind Stokely Carmichael and H. "Rap" Brown (whom Farmer has praised as "a beneficial influence on the American scene") probably the most radical black militant in the United States. While head of the Congress of Racial Equality, Farmer told the *New York Times*: "CORE is the hard cutting edge of the civil rights movement. We're more militant than Malcolm X." One remembers that Malcolm was a member of the Communist Socialist Workers Party.

This example of Mr. Nixon's "new leadership" was employed by the Marxist League for Industrial Democracy (and was until recently its Vice President). Farmer was also on the original Board of Directors\* of the Communist-led Students for a Democratic Society, and has been on the Boards of Directors of the Fabian Socialists' Americans for Democratic Action and the Communist-founded A.C.L.U.† He has been a sponsor of the Leftist Committee for a SANE

\*S.D.S. was created by the League for Industrial Democracy, with which it broke in 1966 for tax purposes.

†See *American Opinion*, September 1969, Pp. 57-90.

Nuclear Policy, and a member of the National Executive Board of the American Committee on Africa, which has financially supported such openly Communist terrorists as Holden Roberto and Eduardo Mondlane.

Finch promised Farmer a "considerable up-graded status" in his job and "a powerful voice in planning and reorganization of the department." That's some "new leadership," isn't it? Well to the Left of even the Johnson mode. No wonder we find the *Des Moines Register* of April 20, 1969, quoting Farmer as saying: "The Nixon Administration cannot be characterized as 'conservative.'"

James E. Allen: The appointment of Dr. James E. Allen to the dual position of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, as well as U.S. Commissioner of Education, raised many an eyebrow among those who had taken seriously Mr. Nixon's oft-repeated campaign denunciation of school integration by busing. Dr. Allen had earned the title of "Mr. Busing" as Commissioner of Education for New York State. *Time* magazine of February 14, 1969, crowed, "Liberal fears were emphatically laid to rest" by the appointment. *Time* also noted that Allen had turned down an offer for the same appointment under President Kennedy in 1961, but had since been persuaded that the federal government is the best place from which to administer the public schools. As *Human Events* mourned:

*What Allen will probably choose to accomplish in his new post can be gauged from his New York performance in the past six years. On June 14, 1963, he issued a directive to every school district in New York demanding the elimination of "racially unbalanced" schools. Allen then defined a "racially unbalanced" school as "one having 50% or more Negroes enrolled." Since this incredible edict, Allen has been disrupting the*



*state's school system by energetically trying to end de facto segregation, closing down perfectly good schools if they are "racially unbalanced" and instituting a massive busing program.*

The efforts of Dr. Allen to ram forced busing down the throats of New Yorkers created havoc. Public reaction was so strong that New York State recently passed a law prohibiting forced busing, directly repudiating Dr. James E. Allen's cattle-car approach to education.

A telling indication of James Allen's mania for forced integration is the fact that his busing program was an arrogant and flagrant violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which says: "Desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

But, cattle-car racism is apparently not Dr. Allen's only Leftist eccentricity. *Time* magazine notes that he has also been "charged with 'coddling the Communists.'" The *Congressional Record* for March 24, 1969, adds some details:

*In the late 1950s Allen put pressures on the [New York] city board of education to help eliminate an investigation into Communist teachers headed by assistant corporation counsel Saul Moskoff. Allen, further, is considered almost as responsible as John Lindsay for permitting [Communist] racial militants to take over the schools in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville area.*

Allen has carried this philosophy with him to Washington. A report from his Office of Education sent to the McClellan Subcommittee investigating campus disorders gave "little credence" to the evidence that outside agitators are responsible for starting the recent campus troubles. Columnist Paul Scott reports that McClellan's probers claim "Allen doesn't

know what he is talking about." Scott, who calls Dr. Allen "Nixon's most liberal" appointee, also says the McClellan Subcommittee wanted to know why Allen's agency hasn't cut off federal scholarships and loans to students involved in campus riots.

Later, Allen told United Press that the student activists disrupting the nation's campuses are "the finest young generation we've ever had," adding: "Disrupters and their sympathizers are usually the brightest students and the most socially concerned." Asked if he had the President's backing in his support of the radicals and militants, Dr. Allen replied: "Well, I can't speak for Mr. Nixon. I think Mr. Nixon's, President Nixon's, objectives are just the same as mine and the very fact that I'm here as his appointee would indicate that he is at least sympathetic in the general direction in which I'm moving."

What is that direction? It is Left, Lefter, Leftist on everything from busing and coddling Communists to the required teaching of sex techniques in the schools. Of the latter, Allen told U.P.I. on May 21, 1969: "Sex education is essential. . . . The biggest problem in sex education is not the children, but the damn parents . . . . They think it's sinister."

Imagine that.

And, imagine what the federal education bureaucracy under Dr. Allen is going to cost. The *New York Times* for July 9, 1969, quotes him as advocating a 350 percent rise in federal expenditure for education within the next decade. With that expenditure, as always before, will come a proportionate rise in federal control.

**William P. Rogers:** Many are beginning to wonder what William P. Rogers really does. He is, of course, Secretary of State; but the authority of that office obviously lies with Henry Kissinger. Rogers is an old and close friend of the President's and can, apparently, be relied upon to play Charlie McCarthy.



The appointment of Rogers was, like so many of President Nixon's choices, hailed by "Liberal" Democrats. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield called the selection "An excellent choice. I am delighted with his appointment and look forward to a continuing good relationship with him." The ultra-Leftist Senator William Fulbright, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was even more lavish in his praise for this "Republican." Fulbright had made no secret of his opinion that Secretary Dean Rusk was too far Right for him, but he called Rogers a "man of unquestioned integrity and ability," adding: "I have known Mr. Rogers for many years and have the highest regard for him . . . I feel sure that his common sense and good judgment will serve the country well."

According to "Liberal" columnists Evans and Novak, the appointment of Rogers despite his lack of experience in foreign affairs "is being received in the elegant circles of Manhattan's Republican establishment with a profound sigh of relief . . . Rogers is well-known . . . and highly regarded." They were afraid that Nixon would appoint a hard-line anti-Communist.

William Rogers, having won his spurs working behind the scenes to destroy Taft at the 1952 Republican Convention with the false charge that the Conservative Ohio Senator was "stealing" delegates, was named by President Eisenhower to succeed Herbert Brownell as Attorney General. From this position he did nothing to carry out Ike's promise to expose and remove Communists from the State Department. But, he did spearhead the move to destroy Senator Joseph McCarthy, who was doing his best to hold Ike to that campaign promise. According to the *New Republic*, Rogers spent most of his time attempting "to enforce compliance with the Supreme Court's finding of 1954 that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional." It was he, for example, who persuaded President

Eisenhower to send troops to integrate the schools of Little Rock.\*

Under President Johnson, Rogers was named an alternate member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations; where, relates the admiring *New Republic*, he labored "in the interest of human rights everywhere."

During his campaign, President Nixon proclaimed: "I want a Secretary of State who will join me in cleaning house in the State Department." This promise has been repudiated, but Rogers declares the State Department is in "excellent" condition. Willard Edwards, the nationally respected Washington correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune*, observed that the "architects of the past," so decried by the Republicans, are now safe. As Edwards explains: "When Nixon won the Presidency and announced Rogers as his pick for Secretary of State, seventy-seven State Department officers wrote out their resignations. But when Rogers announced that [*anti-anti-Communist*] Ivar Rimestad would be retained as deputy undersecretary of administration, the resignations were never submitted to the White House."†

While electioneering, Richard Nixon had promised "justice" for Otto Otepka, the former State Department security officer who had been removed for resisting the placement of security risks in the State Department. Rogers blocked Otepka's re-appointment; which was not altogether surprising since Rogers is so committed to the Left that he has been an

\*Those troops were commanded by General Edwin A. Walker, who became aware of the Communist hands behind this affair and, after being muzzled while in command in West Germany, resigned his commission. It is curious that in the subsequent famous case involving the libel by the Associated Press of General Walker, William P. Rogers represented A.P. against the General before the U.S. Supreme Court.

†Rogers seems drawn to Leftists. The *Washington Sunday Star* of January 19, 1969, revealed that he "wrote Nixon a letter recommending that Nixon name Justice Abe Fortas as chief justice if Nixon won."



attorney for the ultra-Leftist *Washington Post*, a powerful enemy of Otepka. Mr. Otepka was shunted off to a dead-letter office (thanks to Supreme Court decisions) called the Subversive Activities Control Board. It was a political decision described by one Washington observer this way: "Everyone saved face, and the security risks saved their jobs."

Nationally syndicated columnist Holmes Alexander wrote of the matter: "There are many Democratic hold-overs [in the State Department] — actually 12 that were on Senator Joe McCarthy's list of subversives — and they won't stand for Otepka's coming back to take charge of security files." The same old hands that have pushed America from one disaster to another are now safely protected under William Rogers' "new leadership."

Secretary Rogers — who, no doubt by coincidence, is like Kissinger a member of the Council on Foreign Relations — absolutely outdoes the doviest doves in his trust of the Communists. As *Human Events* notes: "Rogers, according to one high State Department source, is constantly thinking up ways in which the United States can make concessions to the Soviets." The *Wall Street Journal* of April 8, 1969, reported Mr. Rogers' first press conference this way: "The Secretary of State said he had 'difficulty believing' the Soviet or any country would ever wish to be the first to launch a nuclear attack . . . Mr. Rogers also found it 'hard to understand' why the Soviet is deploying big 25-megaton SS9 missiles." William Rogers even told Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee that he favors "early talks with the Russians" and (with President Nixon's support, despite campaign oratory) pushed through the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Not unexpectedly, Captive Nations Week came and went without a peep from Rogers.

Secretary of State Rogers has gone so far to accommodate the Communists as to tell the Senate Foreign Relations Com-

mittee on March 27, 1969, that "we are not seeking a military victory" in Vietnam. He has even announced that "the presence of some Communists in the South Vietnamese government would be acceptable to the U.S." The *New York Times*' James Reston quotes him as talking publicly about taking "some risks to end the war." The risks taken by the 38,000 young Americans already killed by the Communists in Vietnam do not seem to be a matter of special concern to the Secretary.

**Melvin Laird:** The appointment of former Wisconsin Congressman Melvin Laird as Secretary of Defense won hearty cheers from "Conservatives." Laird, it seemed, was the one genuine "Conservative" in the Nixon Cabinet. He had an excellent voting record and had tailored the 1964 Republican platform to the liking of Barry Goldwater. He was also qualified by experience for the position, having been a leading member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee where he made a show of fighting Robert McNamara tooth and nail. Like Nixon, Laird had publicly deplored the lag in development of new weapons under McNamara. He grabbed headlines by accusing McNamara of creating a situation where we were left progressively more naked before our enemies, and complained that our foreign policy was an essentially passive one.

Melvin Laird was Richard Nixon's principal defense policy advisor during the recent campaign, and was widely credited with being responsible for some of the tough stands Nixon took in his oratory. Like Nixon, Laird publicly rejected the idea of nuclear "parity" as opposed to U.S. superiority — until after the election. At one time Laird had advocated air strikes on Haiphong, but during the campaign he counselled Republicans to ease off on this sort of talk lest the G.O.P. sound like a war party.

In what now seems ironic, the *Los Angeles Times* reported last December:



*Laird struck hard at President Johnson's promise in October, 1966, to withdraw American troops from Vietnam within six months if Hanoi would do likewise and stop infiltration. Laird said such a promise was disastrous . . .*

Mr. Laird's views apparently changed overnight when he became Secretary of Defense. He now vigorously supports U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. The *Los Angeles Times* says he "has acknowledged the probability of a coalition government in Saigon." *Human Events* observes:

*Contrary to expectations, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, a hardliner on most military matters, is providing extremely "dovish" counsel to the President on the Viet Nam war . . . Laird, according to well informed sources, rather than pressing for military victory, is still pushing a soft-line on Viet Nam with the new Administration.*

Secretary Laird has also forgotten about his public criticism of Robert McNamara over the need for new offensive weapons. He killed the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, which would have provided us with protection from a Russian attack from space, after \$1.3 billion had already been spent on its development. Everything is to be gambled on the insufficient A.B.M., a purely defensive system.

The appointments made by the new Defense Secretary have also been baffling in light of his earlier protestations. The *Wall Street Journal* notes that Laird:

*. . . indicated there will be much business-as-usual under his leadership. Three appointees are hold-overs from the present Administration, and Mr. Laird stressed the controversial Office of Systems Analysis will continue its "very important function."*

This was McNamara's whiz-kid corps, which Congressman Laird and candidate Nixon had so sharply criticized. The *Journal* continues:

*Mr. [John] Foster's retention, though previously rumored, seemingly contradicts some other Nixon campaign statements. The President frequently complained that the Pentagon's current management has been falling behind in the research race with the Soviet Union, but now has reappointed the man in charge of criticized research and development programs.*

There has been much speculation over what happened to Laird. Like Dent, did he prove more "flexible" under pressure than it had been supposed he would? Is he simply a figurehead with the real power in the hands of Henry Kissinger? True, Laird *could* be torn between the desire to resign and the rationalization that if he stays on he may win a few battles. That is possible.

There is also a theory that Nelson Rockefeller has some kind of hold over him. *Human Events* reported in its issue for January 20, 1968, that Laird, "generally thought to be a conservative, last week urged Rocky to enter the presidential primary in Oregon . . . his request that the governor enter into the presidential contest suggests he is not especially happy that Nixon will probably be the Republican nominee." The Evans and Novak column of December 9, 1968, noted that Rocky "advised Nixon in Palm Springs last week that a McNamara-type administrator would be a mistake in the Pentagon today and what was needed now was a student and practitioner of geopolitics. In Laird, Nixon has exactly what Rockefeller recommended."

Secretary Laird responded by naming as his Deputy Secretary one David Packard, a Rockefeller supporter who has been an outspoken promoter of trade



with the Communists. (Rockefeller and partner Cyrus Eaton control all patents going to the Soviet Union. See *New York Times* for January 16, 1967.) Evans and Novak, however, maintain that Packard was recommended by "one of Laird's closest friends: John Gardner . . . (who was boosted by Laird as Richard M. Nixon's running mate)." If C.F.R. *Insider* John Gardner, a top Leftist, is one of Laird's closest friends, America is in trouble.

Was Laird a sleeper? A man making "Conservative" noises only to satisfy the constituents of his highly conservative Congressional District? What, then, of his loud criticism of former Secretary McNamara on every conceivable public occasion? What, indeed. On December 17, 1968, nationally syndicated columnist Holmes Alexander may have blown the cover, as follows:

*In times of stress Defense Secretary Robert McNamara frequently slipped off from the Pentagon, crossed the river and eased himself into the House office suite for a talk with Congressman Melvin Laird.*

*I would not have known about this except for the accident of being in Laird's office one day and of being told that McNamara had been there shortly before. This little-known, almost covert relationship between the past-Secretary and the incoming Secretary says a good deal about Mr. Nixon's choice of Laird to run the Defense Department.*

Yes, it certainly does. It also says a great deal about just how important and clever a figure Melvin Laird really is.

**John Mitchell:** Attorney General John Mitchell is rumored to be one of the two or three most powerful men in the Nixon Administration; yet, his ideological colors remain an absolute mystery. *Time* magazine of July 25, 1969, observed of him:

*"Pragmatic," the favorite adjective of the Nixon Administration, is the word Mitchell's friends use to describe him.*

*If Mitchell's position on major issues is still uncertain, his place in the White House hierarchy is not. He is probably the strongest man in the Administration, with great influence on domestic matters.*

The fact that the Nixon Administration is, in the words of Establishment spokesman James Reston, "zig-zagging to the Left," may give us a clue as to the real John Mitchell. He is often described as a "conservative," but there is not as yet any hard evidence in deeds to back up his sometimes vigorous rhetoric. The *Wall Street Journal* says:

*Mr. Mitchell acknowledges — but denies the truth of — a widespread surmise that he is "a hard-nosed conservative who's going to lower the boom on everyone." . . . The new Attorney General pledges to steer a moderate course on the major problems facing the nation's legal establishment.*

Another clue to "the real Mitchell" is the fact that he has done everything but bring in that "new leadership" to do the much needed house-cleaning of a Justice Department so long dominated by the Left. Evans and Novak comment:

*In Atty. Gen. John Mitchell's huge Justice Department, for example, most first and second level assistants to the new assistant attorneys general are being retained. This means that scores of government lawyers hired by John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson are staying on.*

Mitchell served as Nixon's campaign manager, and had maintained he would



"never accept" a Cabinet post. And, some of his critics complain that his background as a Wall Street expert on municipal bonds — about as far removed from criminal practice as a lawyer can get — was not the best preparation for the government's chief attorney. But Mitchell has friends in high places. He has close ties, for example, with Nelson Rockefeller. The *Wall Street Journal* for January 17, 1969, quotes Rocky as saying to Nixon: "Don't you know? John is my lawyer." You bet he knew!

The *Journal* also reveals that Mitchell has little regard for strict constitutional government or fiscal control by the taxpayers:

*Mr. Mitchell is credited with an innovation in the municipal bond field that has had an enormous effect on one of his big new challenges — civil rights. One problem the bond field faced in the past was that most state constitutions required voter approval of all bonded indebtedness. The voters often denied approval for an issue.*

*Working in the area of public housing, Mr. Mitchell devised a formula to circumvent the constitutional problem . . .*

Attorney General Mitchell reputedly supports the "Southern strategy" used by Nixon to win the election, and Mitchell's assistant, Kevin Phillips, recently published a book giving statistical proof that the future of the Republican Party lies not in the megalopolis of the North but in the suburbs and rural areas of the South, Midwest, and West. In order to keep the South in the Nixon camp, Mitchell apparently advocates that some strategic dialectical moves be made to appease Southerners. Columnist Nick Thimmesch writes:

*Working in tandem with H.E.W. Secretary Robert Finch, Mitchell*

*has pursued a course in school desegregation which holds that cutting off funds to laggard districts doesn't insure integration. Better, he says, to continue to fund the districts . . . and take the stubborn districts to court. Mitchell feels this gives moderate Southerners the face-saving ploy of submitting to court order, thus protecting their honor.*

After all the talk about "law and order" during the campaign, the Nixonites apparently had little specific in mind, and the war on crime remains largely on the drawing boards. Mitchell and Finch have reportedly been carrying on a hot battle over what to do about cracking down on student militants. At first, Mitchell made strong statements. Then, he came out against tough new laws, leading the Republican Battle Line to wonder:

*Mitchell's warning against "repressive" new laws had the ring of Bob Finch's past protests. Had Finch finally won out in the Administration's inner councils?*

Or could it be that the battles aren't really as fierce as the press agents would have us believe?

During the election campaign, intelligence and law enforcement officers across the country passionately hoped for a Nixon victory, thinking it would mean a crackdown on the paramilitary Black Nationalists and the Communists of the New Left. These men knew that literally tons of evidence against such subversives had been turned over to the Justice Department, but never acted upon. They expected scores of indictments would follow as soon as the new Attorney General saw the situation. They are still waiting!

Charles Yost: Doubtless in his quest to bring "new leadership" to the Adminis-



tration, President Nixon offered the post of Ambassador to the United Nations to Humbert Humphrey, Eugene McCarthy, and Sargent Shriver before settling for the virtually unknown Charles Yost. Yost had headed Humphrey's study group on international organizations and peace-keeping, and had served on the U.S. staff at the United Nations under such "Conservatives" as Adlai Stevenson and Arthur Goldberg.

Charles Yost has quite a background. He is reported to have attended a Communist indoctrination course at the Anglo-American Institute of Moscow University in 1934, having made two previous trips to the "workers' paradise" in 1929 and 1933. He returned to work in several New Deal agencies under Lee Pressman, Virginius Frank Coe, and Alger Hiss — all, as it developed later, Communist spies. He was a member of the Communist Institute for Pacific Relations which did so much to establish Mao in China. And, like Henry Kissinger, Ambassador Yost enters the Nixon Administration directly from his job as senior fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations.

Yost's views are just what one would expect considering his background. In an article entitled "World Order and American Responsibility" in the C.F.R.'s *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, Mr. Yost maintains that "world order," a standard euphemism for world government, depends upon the willingness of the United States and the Soviets to "share responsibility" for supporting the establishment of a permanent U.N. "peacekeeping force."

The Associated Press reports Charles Yost advocates that the United States support "establishment of a U.N. peacekeeping force of up to 40,000 troops and put up half of a \$60 million fund to finance it." The *Milwaukee Journal* quotes Yost as stating, "If mankind is to survive to the end of this century, there is going to have to be a rather rapid assimilation of nation-states into a more

coherent and functional international system." The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* quotes him as declaring: "I think we must work for the evolution of the nation state system into a world federal structure. It's time to move away from old slogans and clichés about national interests, national honor, and toward structures which will provide a really more rational and more sensible basis for a permanent world order . . ." That is, he openly favors merging the United States into a World Government.

Yost says of Red China:

*She should be invited without delay, and without regard to her current disorders, into the United Nations, and into all other appropriate international organizations.*

Charles Yost testified before the Democratic Platform Committee that the "chief threat to international and U.S. security is not, at least in the near future, Communist aggression," but the "arms race." The Soviet rape of Czecho-Slovakia, claimed Yost, was not aggression but "an internally defensive rather than an externally aggressive action." The pursuit of *détente* with the Russians, he said, should not be interrupted by such Soviet moves, and the U.S. should now think about reducing U.S. troops in Western Europe. Yost adds that he believes the "absence of Communist China, North Viet Nam and North Korea [from the United Nations] inhibits the United Nations from undertaking a peacekeeping role in East Asia . . ." And, finally, Yost advocates that the U.S. unilaterally begin "restricting major new [arms] programs" and pursue disarmament with the Soviets.

One can imagine that each night in the Kremlin they drink a toast to Charlie Yost and Richard Nixon's "new leadership."

**George Schultz:** As a personality, Secretary of Labor George Shultz is no threat to replace the stars of *Laugh In*,



but many Republicans are threatening a *Cry In* over his policies. Promoted by the Press as another "good gray pragmatist" acceptable to both business and labor, Shultz has proved to be more pink than gray and has helped form a phalanx with Moynihan and Finch to promote revolutionary expansions in Welfare outlays.

The *Chicago Tribune* reports that five of his six assistants are Democrats, and that when Republican Senators began screaming about this Shultz replied: "Why, I've been clearing them — with Senator Javits! He approved them all." The *Wall Street Journal* quotes Secretary Schultz as explaining: "I didn't ask people about their politics."

A little-known college professor who had served as the senior staff economist on President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisors and been named by President Kennedy to the President's Commission on Labor-Management Policy, Shultz has been severely criticized by Republican lawmakers for his big-union activism. *Human Events* reports that these Republicans "remain totally in the dark as to why a Republican labor secretary feels he must augment the powers of Democratic-controlled unions." On the other hand, the *Wall Street Journal* notes: "At AFL-CIO headquarters here, where the Secretary has established an easy working relationship with fellow golfing enthusiast George Meany, Research Director Nat Goldfinger comments, 'George Schultz is one of the most decent and compassionate people in Government today. He's a moderate Republican who believes in the trade union movement . . .'"

The latest move of Secretary Schultz, called the "Philadelphia Plan," will in effect establish a racial quota for employers with government contracts. Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur Fletcher is quoted by Associated Press as decreeing that Shultz's "Philadelphia Plan" will soon be spread nationwide; and, in areas where sufficient qualified Negro labor is

not available, "the government will find the workers and say 'Here are the bodies . . .'"

**George Romney:** Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts reportedly turned down Richard Nixon's offer to head the Department of Housing and Urban Development and recommended George Romney. Even though Romney had on February 9, 1964, blasted the creation of H.U.D. in the strongest of terms as a scheme "to increase the dependence of cities and urban units of government on the federal government," he accepted the appointment. Romney is known to have the worst case of Potomac fever since Williams Jennings Bryan began bellowing on the Platte.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is pushing the Nixon axiom that last year's wasteful, extravagant Democrat boondoggle is this year's efficiently operated Republican necessity. The *Los Angeles Times* reports:

*There are almost 835,000 federally subsidized housing units. The Nixon Administration intends to boost the figure to 1 million by next summer . . . the Administration [will] sign housing subsidy contracts costing at least \$440 million a year. That would boost by more than 50% the existing subsidy . . .*

Republicans have traditionally opposed tax-financed housing. Romney, echoing F.D.R.'s socialist "Four Freedoms," now claims that it is the job of the federal government to see that "everyone should live in a decent home in a suitable environment." That, he says, is a national goal of the first priority. If a citizen can't, or won't, work hard to earn for himself and his family "a home in a suitable environment," then George Romney will see to it that productive citizens are taxed to provide such a home. This, despite the fact that government housing



has a nasty history of being rapidly turned into federal slums.

The Associated Press reports that Secretary Romney "is advocating expansion of the Model Cities program to include entire cities." It explains that "Romney's proposals . . . could in time establish the program administered by his Department of Housing and Urban Development as the government's chief mechanism for the coordination and delivery of social service to all the nation's cities." What of the rights of the cities and states to meet their own needs without federal interference? Well, George Romney spoke to the Charlotte, North Carolina, Chamber of Commerce about that. The *Manchester Union Leader* of January 4, 1967, quotes his remark this way: "As far as I am concerned, the states have no rights!"

Secretary Romney now serves as Chairman of President Nixon's Committee on Voluntary Action, which is dedicated to turning every person who can't mind his own business into an amateur social worker. "We hope to enlist every American and citizen volunteer" into social action work, Romney says. Many of his ideas in this field may come from Marxist agitator Saul Alinsky, who has been cited in Alinsky's promotional literature as "a friend and informal consultant to Michigan's Governor George Romney."

Poor George Romney is always talking faster than he thinks, lending a great deal of credence to the *bon mot*: "Deep down, he's shallow." For example, he had been screaming for more money from the War on Poverty until a member of the House Appropriations Committee carefully pointed out to him that the latest H.U.D. report shows he has almost \$11 billion in allocated, but unobligated, funds in the till already. The Congressman observed: "At the rate projects are being approved at HUD, it will take Romney more than five years to earmark the money Congress has appropriated."

Meanwhile, Secretary Romney con-

tinues to make "Liberal" noises on every conceivable subject. He has an instant opinion on everything from ants to fear of zombies in Harlem. A dove on Vietnam since he recovered from his now famous "brainwash," Mr. Romney favors U.N. membership for Red China, expanded trade with the Communists, negotiations with the Communists, and that U.S.-Soviet Consular Treaty. He is a staunch and outspoken anti-anti-Communist, opposes private schools, is against right-to-work laws, and wants to see the kindly Vietcong admitted to a Coalition Government in Vietnam. Romney has been listed as a member of the Detroit Committee of the Council on Foreign Relations, is a member of the Board of U.N.E.S.C.O.'s notoriously Leftist Council on World Tensions, and is a life member of the N.A.A.C.P.

A political rival of Nixon's for the Republican nomination, George Romney's credentials as a Republican hardly qualify him for the Pachyderm Hall of Fame. Dr. Francis X. Gannon has collected some Romney gems on this subject in his authoritative *Biographical Dictionary Of The Left*. They include the following: "I am neither a Republican nor a Democrat." (*Detroit News*, December 5, 1958) — "I am not a Republican . . . I was a Republican, but I am an independent now." (*Detroit Free Press*, January 30, 1960) — "I am a Republican . . . I have been a Republican all my life. I have never been anything else." (*Detroit Free Press*, January 8, 1964.)

But, as he prepared to run for Governor of Michigan, Mr. Romney refused to declare his political affiliation until state law required his "citizens groups" to identify themselves. He had, after all, worked for the Truman Administration and had been hailed by Walter Reuther for his progressivism. Maybe he was really a Democrat! In his campaign the word "Republican" could not be found on any of his literature, and he would not operate out of Republican Party Head-



quarters. His loyalty to the Party was well displayed in 1964 by his attempts to destroy Barry Goldwater before and after the Arizonan's nomination. All of this apparently qualifies George Romney for the type of "new leadership" which Nixon promised during the campaign.

**David Kennedy:** Chicago banker David Kennedy was to Americans at-large a virtual unknown when tapped to serve as Secretary of the Treasury in the Nixon Administration. The *New Republic* described him as a man with "an active social conscience." The *Chicago Tribune* commented that Kennedy was a banker who "normally would be classified a fiscal conservative, but tends closer to the center." *Coin World* tells us:

*From 1930 to 1946, Mr. Kennedy served as a member of the staff of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve system, successively climbing from technical assistant . . . to special assistant to Marriner Eccles.*

Eccles, a radical socialist, was called the nation's "most liberal banker." That seems to be more indicative of Secretary Kennedy's real inclinations. In his biography submitted to the Senate Finance Committee, Kennedy said that during World War II he "played a key role in Treasury finance." That looks fine, until you stop to realize that the man running such operations in the Treasury Department at the time was a Soviet agent named Harry Dexter White, and you check back and find that even earlier, while Harry Dexter White was running the Department of Research at Treasury, Kennedy was assigned to that division.

David Kennedy, as it turns out, moved from Treasury to the Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company. Doubtless because of his training in the Department under White, he rapidly expanded the Bank's international activities, rising to Chairman of the Board. Thanks

to his efforts, Continental Illinois now has more extensive international bank facilities than any other bank between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The Bank has branches in New York, London, Tokyo, Osaka, Frankfurt, Paris, etc. A top international banker, it is not surprising to note that David Kennedy has for five years been a Chicago director of the dangerous Council on Foreign Relations. And, Kennedy is an active anti-anti-Communist. The *Chicago Tribune* of June 22, 1966, names him as president of the Committee on Advancing the Democratic Process, an A.D.L.-I.A.D. front which sponsored a reprehensible Communist Fronter named Franklin Littell in a program condemning anti-Communists and falsely smearing them with Naziism.

Described by the confused *Wall Street Journal* as a man who "combines conservative and liberal traits," Kennedy is a Keynesian quoted by *U.S. News & World Report* as saying we can't have a depression because we would "have an automatic step-up in Government expenditures . . . [with] money made cheap and easy to get." That "automatic step-up," Mr. Secretary, is teaching us some mighty ugly lessons about inflation.

It was Kennedy who was selected by President Johnson to chair his Commission on Budgetary Concepts, which created a new system of federal bookkeeping to juggle deficits for the convenience of the Johnson Administration and the confusion of a concerned public. Secretary Kennedy has nonetheless claimed that his Number One job is to control inflation. He has used monetary controls to slow the increase in the money supply, but he has at the same time promoted a tax increase to justify further federal spending on the theory that if you buy a car it is inflationary, but if the government does it the expenditure is no longer inflationary.

After his surtax victory over the taxpayers, Kennedy announced that the Nixon Administration will try to provide



some tax relief for the middle-class in a tax-revision bill already passed by the House. The *Wall Street Journal* quotes him as stating that while everyone welcomes lower taxes, "there is a point at which too deep a slash in Federal revenues could perhaps force retrenchment in important domestic programs and even increase the already severe inflationary pressures." Clearly, the "tax reform" hullabaloo is going to mean a tax increase for everybody. And, once again, the "Forgotten Americans" of the days of the Nixon campaign oratory will get the Fickle Finger of Fate award.

**Clifford Hardin:** Even though his predecessor Orville Freeman ballooned the already bloated payroll of the Department of Agriculture by adding twenty percent more employees at the very time federal farm policies drove an equivalent amount of farmers from their lands and into our crowded cities, Nixon's Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin plans to maintain the status quo. Hardin, Chancellor of the University of Nebraska before joining Mr. Nixon's "new leadership" team, told the Associated Press he planned no drastic changes in the national farm program — "not now — maybe not later." This is hardly surprising since Hardin had, again according to Associated Press, "served on various projects under former Presidents Truman and Kennedy and President Johnson."

Clifford Hardin has proposed one new innovation: that the government "rent" fifty to sixty million acres of farmland from its owners for periods of ten to twenty years. This long-term land retirement program would replace the current system where a farmer is paid for not planting part of his land.

Hardin is a Director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, a member of the Leftist Atlantic Union Committee, and a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. While he will have nothing to do with re-establishing a free market in agriculture, he apparently does want to

make sure that no Soviet or Red Chinese munitions worker making arms to kill Americans in Vietnam goes hungry. According to United Press of February 10, 1969, Clifford Hardin "indicated Sunday he favored continued sale of U.S. wheat (at a loss) to the Soviet Union even though some of it might ultimately reach Communist China."

**Paul McCracken:** Mr. Nixon's chief economic advisor, Paul McCracken, is like Kissinger, Burns, Kennedy, Johnson, Rogers, and Yost, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Direct from the faculty of the University of Michigan, the Harvard-educated McCracken is also dedicated to the Marxist concept of sharing the wealth. The *Indianapolis News* reveals that he "has come out strongly for reducing the income gap between the affluent and the poverty-stricken in the United States." As Professor McCracken puts it: "If we move toward some form of more rational income and generalized income maintenance, which is desirable and seems probable, the effective redistribution of income through the federal budget will accelerate." The guaranteed annual income concept which McCracken has supported to assure "redistribution of income" is, alas, coming to pass.

Mr. Nixon has tried to pawn off this Fabian Socialist as a "centrist, a man who is pragmatic in his economics." The *Chicago Tribune* observes of McCracken:

*Political activists, noting his interest in slum problems, speak of him hopefully as "philosophically left of center" — meaning, presumably, a believer in the merits of government spending . . . their implication is that Mr. McCracken will not be too fussy about balancing the budget.*

Regarding that attitude toward government spending, the *Wall Street Journal* has warned: "McCracken would like Con-



gress to do away with the often-troublesome legal ceiling on the national debt."

Now, why do you suppose a spender like Professor McCracken would want to do a thing like that?

**Warren Burger:** The mass media has painted a picture of Warren Earl Burger, Mr. Nixon's selection for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, as standing on Constitutional matters somewhere to the Right of James Madison. Of course, none of us will know for certain until the decisions are in. But, despite strong statements on law and order, Burger has taken some very peculiar stands.

One can, I suppose, forgive him for having been campaign chairman for the ultra-"Liberal" Harold Stassen in 1938, floor manager for Stassen at the 1948 Republican Convention, and having led the Stassen delegation to the 1952 Convention. But whether "Conservatives" can forgive Burger for having played an important role in the theft of the Republican nomination for Eisenhower as a member of the Credentials Committee at the 1952 Republican National Convention, or for throwing an already pledged Minnesota delegation to Eisenhower, and thus seriously altering the course of our nation's history by helping to deprive Senator Robert Taft of the nomination he deserved, is another matter.

Burger, who has received the official seal of approval from James Reston of the *New York Times*, has like Justice William O. Douglas served as a consultant to the Marxist Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California. And, in a paper presented before the Center, Burger called for the virtual dismantling of the American system of justice. The *Chicago Daily News* of June 3, 1969, describes Justice Burger's proposals:

*Among the "techniques, devices and mechanisms" Burger questioned were: The jury system, the presumption that a defendant is*

*innocent until proved guilty, the right of a defendant to remain silent and putting the burden of proof on the prosecution . . .*

*Burger suggested that defendants ought to be required to testify in a courtroom.*

*And, he said: "If we would eliminate the jury we would save a lot of time."*

No doubt the shades of Lenin and Stalin cheered. Just as Communists everywhere must have cheered an article in *American University Law Review* for September 23, 1964, in which Mr. Burger made a fourteen-page argument for civilian review boards, a longtime objective of the Communist war on our police.

Frankly, when the *New York Times* takes editorial space to call a man a "sound and scholarly judge," and to glow that he is "moderately liberal," we feel a little uneasy. But when *Time* magazine turns cartwheels and declares that "If his statements and 13 years on a lower bench are indicative, he will fall into the school of the late Felix Frankfurter," we are concerned about the appointment.

\* \* \*

MANY Republicans reading this survey will attempt to rationalize away its warning by arguing that, anyway, a Republican Administration is better than a Democratic one. That just isn't true if the Republicans carry out Democrat policies of increasing collectivism at home and accommodating the Communists abroad. The Republican Party, overwhelmingly "Conservative" at the grassroots, is apparently in the control of Leftist *Insiders* at the top. There is no other logical explanation for these appointments.

If Republicans bury their heads in the sand and refuse to face this reality, America is in the most serious sort of trouble. Wishful thinking won't alter the facts. Unfortunately, many Americans refuse to read the handwriting on the wall until their backs are against it. ■ ■