


Supreme Court Case Study 59



The President and Executive Privilege

United States v. Nixon, 1974

***** Background of the Case *****

During President Nixon's 1972 re-election campaign, several men were caught breaking into the Democratic National Committee's headquarters in the Watergate apartment and office complex in Washington, D. C. It turned out that the burglars were associated with the president's campaign. A nationwide political and public outcry mushroomed into what became known as the Watergate scandal.

The United States Department of Justice appointed a special prosecutor to carry out an independent investigation of the scandal. From the investigation, trials of various White House staff members, investigative newspaper reports, and televised Senate Select committee investigative hearings, a shocked nation learned that the White House was involved in planning and covering up the burglary.

When it was revealed that the president had taped many conversations in the White House Oval Office, both the Senate investigating committee and the special prosecutor attempted to secure the tapes. The president refused to release them, claiming separation of powers and executive privilege, the right of the president to keep his conversations confidential. The special prosecutor subpoenaed the tapes, and a federal judge ordered President Nixon to release them. Nixon refused and instead turned to the Supreme Court for a judgment on executive privilege.

Constitutional Issue *****

The question for the Court to decide was whether the president could refuse to surrender the tapes and other information to a federal court for possible use against those charged in connection with the Watergate break-in.

***** The Supreme Court's Decision *****

The Court agreed unanimously that the president had to turn over the tapes. Chief Justice Warren E. Burger wrote for the Court. President Nixon had argued that the courts had no jurisdiction over what he claimed was a dispute between the president and his subordinate, the special prosecutor. The Court responded that it was competent to decide the case, just as it had decided similar controversies between officers and branches of the government in the past. In addition, because the material was wanted for a normal federal criminal trial, the matter fell directly under the Court's jurisdiction through the judicial powers spelled out in Article III of the Constitution.

The president had also claimed that executive privilege shielded him from a subpoena for two reasons. First, it was necessary to protect the confidentiality of high-level presidential communications. Second, the principle of separation of powers protects the president through the independence of the executive branch.

(continued)