9/26/73

Money, Attitude

One of the Rich Gang!

Stone Tells How He Assisted Nixon

By MORTON MINTZ

Washington Post News Service

WASHINGTON—President Nixin twice told Chicago insurance magnate W. Clement Stone that he would not have been elected in 1968 had it not been for Stone's gifts of money — $2.8 million — and of the philosophy known as positive mental attitude.

"On two occasions," Stone said, the President "gave me the highest honor that I will probably ever receive, from my viewpoint. He called me aside and said, 'Clem, you know and I know that I wouldn't be here if it weren't for you.'"

Stone, the President's principal contributor, made the disclosure on KUP's Show, a television program broadcast in Chicago by WMAQ last Sunday. An aide to Stone said Wednesday the President expressed his thanks to Stone at Camp David, Md., after the 1968 election and again at a dinner.

On the program, Stone recalled that he once said he would have spent any amount of money to elect or re-elect "one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all presidents."

"How much were you ready to go for?" asked columnist Irv Kupcinet, who conducts the program.

"Ten million dollars," replied Stone, who gave the President $2 million in 1972, for a four-year total of $4.8 million.

"Now, keep this in mind," Stone said May 28 in an interview with Michael Ryan of Granada Television in Britain. "Everything is relative. With a family worth in those days (the 1960s) better than $450 million, what's a million or two, particularly when you can change the course of history according to the principles for which you stand?"

Stone emphasized that he also helped Nixon by introducing him to positive mental attitude (PMA) in 1951, when the President was national chairman of the Boys Clubs of America and Stone was a director.

Every member of the organization's board was exposed to PMA concept, and "I know for a fact" that Nixon "and his family have been exposed to it," Stone told Kupcinet. "I know that the books (on PMA) are in the White

"I found this terrific change in this man, this drastic change, an almost 180-degree turn from somewhat of a negative personality to a positive personality," Stone continued. "I worked with him. He was exposed to PMA, and I realized that perhaps this was my one chance in an entire lifetime in which I could change the course of history for the better."

Praising the President as "a man of integrity," Stone indicated to Kupcinet that he had been disillusioned little, if at all, by the Watergate scandal.

"Previous to the Watergate hearings, I predicted that under the PMA philosophy with ever adversity there is a seed of an equivalent greater benefit," Stone said.

He went on to predict "that the revealing of these things" in the Watergate hearings "will be one of the most wholesome things that could have happened and that Nixon in time will come up with a mandatory, enforceable code of ethics that will try to prevent a recurrence of Watergate at any level of government."

Stone said he believed that "not a dime" of his $4.8 million went to any of the improper acts associated with Watergate. He said he based his belief on the fact that, rather than being solicited, he "provided the seed money. I was the one that was going to change the history of the world, so they didn't have to ask me. So I got in early."

During the 1968 campaign, Stone said, Maurice H. Stans, chairman of the Finance Committee to Re-Elect the President, who has been charged with obstruction of justice in an indictment returned in New York City, and Herbert W. Kalmbach, Nixon's personal attorney, came to him for advice.

Stone said he told them that "if you are aiming for a high objective, you must go after large sums."

Replying to a question about the disclosure that the President taped all of his phone calls and conversations, Stone said, "I think it is perfectly proper for him to have done so for many, many reasons," including the

NY TIMES MAG July 22, 1973

THE densest fog of uncertainty still swirls around the head of Richard Nixon, who finds himself under increasing pressure to speak out more fully, release relevant White House documents and even submit to Congressional questioning. Within a few months, he had suffered an epic fall from grace. He had defused the Vietnam War as a national issue, won the plaudits of a grateful nation for his historic "voyage of peace" to Peking and Moscow—and been returned to office by one of the largest margins of modern times. Now, suddenly, the polls were reflecting a startling loss of public confidence, the once-recumbent Congress was challenging his authority — and he found himself on the defensive, backing and filling before the outpourings of Watergate.

An insistent press and a querulous Congress are asking just how much the President knew, how much he covered up. The answer to these questions will largely determine not just the future of Richard Nixon's Presidency but the public attitude toward political campaigns, indeed toward the entire political process. There may be only a touch of hyperbole in the words which Jeb Magruder is said to have addressed to Bart Porter when he learned that the CREEP aide was about to tell all to the prosecutors:

My God, you are an ant! You are nothing! Do you realize the whole course of history is going to be changed?

THE NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE/JULY 22, 1973

SCIENTISTS.....

I doubt...that any of you documented these two startling newsclips These two newsclips, here on this page...is the key, the answer... to "Why Watergate".

First, note what the fabulously wealthy Clement Stone...one of the "rich gang" I've talked about before... states in this article. He was willing to give Nixon ten million... almost anything, really for the thrill, the kic if you will...of being instrumental in "changing the course o history." Note espec. that he uses this phra not once, but three times.

Next...see the New Yor Times magazine article clipping. See what Magruder, a member of the now-infamous White House Gang...told Port THE EXACT SAME PHRASE WORD FOR WORD USED BY CLEMENT STONE OVER AND OVER!

I.e., wealth wasn't motivating this crowd power, only incidentally...what WAS motivating these national and internat moneyed creeps...was the "kick" out of being able to manipulate and control history...to determine "the course of history".

Of course...in this tremendous, whopping conspiracy...I am positive that key members may have been brainwashed. Sounds crazy, I know...but note that Stone points out that Nixon changed, after "being exposed to PMA". Also, this point would explain the uniformity of the thinking processes of the witnesses before the Senate Watergate Committee.

Owens

KPK & Mant

Watergate Leaves Scars On Young Nixon Loyalist

By STEVEN V. ROBERTS
Special to The New York Times

LAGUNA NIGUEL, Calif., Aug. 4—For two brief days in June Herbert L. Porter was a national figure, testifying about his rather small role in the Watergate drama. Then, as the major characters took over the Senate hearings, he faded rapidly from public view.

But Watergate has left scars on Bart Porter, as it has on many of the earnest young men who toiled idyllically for the glory of Richard Milhous Nixon.

Mr. Porter, his wife, Carol, and their three children are now living with her parents in this seaside community not far from the Western White House. He was a successful computer salesman before he joined the Nixon Administration, but he has yet to find a job, and he has plenty of time to think about what he has been through.

In conversations with Mr. Porter, his family and friends, Mr. Porter sees a positive side. He describes his Senate testimony, in which he admitted fabricating a story at the Watergate trial last January, as "great therapy." He feels he is a "better man" for it.

But Mr. Porter also harbors deep resentment for the men who ran the Nixon White House, the men, he feels, who led him to the point where he now faces a possible indictment for perjury.

Aides Seen Misused

"The original sin was not the Watergate bugging—that wasn't right, but that is not really the issue," he said recently, as the morning fog clung to the coast a few blocks away.

"Nor is the issue really the cover-up," he continued. "That was almost a natural outgrowth of the situation. We were in the middle of a campaign. What else do you do?"

"In my opinion," he went on, "the original sin was the misuse of these younger people, not only through Watergate and the cover-up, but through the whole White House system. They were not criminals by birth or design. Left to their own devices, they wouldn't engage in this sort of thing. Someone had to be telling them to do it, to do their dirty work, and damn it, that's a crime!"

That sounds a little "self-



Associated Press
Herbert L. Porter testifying on Watergate last June

self, or his former colleagues. They did not exactly fight off their seducers. They came to Washington, he pointed out, with vast ambitions, lured by the prospect of power and success, in the same way that young actresses still flock to Hollywood, dreaming of the day when tourists will gawk at their footprints embedded in a sidewalk.

At age 35, Mr. Porter looks like a slightly older version of the big man he once was on the campus of the University of Southern California. In fact it was friends from U.S.C., including Ronald L. Ziegler, now a Presidential assistant, who recruited him to Washington in 1970. After six months doing odd jobs in the White House, he shifted to the Committee for the Re-election of the President and became its scheduling director.

Concealed Data on Liddy

At the committee, Mr. Porter disbursed some money to G. Gordon Liddy, one of the organizers of the Watergate break-in, for what he thought were legal campaign "dirty tricks." As the Watergate cover-up expanded, Mr. Porter was asked to help conceal Mr. Liddy's real activities, and he did. Why?

Mr. Porter was a long-time supporter of Mr. Nixon, a native of the President's home Congressional district; moreover, he was eager to advance his own fortunes. But in addition to loyalty and ambition, he said, the explanation must include the atmosphere of the White House.

It was a "heady place," he said, what with Henry A. Kissinger walking the halls and John B. Connally eating lunch at the next table. Watching the President leave for China was a rare chance to "see history in the making." Decisions were made every day that affected millions of people.

This "mystique" was enhanced by the judicious distribution of certain perquisites—an invitation to a White House dinner, a weekend at Camp David. Mr. Porter has told friends, only half jokingly, that H. R. Haldeman kept a list of which young staffers [illegible] work a whole year of 14-hour days."

Any national Administration has a similar aura, but Mr. Porter feels the zealousness of the Nixon White House was compounded by a special feeling.

"There definitely did exist a 'we-they attitude'" he said. "'We' being anyone inside the gate, 'they' being all others, particularly the press, and of course the opposition party. On my first or second day in the White House, Dwight Chapin said to me, 'One thing you should realize early on, we are practically an island here.' That was the way the world was viewed."

'Protect the President'

The highest calling was to "protect the President" from the hostile forces that surrounded that "island," he added. It was this defensiveness, Mr. Porter believes, that dictated the almost automatic response that became the Watergate "cover-up."

During his testimony, Mr. Porter was asked by Senator Howard H. Baker Jr., Republican of Tennessee, why he had not acted on his own "conscience" and resisted the tide of events.

"That question sounds good, but in practice we just don't do it," Mr. Porter reflected. "If you question too much, you find yourself out in left field. And that's true not just in government, but in business. It is much easier to go along.' It was very simple."

Last Au[gust] covered [illegible] to say it, I just sobbed. I couldn't believe what was happening to me."

He had just taken a job with a large corporation, which decided it could not "risk the embarrassment" and dismissed him. He had just bought a house in California, which he could no longer afford, and in getting out of the deal he lost $5,000.

Lost Job and House

After weeks of uncertainty and against the advice of attorneys, Mr. Porter decided to tell his whole story to Federal prosecutors and Senate committee, without any bargaining for immunity. So he explains the decision now:

"It sounds corny, but I think it was the right thing to do. I think we should let the chips come out, and let the American people judge. It would be the greatest therapy for the country. Lord knows we preach it to our children, we should practice it."

After the testimony [illegible] ters fled Washington "home." According to Mr. P[orter] has found [illegible] to some of [illegible] linked to the [illegible] might face.

As he spe[aks] [illegible]