

[Skip to comments.](#)

## Hillary Rodham's 1974 Watergate "Procedures were Ethically Flawed"

NY POST via Reagan Information Interchange | 8/16/99 | Jerry (Jerome) Zeifman

Posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:02:46 AM** by [Ed in NJ](#)

Hillary Rodham's 1974 Watergate "Procedures were Ethically Flawed"

Jerry Zeifman sent us the letter below, which is "based largely on material previously published" in his book, "Without Honor: The impeachment of President Nixon and the Crimes of Camelot."

The book is now out of print. However, a small supply of the limited first edition is still available. Information about it, and how to obtain a copy, may be found at: [www.iethical.org/book.htm](http://www.iethical.org/book.htm)

Previously published in the NEW YORK POST

August 16, 1999

### HILLARY'S WATERGATE SCANDAL

By Jerry Zeifman

IN December 1974, as general counsel and chief of staff of the House Judiciary Committee, I made a personal evaluation of Hillary Rodham (now Mrs. Clinton), a member of the staff we had gathered for our impeachment inquiry on President Richard Nixon. I decided that I could not recommend her for any future position of public or private trust.

Why? Hillary's main duty on our staff has been described by as "establishing the legal procedures to be followed in the course of the inquiry and impeachment." A number of the procedures she recommended were ethically flawed. And I also concluded that she had violated House and committee rules by disclosing confidential information to unauthorized persons.

Hillary had conferred personally with me regarding procedural rules. I advised her that Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino, House Speaker Carl Albert, Majority Leader Tip O'Neill and I had previously agreed not to advocate anything contrary to the rules already adopted and published for that Congress. I quoted Mr. O'Neill's statement that: "To try to change the rules now would be politically divisive. It would be like trying to change the traditional rules of baseball before a World Series."

Hillary assured me that she had not drafted and would not advocate any such rules changes. I soon learned that she had lied: She had already drafted changes, and continued to advocate them.

In one written legal memorandum, she advocated denying President Nixon representation by counsel. This, though in our then-most-recent prior impeachment proceeding, the committee had afforded the right to counsel to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

I also informed Hillary that the Douglas impeachment files were available for public inspection in our offices. I later learned that the Douglas files were then removed from our general files without my permission, transferred to the offices of the impeachment inquiry staff, and were no longer accessible to the public.

The young Ms. Rodham had other bad advice about procedures, arguing that the Judiciary Committee should

neither 1) hold any hearings with or take the depositions of any live witnesses, nor 2) conduct any original investigation of attergate, bribery, tax evasion, or any other possible impeachable offense of President Nixon - but to rely instead on prior investigations conducted by other committees and agencies.

The committee rejected Ms. Rodham's recommendations: It agreed to allow President Nixon to be represented by counsel and to hold hearings with live witnesses. Hillary then advocated that the official rules of the House be amended to deny members of the committee the right to question witnesses. This unfair recommendation was rejected by the full House. (The committee also vetoed her suggestion that it leave the drafting of the articles of impeachment to her and her fellow special staffers.)

The recommendations advocated by Hillary were apparently initiated or approved by Yale Law School professor Burke Marshall - in violation of committee and House rules on confidentiality. They were also advocated by her immediate supervisors, Special Counsel John Doar and Senior Associate Special Counsel Bernard Nussbaum, both of whom had worked under Marshall in the Kennedy Justice Department.

It was not until two months after Nixon's resignation that I first learned of still another questionable role of Ms. Rodham. On Sept. 26, 1974, Rep. Charles Wiggins, a Republican member of the committee, wrote to ask Chairman Rodino to look into a troubling set of events. That spring, Wiggins and other committee members had asked "that research should be undertaken so as to furnish a standard against which to test the alleged abusive conduct of Richard Nixon." And, while "no such staff study was made available to the members at any time for their use," Wiggins had just learned that such a study had been conducted - at committee expense - by a team of professors who completed and filed their reports with the impeachment-inquiry staff well in advance of our public hearings.

The report was not made available to members of Congress. But after the impeachment-inquiry staff was disbanded, it was published commercially and sold in book stores. Wiggins wrote that he was "especially troubled by the possibility that information deemed essential by some of the members in their discharge of their responsibilities may have been intentionally suppressed by the staff during the course our investigation."

On Oct. 3, Rodino wrote back: "Hillary Rodham of the impeachment-inquiry staff coordinated the work. ... After the staff received the report it was reviewed by Ms. Rodham, briefly by Mr. Labovitz and Mr. Sack, and by Mr. Doar. The staff did not think the manuscript was useful in its present form."

On the charge of willful suppression, he wrote: "That was not the case ... The staff did not think the material was usable by the committee in its existing form and had not had time to modify it so it would have practical utility for the members of the committee. I was informed and agreed with the judgment."

During my 14-year tenure with the House Judiciary Committee, I had supervisory authority over several hundred staff members. With the exception of Ms. Rodham, Doar and Nussbaum, I recommend all of them for future positions of public and private trust.

Jerry Zeifman is the author of "Without Honor: The Impeachment of President Nixon and the Crimes of Camelot," which describes the above matters in more detail. (See [www.iethical.org/book.htm](http://www.iethical.org/book.htm))

---

**TOPICS:** [Culture/Society](#); [News/Current Events](#); [Politics/Elections](#); [US: Arkansas](#)

**KEYWORDS:** [bookreview](#); [books](#); [hillary](#); [nixon](#); [watergate](#); [withouthonor](#); [zeifman](#)

In cycling through the channels just now, I saw wife-of-i42 lying to Katie (Perky) Couric about the Nixon impeachment, and how it "set such high standards" (MAJOR BARF).

Apologies to those that have seen this article before, but it may not have been seen by newbies - and it is an important commentary by someone that was on the same side of the fence, and was fully familiar with her

'work.'

1 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:02:46 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

You seem to be almost insinuating that the honorable Mrs. Clinton was less than 100% truthful in all things. I'm shocked, SHOCKED, I tell you!

< /sarcasm >

2 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:17:02 AM** by **Izzy Dunne** (Hello, I'm a TAGLINE virus. Please help me spread by copying me into YOUR tag line.)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

I, for one, had not seen it and wish to thank you for posting this article.

It still leaves a burning question, to wit: How does this woman (and I use the term liberally) get away with it? How does she manage to keep buried, all of her egregious acts?

3 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:17:08 AM** by **David Isaac**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **David Isaac**

The same way one gets to Carnegie Hall -- practice, practice, practice!

4 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:27:21 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Izzy Dunne**

Someone should come out with a book that refutes, point by point, the lies in Lying History.

5 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:29:52 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 2](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

And the many of the same folks that holler about Homeland Security trampling on our rights would be only too happy to elect her president.

6 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:32:12 AM** by **trebb**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **David Isaac**

*How does she manage to keep buried, all of her egregious acts?*

Obviously the problem is the very considerable portion of the population, including all "objective" (actually merely PC) journalists, which desires to not see what is in fact in the public domain, like this out-of-print book. The issue then is, how to inspire such people to decide to be willing to see? 'Tis a puzzlement.

7 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:36:49 AM** by **conservatism\_IS\_compassion**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

In literature they call this foreshadowing of things to come.

8 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:38:36 AM** by **xp38**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **xp38**

Please, NO!

9 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:51:45 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 8](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

People seem to continue to forget, that Herself did not suddenly appear on the scene in 1992, as the candidate to be the first "co-President" in US history. She had been around for some time, one of the termites gnawing at the foundations of America, and one of Her first major accomplishments was to undermine Richard Nixon's defense in the Watergate aftermath.

Richard Nixon was a far more honorable person than any of his detractors, who would allow no refuge or civility in their pursuit of reversal of the will of the American people. And these very people seem to be so astonished when the same severe condemnation is applied to them, when they are caught out, intent on their own mischief.

Not everybody in America has forgotten.

10 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:57:41 AM** by **alloysteel**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

There could not be a book that big.

11 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 5:59:04 AM** by **jim\_trent**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 5](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Travelgirl; Budge**

More info for your Hildabeast list...

12 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 6:01:32 AM** by **TheBattman** (Big Brother is closer than you would like to know.....)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**



**"They'll vote for me no matter what"**

13 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 6:03:11 AM** by **ErnBatavia** (Bumperootus!)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 5](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

bump for later

14 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 6:09:00 AM** by **Kathleen**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

LAW SPOTREP

15 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:13:43 AM** by **LiteKeeper**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

Funny, we never heard any of this. Sure looks Hitlery was practicing her art of deceit even back then.

16 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:17:58 AM** by **freekitty**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

Thanks for posting this. I had not seen it before.

I would like to see more of her background and things that she has been involved in over the years.

These things must be brought to public attention while there is still time as compared to all of the vile things that Clinton hid was never exposed until after he was elected.

17 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:28:47 AM** by **LADY J**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 16](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

I've spoken twice with Jerry Zeifmann. Two lawyers from the Watergate investigation were not given referrals by him --- Bernie Nussbaum and Hillary Rodham.

18 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:46:27 AM** by **doug from upland** (Martha is indicted and the Clintons still walk free.....what a country)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **LADY J**

Thanks - it's good to know some are hearing this for the first time.

If you haven't read "Boy Clinton" (Tyrrell), there's lots in there about bothtoons early days -- including her support of the Black Panthers (who at the time were advocating the murder of policemen), her internship with Robert Treuhaft (at the time, lawyer for the Communist Party), and other niceties. "Unlimited Access" (Aldrich) is also very good, regarding her WH years.

19 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 8:24:04 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 17](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **alloysteel**

Well put -- and WE have to keep reminding the more forgetful!

20 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 8:26:43 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 10](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **doug from upland**

The Fostergate twins!

21 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 8:36:44 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 18](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **freakitty**

It's surprising that any of this ever saw the light of day....guess the rat media machine was less potent in those days!

22 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 12:48:52 PM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 16](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ErnBatavia**

Nice hat!

23 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 6:57:29 PM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 13](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

One of the other books on Hillary, I can't recall which one, I have read them all, goes into these details too. She was determined to get Nixon, and was allowed to railroad rules into the proceedings that would have assured he would be ousted had he not resigned. Despicable woman.

24 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:03:30 PM** by **ladyinred**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

Oh yes, not only that she said unlike the partisan witch hunt conducted on her hubby, the innocent one! I was furious!

25 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:04:26 PM** by **ladyinred**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **LADY J**

There are many books out on Hillary, and even those that are supposed to be friendly to her tell tales about her that would curl your hair. I have read them all as I intend to know my enemy. Hillary's mentors were card carrying communists who taught her to bring about social change through couching it as "for the children."

26 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:07:29 PM** by **ladyinred**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 17](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ladyinred**

There HAVE been a lot of 'those' books, haven't there?

She probably rehearsed that stupid line a hundred times - rankles the knowing, and fools the fools!

27 posted on **Monday, June 09, 2003 7:08:51 PM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 25](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **David Isaac**

Here's a theory why "she gets away with it". She (Saul Alinsky protege - anything for the cause) was willing to do substantial and unethical things to get rid of the "hated" Nixon. She was an active tool. The Democrat Party knows it and have known for decades. It's been payback time for the liberals and the liberal media for

years now, so she is protected.

By the way, have you looked into Dan Rather's career since 11/22/63?

Bribery, blackmail, and paybacks are how Washington D.C. operates ..... unfortunately!

**28** posted on **Friday, January 02, 2004 6:01:57 AM** by **thesummerwind** (Images of broken light which dance before me like a million eyes)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **ladyinred**

Hillary's mentors were card carrying communists who taught her to bring about social change through couching it as "for the children." --- Bingo

**29** posted on **Friday, January 02, 2004 6:06:34 AM** by **thesummerwind** (Images of broken light which dance before me like a million eyes)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 26](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **TheBattman**

More info for your Hildabeast list...

That's funny; you know me pretty well. I just copied this article to go in my stack of stuff before I got down to you post. I'll also try to order this book.

**30** posted on **Sunday, November 21, 2004 10:08:11 AM** by **Travelgirl**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 12](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Travelgirl**

BTTT

**31** posted on **Sunday, November 21, 2004 10:36:11 AM** by **cibco** (Xin Loi... Saddam)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 30](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

**I decided that I could not recommend her for any future position of public or private trust.**

**Jerry Zeifman**



**32** posted on **Saturday, April 30, 2005 10:27:39 PM** by **Slyfox**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Mrs Zip**

ping

**33** posted on **Sunday, May 01, 2005 2:57:23 AM** by **zip** (Remember: DimocRat lies told often enough became truth to 48% of Americans (NRA))  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

bump

**34** posted on **Sunday, May 01, 2005 4:28:09 AM** by **lilmsdangrus** (hard work musta hurt somebody, somewhere....)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Slyfox**

Good to see you revived this - one of my alltime faves!

Certainly something the masses need to know if Wife of Willie gets the rat nod....along with her gift of \$15,000 to the commie National Lawyers Guild as soon as she got on the board of the Children's Defense Fund.

**35** posted on **Sunday, May 01, 2005 7:25:25 AM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ** (Who killed Suzanne Coleman?)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 32](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

Zeifman speaks volumes.

Suzanne Coleman - isn't she the gal who was Bill Clinton's student who became pregnant and was very happy about it and hinted that that the baby she was carrying was Bill's, but somehow committed suicide with very short arms and a shotgun?

Or, is she somebody else?

**36** posted on **Sunday, May 01, 2005 5:13:59 PM** by **Slyfox**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 35](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Slyfox**

You've got that one right -- first case of Arkancide -- local authorities ruled suicide, with no autopsy.

**37** posted on **Sunday, May 01, 2005 6:10:22 PM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ** (Who killed Suzanne Coleman?)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 36](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **David Isaac**



Because most of the witnesses are dead. The rest are scared.

38 posted on **Thursday, May 12, 2005 8:48:41 PM** by **Glock17** (Aim Center Mass)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 3](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

"Hillary assured me that she had not drafted and would not advocate any such rules changes. I soon learned that she had lied: She had already drafted changes, and continued to advocate them." With Hatellary Rodhamster, as with all deceitful liberals, the ends justify the means, any means. Integrity isn't something these perfidious clintons are even acquainted with.

39 posted on **Thursday, May 12, 2005 8:54:52 PM** by **MHGinTN** (If you can read this, you've had life support from someone. Promote life support for others.)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **MHGinTN**

As far as I know, this is the only quote of a superior stating flat-out that Wife-of-Willie LIED!

40 posted on **Friday, May 13, 2005 3:21:45 PM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ** (Who killed Suzanne Coleman?)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 39](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

In addition, there is a new book coming out in June called, "The Truth About Hillary: What She Knew, When She Knew It, and How Far She'll Go to Become President" by Edward Kline. It's being billed as one of the most damaging books to come out about Hitlery. I've ordered my advance copy already:)

Even though Kline has been a former foreign editor at Newsweek and the former editor in chief of the NYT magazine, I am still interested in what his take on Hitlery.

41 posted on **Friday, June 03, 2005 9:19:25 AM** by **FairfaxVA** (SELECT \* FROM liberals WHERE clue > 0. Zero rows returned!)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 19](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **FairfaxVA**

Thanks for the info.

42 posted on **Friday, June 03, 2005 10:35:29 PM** by **Ed\_in\_NJ** (Who killed Suzanne Coleman?)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 41](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

bump

43 posted on **Saturday, July 07, 2007 11:41:39 AM** by **Eva** (I)  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

Hitlery is ethically flawed.

**44** posted on **Saturday, July 07, 2007 11:42:31 AM** by **television is just wrong** (Amnesty is when you allow them to return to their country of origin without prosecution.)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **television is just wrong**

I was doing a search on Hillary's role in Watergate and I came to the conclusion that it had been purged from Google and replaced with Fred Thompson's role, so I thought I would did out this old FreeRepublic thread and bump it a few times.

**45** posted on **Saturday, July 07, 2007 11:47:08 AM** by **Eva (I)**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 44](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Eva**

funny how Hitlery's role was removed....

**46** posted on **Saturday, July 07, 2007 11:51:14 AM** by **television is just wrong** (Amnesty is when you allow them to return to their country of origin without prosecution.)

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 45](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **television is just wrong**

Here's a little more:

Jerry Zeifman, a former counsel to the House Judiciary Committee for 17 years, breaks these barriers. He takes you to a behind the scenes account of one of the famous faces in politics, Hillary Clinton, in his explosive book *Hillary's Pursuit of Power*

This book describes and documents unethical practices of Senator Hillary Clinton. *Hillary's Pursuit of Power* is based on Zeifman's personal experiences. In 1974, he had supervisory authority of a staff that included Hillary Rodham – who was then engaged in a variety of self-serving unethical practices in violation of House rules.

In 1998, as consultant to a member of the Judiciary Committee that impeached President Clinton, he gained extensive personal insights into the unethical practices of Hillary Clinton in her White House "West Wing" office.

A lifelong Democrat, Jerry Zeifman has concluded that Hillary Clinton is ethically unfit to be either a Senator or President – and if she were to become President, the last vestiges of the traditional moral authority of the party of

Roosevelt, Truman and Johnson will be destroyed.

This book will open the eyes of the people to the truths behind unethical practices previously unknown to the public. It will guide them to make wise decisions on whom to vote for office in the upcoming elections. Suspicions and doubts will be confirmed and dispelled respectively by the amazing revelations in this book.

#### About the Author

As former Chief Counsel of the House Judiciary Committee Jerry Zeifman, was acclaimed by former House Speaker "Tip" O'Neill as a "Great American who played the key role during the Nixon impeachment proceedings." Later, during the Clinton impeachment he served as a consultant to members of the committee. He has also served as: Professor of law at the University of Santa Clara; President of National Institute of Economics and Law; General Counsel to National Council on Industrial Defense; and General Counsel of International Ethical Alliance.

Mr. Zeifman is also the author of Without Honor: The Crimes of Camelot and the Impeachment of President Nixon (Thunder's Mouth Press 1996). He is currently completing a further book for publication in 2007 titled The Dissident Democrat, which spans his career in public service from the Roosevelt administration to the present.

#### Availability of Hillary's Pursuit of Power

The book is available in electronic form for the price of \$3.00

It is available in print form as an autographed and inscribed paperback for total charge of \$13.00 Buy Now or send payment by check or money order to: Marianne Zeifman, 32 Walnut Tree Hill Rd. Sandy Hook, CT 06482

---

Acclaim for Jerry Zeifman's prior book Without Honor: The Crimes of Camelot and the Impeachment of President Nixon (Thunders Mouth Press 1995)

This behind-the-scenes look at the infamous Watergate scandals provides compelling first-hand knowledge that both Democrats loyal to the Kennedys and Republicans "stonewalled" the investigation of President Nixon... There are also cameo appearances by Hillary Clinton. Her actions reveal that if she is not a liar, at least

she has no interest in justice...Highly recommended.

Five Star Review

Amazon.com

Jerry Zeifman..provides unique, often startling insights into the incomplete impeachment of Richard Nixon. I found this book to be a real page turner... It provides missing information that cannot be ignored by students of the period, the Nixon presidency, Watergate, and Congress.

John Dean III

I got a kick out of Without Honor. I liked it a lot. I sometimes try to imagine myself functioning in the political circles of Washington. I wouldn't have had the patience to cope with it. They would have had to send me home in a wheel chair.

Saul Bellow (Nobel Laureate)

A cogent blockbuster.

Publishers Weekly

The story is utterly fascinating and the extraordinary quotes from his diary taped at the time surely make it a primary source of considerable importance.

Edward Mortimer

Financial Times of London

.  
After I started Jerry Zeifman's extraordinarily insightful book I could not put it down — and finished it in one sitting.

Henry Hyde, Chairman, House Judiciary Committee

Limited current availability

A cache of the first edition has recently been located in a warehouse. While the supply lasts, autographed copies inscribed to the buyer can be obtained for \$6.00 (with no charge for shipping) by buying now or sending check or money order to Marianne Zeifman, 32 Walnut Tree Hill Road, Sandy Hook, Ct. 06482.

---

### Biographical Material

Jerome Zeifman was born in 1925 in Mineola, New York. He attended Harvard University, and received a law degree from New York University. He served as a naval communications officer on USS Missouri during World War II.

He opened a private law practice in Nyack, New York

prior to working for the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives. He served as Counsel (1961-72) — and was Chief Counsel (1973-74) during the Watergate scandal, the threatened impeachment of Richard Nixon, and the confirmations of Gerald Ford and Nelson Rockefeller. Zeifman retired from the committee staff in 1974 to teach law at the University of Santa Clara.

His personal papers are currently available at The George Washington University, The Gelman Library, Special Collections and University Archives; 2130 H. St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20052 Phone: 202-994-7549 Email: [speccoll@gwu.edu](mailto:speccoll@gwu.edu)

The material dates from 1960-77. The collection contains his personal diary and correspondence, as well as his work-related papers. The collection deals primarily with issues related to the Watergate scandal, the resignation of Spiro Agnew, the impeachment of President Nixon, the confirmation of Gerald Ford to be President, the confirmation of Nelson Rockefeller to be Vice President, the efforts of Gerald Ford (as majority leader) to impeach Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, and prior efforts to impeach seven other federal judges. The materials also contain information about the employment on the Judiciary Committee of a number of people who later rose to national prominence, including Hillary Rodham Clinton, Bernard Nussbaum, John Doar, and William Weld.

Present Career As Author – See [www.Jzeifman.com](http://www.Jzeifman.com)

Books: Without Honor: The Crimes of Camelot and the Impeachment of President Nixon (Thunders Mouth Press 1995); Hillary's Pursuit of Power (Xlibris 2006); Best and Worst of Times: Memoirs of A Democratic Counsel (for publication 2007)

Articles in such publications as Wall Street Journal, Washington Times, New York Post, Insight Magazine, News Max, World Net Daily, National Ledger, Accuracy in Media, etc. (See [Google.com](http://Google.com))

Numerous TV and radio interviews (1995 to present)

---

## ARTICLES

by  
Jerry Zeifman

NewsMax.com April 17, 2007

## Democratic Caucus Should Remove House Speaker Nancy Pelosi

Copyright © 2007 Jerry Zeifman

On April 6, a Washington Post Editorial aptly described Mrs. Pelosi's trip to Damascus as a "pratfall," – which the dictionary defines as "a fall in which one lands on the buttocks, often regarded as comical or humiliating."

In my view that word was a discrete understatement. As a life-long Democrat and former congressional chief counsel I regard her conduct as an unconstitutional abuse of power that warrants her removal by our Democratic Caucus,

As I previously noted in my NewsMax article of April 7, she persistently fosters what Thomas Jefferson denounced as "tyranny by the majority" — and violates House Rules that give her the duty to maintain order, civility, and decorum, and to foster "comity" (a word rarely used these days, meaning "mutual respect"). Her trip to Damascus was more than a blunder. In denying President Bush's request as well as purporting falsely to Speak for Israel it was a usurpation of Presidential power

As a result of her defiance of the president, Democrat Leon Panetta, the former chief of staff to President Clinton, cautioned in the April 2 New York Times that if the Democrats "go into total confrontation mode on other than [domestic issues]... that's a recipe for losing seats in the next election."

### The Wright Precedent

The prior history of Democratic Speaker Jim Wright is now being repeated by Nancy Pelosi. After Wright became speaker, five South American presidents had agreed on a peace plan which the Reagan administration vigorously opposed. Anti-Sandinistas and Contra hardliners became incensed when they learned that Speaker

Wright had secretly sat in on a meeting between Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega and Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo the Catholic leader being asked to mediate the peace.

Then House Minority Leader Newt Gingrich began filing numerous accusations in the Ethics Committee of malfeasance by Wright. In the end the House Democratic Caucus determined that Wright had lost his effectiveness as Speaker and compelled him to resign. They voted to replace him with Democrat Tom Foley — who restored the traditional civility and comity that had prevailed under previous Democratic Speakers.

To date the Democratic Caucus has either been suffering from a loss of institutional memory or is hopefully keeping its power dry before taking up the matter of her counter-productive loss of effectiveness as Speaker.

Also few if any media writers ever refresh the public's recollection of the controversy in the Democratic Caucus in 2002 when she first ran for Minority Leader. Then she was opposed by Rep. Harold Ford Jr, (D Tenn), a black Southern Democrat who later became a Senator — and without her support was recently defeated for re-election by a Republican. Five years ago Ford appeared on the Don Imus show and described Pelosi as: “destructive,” “obstructionist,” and “not the kind of leadership we [Democrats] need.”

Last year after becoming Speaker Pelosi supported her closest ally, Abscam-Scandal-tainted Rep. John Murtha, to be Majority Leader. However, she was overruled by Rep. Rahm Emanuel (D IL) and the Democratic Caucus which by a large majority voted to appoint Steny Hoyer, Pelosi's long time rival.

Mrs. Pelosi, whose San Francisco constituency is far left, currently claims credit for leading the Democratic Party's election victories last year. However the

credit really belongs to Emanuel – a former key member of Chicago Mayor Daley's staff, whom Bill Clinton hired to be his Chief of Staff. The truth is that Emanuel had the political acumen to recruit enough conservative Democrats to defeat Republicans and control the House.

In my view, the best way for Democrats to try to win control of both Congress and the White House in 2008 is for Emanuel and the Democratic Caucus now to follow the Wright precedent of 1989 and force Pelosi to resign, Then Rahm Emanuel should use his political acumen to replace her with a more moderate Democrat with a reputation for civility and comity. This will shift our party's partisan policies toward a more centrist position — and reduce the demagogic political warfare that is now diminishing the moral authority of both political parties.

The result will restore the pre-Pelosi Democratic tradition, in which Democratic partisan policies are determined in the Democratic Caucus and not in the Speaker's office — and our House Speakers are role models of civility.

#### What Citizens Can Do About Pelosi

In the case of Wright the Democratic Caucus responded to a wide spread public outcry against his fierce partisanship that was generated by the proceedings of the House Ethics Committee that investigated his political history. Under today's House Rules such an investigation can be launched by petitions filed by House Members. In my view, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike should contact their Representatives in Congress and urge them to file such a petition with the Ethics Committee.

---

Nancy Pelosi Should Resign

Copyright © 2007 Jerry Zeifman

NewsMax.com April 6, 2007



Nancy Pelosi has persistently violated her duty to exercise her speaker powers in accordance with the Constitution and the current "106th Congress House Rules Manual" (House Document 106-320). In short, she has fostered what is known as "tyranny by the majority" — and violated House Rules that give her the duty to maintain order, civility, and decorum, and to foster "comity" (a word rarely used these days, meaning "mutual respect").

The "House Rules Manual" includes Jefferson's "Manual of Parliamentary Procedures," originally drafted by the founder of the Democratic Party when, as vice president, he presided over the Senate from 1797 to 1801.

In 1837 the House, provided that the provisions of Jefferson's Manual should "govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with [subsequently adopted rules]."

Jefferson's manual, which is still in effect, was a codification of 18th century "common law" and re-affirms that House Rules are "the only weapons by which the minority can defend itself . . . and by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities."

Currently, Pelosi, who is second in line to the president, often describes herself as a partner in his power — a higher role than the Constitution grants to the vice president, who is first in the line of succession — and whose only official duties are confined to presiding over the Senate.

#### Pelosi Oversteps the Electorate

In closing the recent debate on the \$125 billion Emergency Defense Appropriations bill's provision to bring our troops home

from Iraq next year, Pelosi — purporting to speak for the entire electorate — proclaimed “The American people have lost faith in the president’s conduct of this war . . . The American people see the reality of the war; the president does not.” Both before and after the debate she has also often derided him for waging “a war without end.”

As Democratic Sen. Patrick Moynihan once noted “Members of Congress are entitled to their own opinions — but not to their own facts.” Mrs. Pelosi’s false assertion of a national consensus was then belied by a roll call vote of 218 to 213.”

The facts are that she presides over a House divided by both the war in Iraq and a political culture war at home. She obviously wants to win the domestic political war against the Republicans by setting a deadline for the Iraq war. Another fact is that when she first became speaker she pledged to curtail the “earmarking” of appropriation bills with pork. Yet she encouraged her longtime Democratic ally John Murtha to use his powers on the Appropriations Committee to load the bill with \$24 billion of earmarked pork. The New York Times of March 24 described it as “largely aimed at domestic program unrelated to military expenses [and] was added by Democrats to make the bill more acceptable to lawmakers.”

Similarly, the Senate later approved a similar pork laden measure in a party line vote of 51 to 47, with Sen. Lieberman the sole Democrat siding with the Republicans. Despite the fact that, with defense funds due to expire in May, Pelosi then used her powers to recess until April 29 — which even her liberal supporters in the media have characterized as an exercise of partisan brinkmanship.

#### Pelosi’s Syrian Mistake

She also denied a request by President Bush (who has primary constitutional

authority over the conduct of foreign policy) that as the third-highest official of the United State she not make an official visit to Syria, which our government has officially declared to be a “terrorist state.” On a high profile televised visit to Syria, she conferred with President Bashar al-Hassad. She not only purported to speak for the American people in opposing Bush’s policies and the Iraq war, she purported to have spoken for Israel. As reported in the Jerusalem Post, “[Israel’s] Prime Minister Office issued a rare ‘clarification’ Wednesday that, in gentle diplomatic terms, contradicted U.S. Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi’s statement in Damascus that she had brought a message from Israel about a willingness to engage in peace talks.”

As a result of her defiance of the president and persistent confrontation of his foreign policies, Democrat Leon Panetta, the former chief of staff to President Clinton, was quoted in the April 2 New York Times as cautioning that if the Democrats “go into total confrontation mode on other than [domestic issues] where they just pass bills and the president vetoes them, that’s a recipe for losing seats in the next election.” Ironically, history is now repeating itself. Our first woman Speaker Pelosi may well deserve to become the second Democratic speaker to be compelled to resign from Congress.

The prior history of Democratic Speaker Jim Wright is now being repeated by Nancy Pelosi — perhaps by a loss of memory of the House Democratic caucus, which forced Wright to resign. After Wright became speaker five South American presidents had agreed on a peace plan which the Reagan administration vigorously opposed.

Anti-Sandinistas and Contra hardliners became incensed when they learned that Speaker Wright had secretly sat in on a meeting between Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega and Cardinal Miguel Obando

y Bravo the Catholic leader being asked to mediate the peace. The Washington Post wrote “[Wright’s] approach marks a dramatic shift in the running of the House and in the role of the House speaker as Washington’s No. 1 Democrat.”

#### The Wrong Way for Wright

As described 10 years later by Wright’s own chief of staff: “[Then] Republican Minority Whip Trent Lott described Wright’s participation in foreign affairs as “The most arrogant abuse of power I’ve ever seen . . . Dick Cheney of Illinois, [then] chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, got so mad at Jim Wright that he began to wax nostalgic about the warmth and affection for the previous speaker, Tip O’Neill. ‘There are no such feelings for Jim Wright,’ he observed.” Then-House Minority Leader Newt Gingrich began filing numerous accusations of malfeasance by the speaker in the House Ethics Committee.

In the end Jim Wright resigned.

With the unanimous endorsement of the Democratic caucus the House then voted to replace him with Democrat Tom Foley — who restored the traditional civility and comity that had prevailed under Democratic Speakers Sam Rayburn, John McCormack, Carl Albert and “Tip” O’Neill.

Currently, with public respect for professional politicians at an all time low, and the financing of presidential campaigns at an all time high, the moral authority of both the Democratic Party and the GOP is diminishing. In my view, the longer Nancy Pelosi remains our party’s leading spokesperson the more her penchant for political warfare and non-compliance with Jefferson’s “Manual” will enhance the chances of Republican control of Congress and/or the White House in 2008.

She will serve our party and the nation best by resigning.

---

NewsMax.com February 26, 2007

## Hillary Clinton: Politics Above Principle For Over 30 Years

If Hillary becomes our first woman President she will have the dubious distinction of having successfully thwarted the efforts of Senator Obama to become our first Black — and Governor Richardson our first Hispanic — President. Her victory would also be the culmination of a political career which she began in 1969 at Wellesley — when she won prominence in Life Magazine for her controversial condemnation of our first Black Senator, Ed Brooke, a liberal Massachusetts Republican.

In high school Hillary had been a Republican “Goldwater Girl” and at Wellesley she soon became President of the college Republican club that supported Nixon. However, when Nixon fell into disrepute Hillary eventually joined the then popular “New Left” wing of the Democratic Party.

At that time Senator Brooke had become an anathema to far left Black Panthers and Black Muslims. Because of his prior military service and membership in the Republican Party – despite his opposition to Nixon’s escalation of Vietnam War – they maligned him as a “Right Wing Uncle Tom”

In 1969 Senator Brooke was invited to receive an honorary degree and give a commencement address at Wellesley. “New left” student protesters persuaded the school’s president to allow Hillary to be the first student in the schools history to give a commencement address in rebuttal to that of another speaker.

In her speech Hillary assailed Brooke.

She suggested that the “words integrity, trust, and respect” were misused if applied to him. To explain to her fellow students

why she had abandoned the Republican Party she added, “There’s a very strange conservative strain that goes through a lot of New Left, collegiate protests that I find very intriguing because it harkens back to a lot of the old virtues, to the fulfillment of original ideas. And it’s also a very unique American experience.”

In my recent book *Hillary’s Pursuit of Power* I have documented her ethical flaws since 1974 – when she served under my supervision on the staff of House Judiciary Committee. At that time, she became allied with the far left wing of our party, which opposed the confirmation of Gerald Ford to be vice president. For self serving partisan purposes they vilified Nixon publicly – but wanted us to keep him in office “twisting in the wind” for as long as possible.

In my view, throughout her entire career Hillary has put politics above principle — and is ethically unfit to hold office.

---

Friday, Dec. 29, 2006  
Reprinted from NewMax.com

#### Ford’s Forgotten Legacy

When the confirmation of Jerry Ford to be vice president was pending in the House Judiciary Committee I, as a Democrat, was in charge of an investigation that found him highly qualified.

I now continue to have the highest regard for his willingness to put principle above partisan politics.

Sadly, his legacies are now being maligned by *The New York Times*.

In its Dec. 28 editorial, the *Times* assailed him for the pardon of Richard Nixon. It also denigrated his prior role as a Republican minority leader by describing him this way: “In essence a creature of Congress — more precisely, of the House of Representatives, a place of perpetual compromise that encourages neither the vision that

sometimes attaches to the Senate nor the managerial skills [of] a governor.”

The New York Times and the current left wing of our Democratic Party now give Ford no credit for a meeting he held in the Oval Office with Times reporter James Reston and other prominent journalists.

At that time he disclosed that the CIA and Defense Department had jointly sponsored political assassinations on a broad scale under presidents Kennedy and Nixon.

Prominent Democrats such as Ted Kennedy, Nancy Pelosi, Hillary Clinton, and Harry Reid — like the editors of The New York Times, the media in general, and even many Republicans — would have us forget that John and Robert Kennedy were responsible for the assassinations of President Lumumba in the Congo, President Ngo Dinh Diem in Vietnam, and Rafael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

In revising history, they would also have the present generation of Americans not know that with the aid of Mafia leader Sam Giancana, the Kennedys sponsored numerous attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro.

In my view, the current ignorance of most Americans of an assassination program named “Operation Phoenix” — that went into operation during the Nixon administration — also reflects poorly on the media.

Under that program, political assassinations of South Vietnamese civilians were carried out on a broad scale.

In my view, the fact that the Phoenix program has not been widely reported is largely due to the collaboration of most of the main media with the CIA — that has long been a major source of leaks of scandals in other agencies.

In the 1970s, CIA Director William Colby himself admitted before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that the program, which was administered jointly with the Defense Department, killed more than 20,000 suspected civilian communists.

Later investigative journalists reported that Colby's figures had understated the assassinations. For more on this, read "The Agency: The Rise and Decline of the CIA," by John Ranelagh (1986).

From 1965 through 1968 the program summarily executed about 600 civilians per month. Of these most were tortured prior to execution. From 1968 through 1971, more than 40,000 were reportedly killed by the program.

When it was first publicly exposed, the intelligence journal *Counterspy* described the Phoenix Program as "the most indiscriminate and massive program of political murder since the Nazi death camps of World War II."

To his credit, President Ford not only issued an executive order outlawing political assassinations, he took positive steps to reform both the CIA and the Defense Department. He fired William Colby and replaced him with George Bush senior. He likewise fired Nixon's secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger, and replaced him with Donald Rumsfeld. He also appointed Dick Cheney as his chief of staff.

Now maligned by *The New York Times* as lacking managerial skills and vision, the Ford administration was scandal free. In my view he was the most nonpartisan and ethical president in my life time.

---

## HILLARY'S WATERGATE SCANDAL

In December 1974, as general counsel and chief of staff of the House Judiciary Committee, I made a personal evaluation of Hillary Rodham (now Senator Clinton), a member of the staff we had gathered for our impeachment inquiry on President Richard Nixon. I decided that I could not recommend her for any future position of public or private trust.

Why? Hillary's main duty on our staff has been described by as "establishing the legal procedures to be followed in the course of the inquiry and impeachment." A number of the procedures she recommended were ethically flawed. And I also



concluded that she had violated House and committee rules by disclosing confidential information to unauthorized persons.

Hillary had conferred personally with me regarding procedural rules. I advised her that Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino, House Speaker Carl Albert, Majority Leader Tip O'Neill and I had previously agreed not to advocate anything contrary to the rules already adopted and published for that Congress. I quoted Mr. O'Neill's statement that: "To try to change the rules now would be politically divisive. It would be like trying to change the traditional rules of baseball before a World Series."

Hillary assured me that she had not drafted and would not advocate any such rules changes. I soon learned that she had lied: She had already drafted changes, and continued to advocate them.

In one written legal memorandum, she advocated denying President Nixon representation by counsel. She had done this despite the fact that—in our then-most-recent prior impeachment proceeding—the committee had afforded the right to counsel to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

I also informed Hillary that the Douglas impeachment files were available for public inspection in our offices. I later learned that the Douglas files were then removed from our general files without my permission, transferred to the offices of the impeachment inquiry staff, and were no longer accessible to the public.

The young Ms. Rodham had other bad advice about procedures, arguing that the Judiciary Committee should neither (1) hold any hearings with or take the depositions of any live witnesses, nor 2) conduct any original investigation of Watergate, bribery, tax evasion, or any other possible impeachable offense of President Nixon - but to rely instead on prior investigations conducted by other committees and agencies.

The committee rejected Ms. Rodham's recommendations: It agreed to allow President Nixon to be represented by counsel and to hold hearings with live witnesses. Hillary then advocated that the official rules of the House be amended to deny members of the committee the right to question witnesses. This unfair recommendation was rejected

by the full House. (The committee also vetoed her suggestion that it leave the drafting of the articles of impeachment to her and her fellow special staffers.)

The recommendations advocated by Hillary were apparently initiated or approved by Yale Law School professor Burke Marshall - in violation of committee and House rules on confidentiality. They were also advocated by her immediate supervisors, Special Counsel John Doar and Senior Associate Special Counsel Bernard Nussbaum, both of whom had worked under Marshall in the Kennedy Justice Department.

It was not until two months after Nixon's resignation that I first learned of still another questionable role of Ms. Rodham. On Sept. 26, 1974, Rep. Charles Wiggins, a Republican member of the committee, wrote to ask Chairman Rodino to look into a troubling set of events.

That spring, Wiggins and other committee members had asked "that research should be undertaken so as to furnish a standard against which to test the alleged abusive conduct of Richard Nixon." And, while "no such staff study was made available to the members at any time for their use," Wiggins had just learned that such a study had been conducted - at committee expense - by a team of professors who completed and filed their reports with the impeachment-inquiry staff well in advance of our public hearings.

The report was not made available to members of Congress. But after the impeachment-inquiry staff was disbanded, it was published commercially and sold in book stores. Wiggins wrote that he was "especially troubled by the possibility that information deemed essential by some of the members in their discharge of their responsibilities may have been intentionally suppressed by the staff during the course our investigation."

On Oct. 3, Rodino wrote back: "Hillary Rodham of the impeachment-inquiry staff coordinated the work. ... After the staff received the report it was reviewed by Ms. Rodham, briefly by Mr. Labovitz and Mr. Sack, and by Mr. Doar. The staff did not think the manuscript was useful in its present form."

On the charge of willful suppression, he wrote: "That was not the case ... The staff did not think the material was usable by the committee in its existing

form and had not had time to modify it so it would have practical utility for the members of the committee. I was informed and agreed with the judgment.”

During my 17 year tenure with the House Judiciary Committee, I had supervisory authority over several hundred staff members. With the exception of Ms. Rodham, Doar and Nussbaum, I recommend all of them for future positions of public and private trust.

WALL STREET JOURNAL  
October 25, 1999

### Cancer on the Presidency

Sadly, as a life-long Democrat and chief counsel of the House Judiciary Committee at the time of the Nixon impeachment inquiry, I cannot in good conscience vote to re-elect Bill Clinton. Having reached this decision, I am proud to be among those Democrats who have chosen principle over party. Defeating Mr. Clinton would help revive the traditional moral values of the Democratic Party — as they existed under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson and Carter.

Having long championed traditional Democratic causes, I simply cannot accept Mr. Clinton's shameless election-year surge to the right as his chosen means of winning a second term. And like most if not all traditional Democrats, I have grave reservations about the Clintons' morality and ethics. In my view there is now probable cause to consider our president and first lady as felons, who are likely to be indicted after the Nov. 5 election.

The misdeeds of the Clinton administration have fallen into a pattern of deceit and corruption that now clearly justifies denying Mr. Clinton a second term in office. To date more than 30 high administration officials have been investigated, fired or forced to resign, and the White House has illegally obtained more than 900 confidential FBI files. Four independent counsels have been appointed, three to investigate cabinet members and one to investigate the president himself.

The White House suppressed documents under subpoena. The Department of Justice, the FBI and the Treasury Department have been politicized and misused to prosecute or investigate innocent staffers of the White House Travel Office. The president's Health Care Task Force operated secretly in gross violation of federal disclosure laws, misled the federal courts and ignored conflict-of-interest laws.

The most recent scandal, involving former Commerce Department official and Democratic Party fund-raiser John Huang (who still has failed to answer a summons issued by District Judge Royce C. Lamberth), is but another hauntingly familiar throwback to my days as an investigator of Watergate crimes and a wide variety of other forms of presidential misconduct. The 1972 Republican Committee to Re-Elect the President (CREEP) was involved in many shady operations that mixed legitimate government funding operations with the illegitimate refunneling of money through backdoor corporate contributions into CREEP coffers.

Now it appears that Mr. Huang, and his former associates from the Indonesian Lippo financial conglomerate, were unlawfully funneling contributions from foreign sources (that had both corporate and political interests in U.S. policy) into Democratic Party coffers. This mixing of U.S. policy with partisan fund-raising — not to mention the questionable background of some of the institutions and individuals given top clearance by the White House and the DNC — has produced a cancer on the Clinton presidency painfully reminiscent of the cancer that brought down Nixon.

I am particularly saddened that the Clintons now believe that their unethical and unlawful acts in the pursuit of power will be condoned by all but a few Democrats in the name of party unity. During the Nixon impeachment inquiry it was my view that the core of Nixon's corruption was his belief that in politics his ends justified any means at all.

Ironically, it is now the Clinton administration

that has given renewed intensity to the corrupt notion that immoral means can be legitimized in the pursuit of political ends. If Mr. Clinton is re-elected it will be testimony to his success in putting politics before principle. A second Clinton term would polarize the nation even more dangerously than did Richard Nixon's — this time with Republicans as the new defenders of integrity in government and Democrats as the defenders of a corrupt administration. If Mr. Clinton is defeated, Democrats may find a new strength — and long remember the folly of marching in lockstep in support of a corrupt president in the name of party unity.

---

Books and Articles

by

Jerry Zeifman

Send comments to:

[jzeifman@yahoo.com](mailto:jzeifman@yahoo.com)

---

47 posted on **Saturday, July 07, 2007 12:00:35 PM** by **Eva (I)**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 46](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

For parallel and reversed scripts involving Hillary and illuminati suicide bombers:

<http://illuminati-religion.blogspot.com/2008/11/richard-m-nixon-v-barack-h-obama-or-two.html>

---

48 posted on **Monday, December 29, 2008 5:29:23 PM** by **VIPu**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

Get Quincy to test the fetus DNA.

---

49 posted on **Monday, July 27, 2009 3:39:34 PM** by **FreeJustADollar**

[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 37](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

---

To: **Ed\_in\_NJ**

“The HillaBeast” would lie....I am shocked! There is also gambling here.....I am shocked....shut the place down, Oh by the way where are my winnings Rick?

50 posted on **Sunday, May 12, 2013 2:24:15 PM** by **banker16**  
[ [Post Reply](#) | [Private Reply](#) | [To 1](#) | [View Replies](#) ]

**Disclaimer:** Opinions posted on Free Republic are those of the individual posters and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Free Republic or its management. All materials posted herein are protected by copyright law and the exemption for fair use of copyrighted works.

**Free Republic**  
[Browse](#) · [Search](#)

[News/Activism](#)  
[Topics](#) · [Post Article](#)

---

**FreeRepublic, LLC, PO BOX 9771, FRESNO, CA 93794**  
FreeRepublic.com is powered by software copyright 2000-2008 John Robinson