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In November 1939, after the outbreak of war in Europe, Hoover also began to compile a list of individuals to be closely monitored and/or detained in the event of a national emergency or war. In June 1940 he sought and gained the approval of Attorney General Robert Jackson for this list, known as the Custodial Detention list. (Late in life, Jackson appears to have regretted the powers that Hoover accumulated.)

The Custodial Detention list played no role in the wholesale displacement in 1942 of Japanese and coastal Italians, which Hoover opposed. In 1943 Biddle decided that the Custodial Detention list had outlived its usefulness and that there was no statutory authorization for it. His order to Hoover to close the list was unambiguous:

The [Justice] Department fulfills its proper function by investigating the activities of persons who may have violated the law. It is not aided in this work by classifying persons as to dangerousness.

[But] upon receipt of this order, the FBI Director did not abolish the FBI’s list. Instead, he changed its name from Custodial Detention List to Security Index.

Hoover’s decision to disregard Biddle’s order, leaving his detention program planning without legal authorization “remained secret until after his death.” The plans, along with Hoover’s illegal intelligence acquisitions and his use of organized crime as a source for them, were cornerstones in his conversion of the FBI into a powerful bureau that was both publicly funded and in part outside the domain of public law. This in turn became the key element in his aggregation of powers into what in the past I have called the deep state.

In particular the detention list survived a second and third effort to abolish it.

When the Security Index was ordered closed in 1971, the names were again transferred, to a new Administrative Index (ADEX). This new ADEX was in turn discontinued in 1978 under Jimmy Carter and his Attorney General Griffin Bell. But the list was not destroyed, and remained available for use by the new Reagan Administration, when in 1982 a secret committee including Rumsfeld and Cheney began planning for mass detentions under the rubric of Continuity of Government (COG) planning.

How Hoover’s Detention Plans Became Part of National Emergency (COG) Planning
According to Tim Weiner, it was on July 7, 1950, at the crest of the hysteria fomented by the Korean War and by hearings in HUAC and SISS, Hoover for the first time formally briefed the White House and the NSC his plans for “the mass detention of political suspects in military stockades, a secret prison system for jailing American citizens, and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.” He also revealed that he had had since 1939 a list of about twelve thousand individuals, nearly all of them U.S. citizens, who under his plan could be rounded up summarily on the issuance of a single “master warrant.” (According to Tim Weiner, Hoover had also approved a plan, never fully implemented, “to put every one of the roughly eighty thousand members of the Communist Party of the United States on the FBI’s secret Security [i.e. detention] Index.”)

Hoover’s plan was soon paralleled in Congress by the passage (over Truman’s veto) of the McCarran Internal Security Act in the same year, whose Title II authorized the Attorney General in times of emergency to round up and hold individuals in detention centers. Congress, in passing the Emergency Detention Act, was unaware that Hoover had already assumed this power. Moreover the Act established certain protections of individual human rights, which Hoover and some DOJ officials considered “unworkable.”

Accordingly, Attorney General J. Howard directed the FBI to ignore the congressionally mandated standards and instead base current and future detention investigation on the administration’s secretly authorized program.

In October 1950 the entry of China into the Korean War moved Truman on December 16, 1950, to proclaim “a national emergency, which requires that the military, naval, air, and civilian defenses of this country be strengthened as speedily as possible.” Truman’s proclamation of a national emergency authorized publicly the military buildup authorized secretly two days earlier in NSC 68/4 of December 14; in the same way that Bush’s proclamation of a national emergency on September 14, 2011 became the public authority for the COG measures implemented secretly by Cheney and Rumsfeld (during Bush’s absence from Washington) on 9/11.

The Chinese intervention also persuaded Truman to threaten Beijing with possible use of atomic weapons.[i] As the Soviet Union now possessed its own bomb, Truman initiated COG planning to deal with a possible counterattack. Thus in a sense it can be said that the manic planning for Doomsday is a by-product of the Korean War.

Truman’s proclamation of a national emergency lasted until 1977. Under Eisenhower “A series of atomic attack simulations, entitled “Operation Alert,” were implemented from 1955 to 1960, ... to test “the capability of all levels of government to operate following an attack.” These exercises generated a growing number of Presidential Emergency Action Documents, or PEADs, which have been since defined by FEMA as

“[f]inal drafts of Presidential messages, proposed legislation proclamations, and other formal documents, including DOJ [Department of Justice]-issued cover sheets addressed to the President, to be issued in event of a Presidentially-declared national emergency.”
We learn from an internal FBI memo of June 19, 1958 that some of these PEADs from the FBI concerned the “apprehension and detention of those dangerous alien enemies presently included in our Security Index.”136 (One wonders what “dangerous alien enemies” were contemplated in the emergency planning of the late 1950s, when the Communist Party was by then clearly moribund, and the USG had not yet begun to stoke xenophobic anxieties about terrorists.)

Of even greater significance to COG planning in the 1980s and 1990s was the decision by Eisenhower’s cabinet to commission new “executive agencies to develop continuity measures - the means by which a fragmented federal government could begin to exercise authority over a devastated nation.”137 One of these, destined to mushroom under Reagan into a billion-dollar boondoggle, was the National Communications Agency (NCA), whose designated task was to “assist in maintaining the flow of essential national telecommunications.” Like some of the other such agencies, it was chaired by a corporate executive outside government: in this case by President Frank Stanton of the CBS Television Network.138 Eisenhower had first brought in Stanton and other prominent private citizens for Doomsday planning, just “a few weeks after the Soviets launched the first manmade satellite in 1957, shattering America’s sense of security.” The involvement of private leaders has been a feature of Doomsday planning ever since.139

The NCA was a precursor of the National Communications System (NCS), formally established by a JFK Presidential Memorandum on August 21, 1963. By 1969 at least $175 million had been spent “to increase the survivability of national communications resources” in a nuclear attack.140 In June 1979 the system was tested under Carter, in the first known instance of the COG exercise GLOBAL SHIELD. By the Reagan era the NCS had mushroomed into an $8 billion communications and logistics program for an alternative emergency communications network.141

Elsewhere I have argued that in the background of 9/11, as well as in all comparable deep events diverting America towards its current dual state, we can see the workings of “the alternative emergency planning structure with its own communications network, operating as a shadow network outside of regular government channels.”142 The most obvious example is in Iran-Contra, when Oliver North, arranging for the arms shipments to Iran that eventually cost him his job, used the nation’s top secret Doomsday communications network. North’s network, known as Flashboard,

excluded other bureaucrats with opposing viewpoints...[and] had its own special worldwide antiterrorist computer network, ... by which members could communicate exclusively with each other and their collaborators abroad.143

North was also actively developing the plans, which as we have seen originated with Hoover, for emergency detentions on a large scale.144

So, before him, was James McCord, famous for having participated in the 1972 burglary that precipitated the 1972 Watergate crisis.

McCord was a member of a small Air Force Reserve unit in Washington attached to the Office of Emergency Preparedness (OEP); assigned “to draw up lists of radicals and to develop contingency plans for censorship of the news media and U.S. mail in time of war.” His unit was part of
the Wartime Information Security Program (WISP), which had responsibility for activating "contingency plans for imposing censorship on the press, the mails and all telecommunications (including government communications) [and] preventive detention of civilian 'security risks,' who would be placed in military 'camps.'"\(^{145}\)

From this time forward into the 1990s, the FBI's emergency plans and PEADs would be melded into the national emergency planning process, which in turn was enmeshed in Iran-Contra and also possibly Watergate.\(^{146}\)

**Hoover's Use of Organized Crime as a Source of Intelligence**

From the outset, Hoover's power over most other agencies of government (but conspicuously not the CIA) was reinforced by his de facto alliance with the overworld and its political armies, combined with his de facto alliance with underworld criminal elements. Back in 1919-20, Hoover's Bureau, in conducting its nation-wide raids and arrests, "coordinated its work closely with a 250,000 member right-wing vigilante group, the American Protective League," supported by business leaders.\(^{147}\) In later years Hoover continued to augment the FBI's spying networks and files with other business-supported organizations, above all the American Legion\(^{148}\) and its post-war offshoot the American Security Council (ASC).

The second major network supplementing the FBI was the Anti-Defamation League, According to its prominent critic Alfred M. Lilienthal, "the ADL ... works closely with the Israeli intelligence agency, Mossad, and sometimes with the FBI or CIA."\(^{149}\)

The author and Village Voice journalist Robert Friedman agrees:

At the onset of the Cold War, the ADL was running perhaps the largest private spy agency in America, regularly feeding the FBI information not only on anti-Semitic groups like the KKK and the American Nazi party, but also on Jewish leftists and members of the Communist Party.... It supplied not only the FBI, but, according to the Congressional Record, the Commerce Department, which reviewed the files of applicants for government jobs, searching for "subversives.".... In the '50's and '60s, the ADL continued to penetrate and expose racist and fascist groups. It also championed the civil rights movement, speaking out for fair housing and against job discrimination. Yet as always, there was a darker side. The ADL spied on Martin Luther King and passed its files to J. Edgar Hoover's FBI, according to Henry Schwarzchild, who was an ADL officer from 1962 to 1964 and is now an official with the ACLU. "It was common and casually accepted knowledge," Schwarzchild told the S.F. Weekly.\(^{150}\)

Hoover also exploited the close and arguably very improper relationships that he maintained with wealthy, usually independent and self-made, millionaires like Joseph Kennedy, Clint Murchison, Sr., Lewis Rosenstiel, and George Allen (Hoover's backdoor forwarder to Truman of the memo attacking McCloy).\(^{151}\)

It is a telling sign of the deep state milieu after Prohibition that every one of these self-made millionaires had intimate connections to
organized crime – and there are many reports that through them and their journalistic friends like Walter Winchell, Hoover himself met at New York’s Stork Club with organized crime figures like Frank Costello. Burton Hersh asserts that Hoover tactfully maintained this connection to the Stork Club milieu because “Costello was a resource.”

The Stork Club, where Hoover liked to hobnob with journalists like Walter Winchell and mobsters like Frank Costello

For decades Hoover declined to investigate and prosecute organized crime, claiming “that it was a local police problem, outside of the FBI’s jurisdiction.” As former FBI agent Peter Pitchess (later Sheriff of Los Angeles County) recalled, “Organized crime was just not a concern of the Bureau. We knew it existed, but there were hardly any prosecutions, and we knew this was FBI policy.” In this way Hoover tacitly accepted Tammany-style corruption as a reinforcement of the status quo, and also as a resource for dealing with outsiders who threatened it.

Hoover was recognizing and sanctioning, rather than creating, the social status of the Mob, which at the time helped elect politicians and perform favors for the wealthy. In particular Hoover was helping to preserve a status quo in which organized crime continued to help wealthy industrialists like Henry Ford (or more precisely his security chief Harry Bennett) fight trade unions like the United Auto Workers, by granting delivery contracts and concessions to prominent mobsters like Joe Adonis, Brooklyn’s top man in narcotics.

An important political consequence of this de facto tolerance was to protect and reinforce the enduring influence of organized crime in the local politics of cities like New York, Newark, Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco. This was brought home to me through my researches into Jack Ruby, whom I linked in an early manuscript to a nation-wide network of mob figures involved in gambling and narcotics. One morning I was surprised to see in our local newspaper that one of Ruby’s associates, Benny Barrish, was named for his part in the 1974 lease of a San Francisco City golf course to an east coast gangster.

Hoover did not just tolerate organized crime: he used it not just as a source of information, but as a source also of enforcement. A notorious example of the latter was the surrender of Louis Lepke Buchalter to Hoover personally, negotiated with the approval of Lansky and the aid of newsman Walter Winchell at the Stork Club. Enforcement was politically selective. For example when in 1957 a rogue ex-FBI agent, with the assistance of Joe Zicarelli of the Bonanno family, kidnapped the left-wing Dominican journalist Jesús de Galindez on behalf of Dominican dictator Trujillo (who subsequently had him murdered),
Hoover, rather than indict a right-wing dictator, “informed the Justice and State Departments that the case against Trujillo and his henchmen was not ‘sufficiently airtight.’”

Hoover used political criteria to recruit and protect individual mafia members as informants, a process which could easily lead to corruption and scandal – some of which still exists. The example of Ali Mohamed, examined earlier, was far from unique. In 1971, as a favor to his political ally, House Speaker John McCormack, Hoover in a personal memo directed the Boston FBI office to develop Whitey Bulger, then a minor mob figure, as an informant. (Whitey’s brother James was part of the McCormack political machine and a member of the House of Representatives.)

For two decades Bulger fed inside information about the Boston Patriarca crime family to his FBI contact John Connolly (also appointed by Hoover on the recommendation of McCormack). At the same time Whitey Bulger ran a lucrative protection racket targeting drug kingpins and gambling operators. Eventually Bulger was indicted for 19 murders, including the murder of another FBI informant for which crime Connolly was also jailed.

The Connolly-Bulger scandal in Boston was not anomalous. In the 1980s a very similar scandal developed in the FBI’s New York office, where agent Lin DeVecchio protected his mafia informant Gregory Scarpa, Sr., from arrest, allowing Scarpa to commit a series of mob murders with impunity. Author Peter Lance has made a persuasive case that the FBI’s eagerness to cover up the DeVecchio scandal eventually led it to cover up significant evidence about 9/11.

Hoover’s Use of Illegal Methods to Combat the Ku Klux Klan

Those who like myself celebrate the nonviolent desegregation of the South in the 1960s need to recognize that the civil rights movement did not achieve this fundamental change without other efforts to enforce federal laws. The White House deployed federal manpower to enforce rulings of the federal courts -- U.S. marshals whenever possible. These were inadequate, however, when Governor Ross Barnett in 1962 sought to block the court-ordered admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi, an event which “many historians view as ground zero on the southern counterrevolution against integration and multiculturalism.” In this case a well-organized riot forced the Kennedy brothers to send in more than twelve thousand U.S. Army soldiers, climaxing a fixed battle that left two people dead.

The attempt of the Kennedys to use the law against insurrection began to look increasingly counterproductive. Robert Kennedy then moved against General Edwin Walker, who had mobilized the mob at Ole Miss “with his contingent of gunmen from Dallas” by remanding the general for psychiatric examination at the Medical Center for Federal Prisoners in Springfield, Missouri. “The John Birch Society and other far-right groups heralded this as an example of the ‘Kennedy police state.’” After five days, the USG backed down and Walker was released, now a “leading light” of the Birch Society in Dallas and elsewhere. And he still had good connections with other right-wingers in the US military.

In April 1963 there was a meeting in New Orleans of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., a Miami detective’s report of which included the statement that "there was indicated the overthrow of the present government of the United States," including "the setting up of a criminal activity to assassinate particular persons." The report added that "membership within the Congress of Freedom, Inc., contain high ranking members of the armed forces that secretly belong to the organization." Things were beginning to get out of hand.
Characteristically, Hoover took no known steps against this conclave of "high ranking members of the armed forces;" indeed, he took steps to discredit the source. With respect to the lower middle-class Klan, however, his response was quite different. While the White House used legal means to respond to the phenomenon of Klan violence, Hoover secretly resorted to illegal means to go after the hidden roots of disorder in the Klan and its allies. This may have been more important as well as less disruptive, for as journalist Maryanne Vollers has noted, “the retaliation that followed Meredith’s admission to Ole Miss showed a pattern indicting that someone was directing a terror campaign in the state.” (It is possible, though not certain, that Hoover had better intelligence than Kennedy on the strength of the deep powers backing Klan resistance to desegregation.)

Admittedly Hoover dealt very belatedly with the problem of racial violence, but in the end he also did so forcefully. He himself was a segregationist by background and inclination. In 1956 he warned Eisenhower’s cabinet about the dangers of “mixed education” from desegregation, including the "specter of racial [i.e. interracial] marriage." As late as 1961 there were only five African-American FBI agents, all of whom “mostly served as drivers.”

There were other factors inhibiting his commitment to racial justice. The FBI model for social stability was cooperation with local law enforcement, which in the Deep South was committed to segregation. And much of Hoover’s support in Congress came from southern racist committee chairmen like Senator Eastland, the overseer of the SISS.

And yet, as the civil rights movement was answered with more and more bombings and murders from a resurgent Ku Klux Klan, Hoover himself intervened, far more vigorously than is generally recognized. It is widely known that on September 2, 1964, after the murder of three civil rights workers in Mississippi, Hoover matched his COINTELPRO against “Black Nationalist Hate Groups” (including the SCLC and Martin Luther King) with a new COINTELPRO – WHITE HATE directed exclusively against the Klan. In the next seven years the FBI conducted 287 separate operations, and by September 1965, the FBI could identify 2,000 Klansmen on its payroll as informants.

It is wrong to dismiss Hoover’s anti-Klan campaign as “small” compared to other COINTELPROs. On the contrary, “COINTELPRO activities had a devastating effect on Klan activity. There were so many undercover agents operating in the Klan that Klan leaders became hesitant to make decisions for fear that the FBI would learn of them.”

Tim Weiner writes that

“Mr. Hoover never would have changed by himself” not without LBJ’s forceful command [on July 2,
1964), Burke Marshall [RFK’s civil rights chief] said. “The FBI was grudging about doing anything” against the Klan. “Mr. Hoover viewed the civil-rights activists as lawbreakers. The FBI was worse than useless, given his mind-set” – until the president ordered him to change his mind.\textsuperscript{178}

Marshall’s negative judgment of Hoover reflects that voiced at the time by Martin Luther King. However Athan Theoharis reports that, already in 1963, Hoover had subordinated his distaste for the nonviolent civil rights movement to his concern that certain Klan elements represented an organized violent insurrection, against the court-ordered imposition of federal laws. Not only this, Hoover had decided to fight illegal violence with illegal violence – the resources of the deep state.

It is not yet widely known that, after the murder of civil rights activist Medgar Evers in June 1963, Hoover allegedly authorized the use of a mafia killer, “Julio” [possibly Gregory Scarpa], to extract the name of Evers’ murderer from a pistol-whipped and terrorized witness.\textsuperscript{179} A year later, after the June 1964 murder of three civil rights workers in Mississippi, Scarpa again extracted the facts for the FBI from a witness, this time by brandishing a straight-edge razor and unzipping the witness’ fly.\textsuperscript{180} And in 1966, after the arson-murder of Vernon Dahmer, Scarpa identified the culprit from a witness beaten so violently he was hospitalized and never again the same.\textsuperscript{181}

Among those arrested and eventually convicted as a result of Scarpa’s interventions was Samuel Holloway Bowers, leader of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, “the most successfully violent KKK subgroup in the nation.”\textsuperscript{182} Bowers was the power behind murders and bombings across the entire Deep South (including, a recent book has suggested, at least one murder plot against Martin Luther King).\textsuperscript{183} He had rightly anticipated that he would not be tried in a Mississippi state court; but Scarpa’s discoveries helped enable the federal government to convict him and establish federal authority. This ended the impunity of Bowers’ Klan, and defused its dangerous “strategy to induce [a] race war.”\textsuperscript{184}

**Samuel Bowers, the Ku Klux Klan leader and murderer successfully targeted by the FBI**

In 1967, after the conviction of Bowers,
remnants of his White Knights began bombing Jewish synagogues and homes. This escalation of violence, to include white as well as black targets, also escalated the FBI’s resort to illegalities, far beyond the use of torture to obtain evidence. According to investigative reporter Jack Nelson, who broke the story, the FBI in 1968 helped provoke the attempted bombing of a Jewish businessman’s home in Meridian, Mississippi. In Nelson’s account, the FBI hired two informants to induce two of Bowers’ close associates (Thomas A. Tarrants III and another Klansman) to attempt another bombing, so that police waiting at the scene could execute them during the commission of the crime.

As Nelson pointed out, this represented a new level of FBI illegality:

1) it involved premeditated murder;

2) it involved entrapment — Tarrants (and another victim, not the intended target) “had been lured into a trap by a pair of informants;”

3) the informants [one of them out on appeal after being convicted for shooting the three civil rights workers in 1964] were motivated, not just by thousands of dollars in reward money put up by the local Anti-Defamation League, but also by “threats by the local police and the FBI to kill them if they didn’t cooperate.”

It is difficult to defend such tactics, other than to note (as Nelson does) that 1968 was “a year like no other,” with killings and unprecedented rioting around the nation and the world. Nelson himself was so shocked by what he learned that he broke with the local FBI (his source for earlier stories) and alerted the nation to the illegalities.

At the same time Nelson had to concede that, “Since the ambush, there had been no further violence against Jews in Mississippi.” His assessment is expanded on by professor George Michael: “The attack proved effective, as it finally broke the back of the Klan violence in Mississippi.”

Let me close this dubious late chapter in Hoover’s career with words spoken by Gandhi shortly before his assassination: “No good act can produce an evil result. Evil means, even for a good end, produce evil results.” Evil results, in this case, even for the FBI itself.

*  

**The End of Hooverism and the Debates of the Post-Vietnam Era**

It can be said that by 1968 Hoover, William Sullivan, the other leaders in Washington, and the country itself were all driven awry from violence, all no longer themselves, all out of control. I wrote earlier that “all power intoxicates; unchecked power intoxicates irrevocably.” Like Defense Secretary Forrestal and CIA officer Frank Wisner, both Hoover and Sullivan were by now behaving so oddly that their behavior, especially Sullivan’s, was being questioned by their own colleagues.

But the mania by 1968 was institutional, not just personal. The FBI by then, at Sullivan’s urging, had helped instigate a number of other murders, notably that of Black Panther leader Fred Hampton in Chicago, killed with multiple gun wounds while at home sleeping in his bed. Furthermore there were a number of instances where the FBI instigated battles, sometimes lethal, between the Panthers and other groups, making the Bureau, as legal scholar Frank Donner has written, “criminally complicit in the violence” that ensued. Across the country
break-ins and assaults were carried out by right-wing paramilitary groups coordinating their efforts with FBI informants, military intelligence agents, and local police investigative units.... The FBI relationship to the far right reached a violent climax in San Diego, where an FBI informant testified the FBI provided him with $10,000 worth of weapons, including explosives used in a bombing by the Secret Army Organization (SAO), a right-wing group which harassed activists protesting the Vietnam war. The FBI even hid a gun used in an SAO assassination attempt against a leftist professor until an ACLU-sponsored lawsuit by a woman wounded in the assault forced the FBI to reveal the weapon’s existence.\textsuperscript{197}

The FBI’s escalation in the use of violence reflected the increasingly independent domination of the its COINTELPROs by Assistant Director William “Crazy Bill” Sullivan.\textsuperscript{198} Already in 1967 Sullivan had challenged Hoover’s aging leadership, arguing that the Ku Klux Klan was a far greater threat than the CPUSA. As Hoover grew increasingly cautious, Sullivan took less and less guidance from his director, and built violence-prone coalitions instead with James Angleton in the CIA, and eventually the Nixon White House.\textsuperscript{199}

In a dialectic worthy of a Greek tragedy, the FBI’s excesses had seriously undermined Hoover’s powers before his death in 1972. Nelson, backed by his newspaper the \textit{L.A. Times}, proceeded, after exposing the Meridian incident, to expose a series of other FBI illegalities, inducing Hoover in turn to put Nelson on his enemies’ list and wage a lying war against him as a “jackal” and “a lice- covered ferret.”\textsuperscript{200} Nelson’s sequence of page-one stories had the consequence of eroding Hoover’s support in both Congress and the White House: “Suddenly, after years of near idolization, J. Edgar Hoover was no longer untouchable. The FBI director was now fair game.”\textsuperscript{201}

Before Hoover’s death in 1972 Congress had finally begun to expose and condemn Hoover’s wiretapping and other illegalities. As Hoover became more and more reluctant to break the law, he became increasingly a curb to the illegalities of others – notably the increasingly obvious efforts of William Sullivan to replace him, with the support of President Nixon. A denouement of sorts was Hoover’s blocking of the 1970 “Huston Plan” for a consolidated national police uniting the resources of FBI, CIA, DIA, and NSA. The plan was nominally proposed Tom Huston in the Nixon White House, but in fact drafted chiefly by Sullivan. The other agencies supported the proposal and Nixon initially signed it; but Hoover, by enlisting Attorney General Mitchell as an ally, succeeded in persuading Nixon to reverse his decision.\textsuperscript{202}

This episode was not without consequences. In the short run, the defeat of the Huston Plan drove the White House to engage unilaterally in the series of illegalities we remember as “Watergate.”\textsuperscript{203} And the coalition of agencies backing the plan was revived during the COG planning (the Doomsday Project) of the 1980s and 1990s. Viewed retrospectively, the Huston Plan looks like an early blueprint for the shadow security state we live under today.

But simultaneously Hoover, increasingly out of touch with reality, began to lose the self-restraint with which he had previously managed his own secret intelligence. In 1971 a congressman who was also a U.S. Navy hero, Commander William Anderson, spoke in the House and
rebuked J. Edgar Hoover ... for accusing two prominent opponents of the Vietnam War of plotting to kidnap a government official and blow up electrical systems in the Washington area. He termed Hoover’s accusations the “climax” of “an outrageous pattern of fear and repression.”

Such a rebuke of Hoover in Congress was unprecedented, and so was Hoover’s response. Instead of privately threatening Anderson, he had the Congressman investigated.... Agents found a madam who “thought” Anderson had visited her place of business several years earlier. Hoover then scribbled “whoremonger” on the memorandum...and arranged to have the story leaked to the press in Anderson’s home state.... In 1972, William Anderson — four-term congressman from Tennessee — was defeated for reelection.

But the spell of the FBI over Congress had been broken; and in a few years Congress, in a turnabout, would begin to investigate the FBI.

The Debate Over Secret Powers in the Post-Vietnam Interim Before Reagan

After the traumas of Watergate and Nixon’s resignation, the national mood for more transparency in government increased, at least temporarily. A number of Congressional committees, notably the Senate Committee chaired by Senator Frank Church, began to examine some of the illegalities of the COINTELPROs, as did an administrative committee of Justice department officials set up by Attorney General William Saxbe.

It appeared briefly, in short, that the public state might bring Hooverism under control. And indeed, a number of key FBI programs, such as the Security List for emergency mass detentions, were terminated, at least on paper, in 1978. Congress also passed the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance (FISA) Act of 1978, as a compromise effort to regulate wiretapping. In addition two senior FBI officials were convicted in 1980 for having authorized illegal break-ins.

But meanwhile other counterforces were building to reverse what Professor Samuel Huntington, in a study for the Trilateral Commission, called the "excess of democracy" then current in the American system. In 1974 the new Ford White House, with first Donald Rumsfeld and later Dick Cheney as Chief of Staff, became a focal point for resisting the efforts of Church and others to achieve greater openness in American government.

In 1974 the new Ford White House, with first Donald Rumsfeld and later Dick Cheney as Chief of Staff, became a focal point for resisting the efforts of Church and others to achieve greater openness in American government.[ii]

Rumsfeld and Cheney were not acting alone. Behind them were the forces determined to see that U.S. defense budget did not shrink (as candidate Jimmy Carter intended) after Vietnam. And behind the neocons of the 1970s Committee on the Present Danger were still other, more shadowy international forces, such as the Saudi-backed Safari Club of intelligence chiefs, and behind it the ultra-reactionary political backers of future leaders Reagan and Thatcher in the Pinay Circle.[iii]

Although the predominant issues after the collapse of the Saigon regime in Vietnam were the future of détente and the defense budget, also at stake was the future of the secret powers amassed by Hoover – above all warrantless surveillance. Journalists Lou Dubose and Jake Bernstein write that in this
period Cheney, aided by his friend Antonin Scalia (then Chief of the Justice Department’s Office of Legal Counsel) “teamed up to defend executive privilege,” including “illegal wiretapping.” Rumsfeld, Cheney, and Scalia also united in an unsuccessful campaign to block implementation of the important 1976 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

This campaign of Donald Rumsfeld and Cheney in the Ford White House, to protect the FBI and CIA from congressional tampering, was part of a larger campaign, to put an end to Nixon-Kissinger policies of detente and multipolarity, and put America back on the path towards global domination.

In the so-called Halloween Massacre of 1975, Rumsfeld and Cheney also arranged to end Kissinger’s tenure as national security advisor, and for Nelson Rockefeller to be removed from his expected vice-presidential position on the 1976 Republican ticket. This opened the way to the election of Reagan in 1980 and the subsequent Reagan Revolution, the final victory of the executive forces for secrecy over the Congressional efforts at openness. With the appointment of Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney to a secret COG planning committee in 1982 (the so-called Doomsday Project), arrangements resumed for warrantless surveillance, massive emergency detentions and other suspended features of Hoover’s agenda.

In short the Post-Vietnam struggle in Washington, between the Congressional defenders of a public state, and the Administrative defenders of secret powers, was effectively resolved by the launching in 1982 of the so-called Doomsday Project: plans for an emergency suspension of provisions in the Constitution. Today the landmark achievements of the post-Watergate reforms, such as the FISA Act and the National Emergencies Act, are dead. Programs briefly suspended, such as the maintenance of lists for wide-scale detention, have been restored on a level far wider than before.

Of all the post-Watergate reforms, the most visible one to survive was the establishment, by the Intelligence Oversight Act of 1980, of permanent committees in both the Senate and the House for oversight of the CIA and FBI. Those who see this reform as significant point to the Iran-Contra crisis of the 1980s, when a congressional ban on CIA aid to the Nicaraguan Contras (the so-called Boland Amendments) led to illegal responses by White House officials, and their subsequent exposure. But the intention of the reform can be said to have been effectively reversed, making the committees into constituencies for the intelligence agencies, rather than custodians of them. Thus in the 1980s the Committees not only gave the CIA full leash on their dubious Afghan operation, Congressman Charlie Wilson actually pressed on the CIA a larger budget than many CIA operatives wanted.

To sum up: on the surface, one can date the recent growth on unchecked secret powers in America to 9/11 and the implementation that morning of Continuity of Government (COG) measures that had been secretly planned for two decades by Cheney and Rumsfeld, even when the two men were not officially part of the U.S. Government. But that event had been prepared for, perhaps even made inevitable, by the much earlier Rumsfeld-Cheney victory in the post-Vietnam contest between Congress and the White House: over whether the public state would control the deep state, or vice versa.

**Hooverism and the Doomsday Mania: the Instructive Difference**

The Doomsday Mania, I would once have said, had restored Hooverism. I would now say that COG planning, in restoring specific Hoover techniques, has gone beyond Hooverism to something far more dangerous. In addition, some of the illegalities that Hoover merely
planned for (like massive detention), Rumsfeld and Cheney, after also planning for two decades, implemented on September 11, 2001.

The COG measures implemented on 9/11, have supplemented Hoover’s powers with parallel powers developed by the CIA and NSA (as foreseen in the Huston Plan), plus the worst FBI illegalities from the emergency era of the 1960s. Torture, practiced by the FBI in an extreme situation, became embodied in legal memoranda as a standard way to interrogate suspects. Preemptive murder of opponents, as practiced by the FBI in Meridian and Chicago, is now the standard practice of the drone program initiated by Bush and Cheney and since expanded by Obama. In brief, as I said earlier, the aims of Hooverism were to maintain the status quo, while the aim of the Doomsday Mania has been explicitly to change it.

Hoover’s actions against the Klan were accompanied by similar illegal actions against Martin Luther King, whom he once characterized, on the record, as “the most notorious liar in the country.” The two campaigns, set side by side, reveal Hoover’s commitment to the status quo, against any forces, legal or illegal, violent or nonviolent, threatening change.

His tactics to crush the Klan were clearly illegal. But they were in response to murders and a challenge to public order. They were also in their way measured, and in their way less disruptive of the peace than the “legal” tactics of the Kennedy brothers in the 1960s -- whose response to the challenge at Ole Miss had resulted not only in lethal violence but the responsive determination of Bowers and others to commit serial murders, in order to induce an apocalyptic race war.

In this respect Hoover’s “deep state” illegalities can be distinguished from those we have witnessed since 9/11 against al Qaeda. Hoover’s actions were finite and narrowly targeted, in order to achieve a successful consolidation of federal law. His methods were essentially nonviolent against the nonviolent, violent against the violent. The implementation of COG planning we have seen since 9/11 has been, in contrast, an open-ended erosion of law and liberty, increasing year by year, with no end in sight.

In this essay I have tried to show Hoover’s responsibility for developing the traditions of suspending habeas corpus and other constitutional liberties that have been implemented in the last decade. But we should also recognize the huge difference between planning for a suspension of liberty, and the implementation of those plans. There is no evidence that Hoover wanted to see his emergency plans implemented by state institutions including his own FBI. But Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney, after working on COG plans for almost two decades, called publicly in 2000 for “a process of transformation, which even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event— like a new Pearl Harbor.”

The Expansion of Secret Powers Since 9/11

With the implementation of COG emergency responses to 9/11, we have indeed seen an exponential expansion of America as a dual state, or what Dana Priest has called two governments: the one its citizens were familiar with, operated more or less in the open: the other a parallel top secret government whose parts had mushroomed in less than a decade into a gigantic, sprawling universe of its own, visible to only a carefully vetted cadre - and its entirety...visible only to God.

The second government, called by Priest “Top
Secret America,” should not be thought of as identical to the deep state, but rather as the radically expanded institutional base for the deep state, ensuring an ever greater share of the national budget for top-down programs to constrain dissent both abroad and at home.

The unchecked expansion of this base – much of it now outsourced – has continued under Obama, even as budgetary cutbacks have continued to weaken the public government citizens are familiar with. For example

CACI...recorded $36.4 million in profits in the third quarter of fiscal 2011. It hired four hundred new employees and was looking for another four hundred. Analysts attributed its success to the swelling cybersecurity and intelligence markets and to its lucrative contracts with the army for intelligence and information war services.\(^{221}\)

A percentage of such profits are inevitably dedicated to making budget allocations for security as certain in Congress as Hoover’s FBI budget was when he was at his prime. These flows of funds further trivialize the independence of Congress, to the point where, as Nation editor Katrina vanden Heuvel recently wrote, “‘Bipartisan agreement in Washington usually means citizens should hold on to their wallets or get ready for another threat to peace.’\(^{222}\)

Priest notes how Obama campaigned in 2008 as a critic of a number of covert programs, including torture, renditions, and secret prisons – yet in the end, torture aside, the new administration, in the words of a CIA observer, “changed virtually nothing.”\(^{223}\) Indeed, after having promised great openness, the Obama administration has proceeded to indict more whistleblowers than all previous administrations combined, with a vindictiveness that has brought a reprimand from a federal judge.\(^{224}\)

Dana Priest’s book is of great value for its researches into a Top Secret realm not normally described in the governing media. But it is almost silent about the human agents who have brought us here: in her book Dick Cheney is mentioned only once in passing, and there is nothing at all about the COG planning of the Doomsday Project.

At one point a statement by Janet Napolitano, Obama’s cabinet-level Secretary of Homeland Security, reminds Priest of J. Edgar Hoover and “the dark days of McCarthyism, when...an obsessed and paranoid FBI had drawn up a black list” (the Security Index).\(^{225}\) There is indeed a sense in which America’s Doomsday Mania today is derived from Hoover’s obsessive penchant for surveillance and control. But if we were to begin by returning to the dual state as it operated under Hoover, this would represent a return to a far more limited form of secret government than that oppressing us today.

**Conclusion**

Recent American history has seen two competing narratives: one relatively stable and benign, and one posing a dangerous threat to constitutional democracy. On the one hand a succession of power-hungry men have first amassed excessive powers and then in consequence have self-destructed or been ousted: Joe McCarthy in the 1950s, Richard Nixon in 1974, Oliver North in 1986, and Donald Rumsfeld in 2006.\(^{226}\) Their rise and fall might suggest that American politics essentially comprises a self-correcting, homeostatic system, one in which excessive power generates counterforces to correct it. But this appearance of equilibrium is misleading.

Each of these visible figures exercised power because of their connection to the
subterranean accumulation of illegal secret powers assembled originally and principally by J. Edgar Hoover. The departure of individuals did not establish effective legal checks and balances on the deep powers behind them. The one serious congressional effort to do this, after Nixon’s resignation in 1974, was successfully stymied by two men (Rumsfeld and Cheney) who went on to plan successfully for the expansion of these same powers in the Doomsday Project.

The second narrative illustrates the truth of the principle, well understood by America’s Founding Fathers, that power, unchecked, will continue to grow like a cancer. This unchecked growth of the security state has been reinforced by a parallel and related development - the unchecked accumulation of gross wealth by the top one percent of the one percent.\(^{227}\)

The combined growth of great wealth and the security state has radically diminished the powers of the public state (and above all Congress) to restore equilibrium to the American political system. This process, as many have warned, is not at all homeostatic, but threatens disaster if not brought under control.

Corresponding to these two narratives are two opposing prospects for America’s future: one optimistic and one gloomy. The development of the Internet has provided new channels of communication for those concerned progressives and dissidents (including “conspiracy theorists) who are unheard in the increasingly corporatized and corrupt governing media. These in turn have supplied a growing constituency in support of those isolated and embattled whistleblowers who have arisen in virtually every agency contributing to the unchecked security state. And we have seen at least two successful bureaucratic revolts in the last decade: first in the FBI and the Justice Department against the torture memos inspired by Cheney, and then “the revolt of the generals” against Donald Rumsfeld.

A pessimist would respond that these developments have somewhat rationalized and heightened the powers of the security state. A rational assessment of the data assembled in this essay gives no grounds for predicting that the checks needed for democratic checks and balances will soon emerge. If they do not, a veneer of continuity will mask the growing irrelevance of the public state’s democratic institutions, leaving them to debate fruitlessly - in the same way that the Roman Senate continued to debate as the Republic slouched into Empire.

In terms of logical analysis, the likely prospect would seem to be the pessimistic one. But neither humans nor their history are wholly logical. The last century has seen a number of nonviolent changes - even revolutions - that few social scientists were able logically to predict. At their head we should list the contribution of Gandhian nonviolence to the liberation of India, one of the world’s largest and most exploited nations. Since then we have seen other such contributions: to the largely nonviolent desegregation of the American South, the nonviolent transfer of power in South Africa, and the nonviolent expulsion of Soviet troops from Poland and Eastern Europe.

So it is from faith, rather than from logic, that I am committed to the optimistic prospect. I do so because of the rewards offered by that truth which, as Gandhi wrote, “is like a birth.”\(^{228}\) And I do so from faith, because, to quote Gandhi yet again, “Just as the body cannot exist without blood, so the soul needs matchless and pure strength of faith.”\(^{229}\) Those of us who are old enough have seen such leaders of faith - Gandhi, King and Lech Walesa - arise to deal with what is humanly intolerable. I believe that we will see such leaders again.

Peter Dale Scott, a former Canadian diplomat
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