

8/21/71

Dear Jim,

Certain things are as inevitable as the sun-moon cycle: Bud has a compulsion to be heard and published on the assassination; he never knows what he is talking about and lacks fidelity even when he is part of that of which he writes; he will not subject his compulsions to testing for accuracy or faithfulness before publication; those around him are incapable of evaluating what he writes about because they also know nothing about it; the credibility of everyone is thereby undermined a bit more; and the objective we all seek is thereby made closer to impossible to attain.

And, of course, he not only doesn't send me a copy of any of it but clearly he tells others who ordinarily would not to.

Although I had no time for it, after taking a walk and working up a sweat this a.m. I read his sick stuff in the sicker August Computers. The totality of inaccuracy on minor points and the glibness with which the lack of proof of the major point was glossed over or misrepresented are astounding, the end product being a work that can be used against everyone, pre-eminently him. In addition, here there could have been a real case made of a legitimate point, that is not and the prospects of it in the future diminished because this trivia and foolish indulgence of ego can and will be invoked to ridicule any such effort.

On such small things as dates there is no single accuracy, save for that of the first hearing in Halleck's court. Here there is dishonesty, for there was nothing to prevent Garrison's filing of the identical suit for the two previous years and it is JG who abandoned the appeal procedures, not the federal government. In all respects there is no point made that is accurately made. The stuff about Ferrie, which you would think he would know well, is seriously faulted. Again, in details where unnecessary, where the simple fact should be known to one who represents himself as an expert and was readily available to anyone doing any writing if his interest was accuracy. Here Bud compares unfavorably with George Lardner, who did, from time to time, ask me to check things.

Even the sequence of events is wrong.

And how honest is it to write an article after the fact and make no reference to the actual indictment of Garrison by the federal government? This was not too late for August publication even if the article had been written earlier.

I know there is little you can do to stop this kind of thing. My purposes are to let you know again that you should try, all of you, and that he is again consistent with his track record. In this case there is further hazard because he represents a client against the federal government and he here has done what in my non-lawyer's opinion may further reduce the poor prospects of his client. In this case I think he was confronted with an actual if not a legal conflict and he remains blind, unthinking.

Perhaps the two most conspicuous things is that again Bud has proved that he has done no real work, has no real idea of what fact and imagination separate, doesn't really care about fact and is like a Warren Commission on our side, substituting what he wants to be fact for it (which might give an insight into the WC by some of you), and that Bob is either not possessed of the knowledge necessary to check Bud, can't do it, or has a mind no less tainted.

At some point all of us are going to have to pay for his endless, unnecessary and really stupid ego indulgences. The tragedy is that they may destroy him, for at some point he may come to understand himself and what he has done. With the usual regrets, HW

Jim Garrison, District Attorney, Orleans Parish

vs. The Federal Government

"Why did Jim Garrison involve himself in the Clay Shaw prosecution - which has brought him nothing but grief, frustration, and heartache?"

Bernard Fensterwald, Attorney
Executive Director
National Committee to Investigate Assassinations
927 15th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

In 1961, 1965, and again in 1969 the citizens of Orleans Parish, Louisiana, elected as their District Attorney a local lawyer whom, it seems fair to assume in view of the election returns, they considered capable, honest, and well qualified for the office. In fact, he was the first District Attorney in modern times in New Orleans to be elected to a third term. In his capacity as chief prosecutor he had the duty and obligation to assist in the indictment of those persons he suspected of having committed crimes in the jurisdiction and, in the case of those indicted, to prosecute them to the full extent of the law.

The man selected to serve three successive four year terms for the Parish was Jim Garrison. During his second term as District Attorney he was subjected to one of the most vicious character assassinations the Federal government in Washington has ever effected on any local official to date. Garrison's "folly" consisted primarily in his refusal to accept the conclusions of a non-judicial federal body chosen, not by the citizens of the nation, but by one man, ex-President Lyndon B. Johnson of the United States. That body was the Warren Commission which investigated the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Artillery Spotter Plane Pilot

Before examining the background and nature of this character assassination, it might be well to relate some of the background and nature of the victim.

Ealing Carrouthers Garrison (he changed his name to Jim after World War II) was born in Denison, Iowa, on November 20, 1921. He grew up and received his early education in Chicago, where his mother had moved after she divorced his father in 1924.

During World War II, Garrison had a long, dangerous, and distinguished career as an artillery spotter plane pilot in the European Theatre, where he flew many missions in an unarmed plane over the German lines. After the war he remained in the Army Reserve, and he was called up briefly for active duty during the Korean War. He was returned to inactive duty in the Reserve when he was found both physically and psychologically unsuited for combat duty. He received psychiatric care both during and after his Korean War service, and with apparent favorable results, for as late as 1969 he still held an Army Reserve Commission as a Lieutenant Colonel.

1961: Elected District Attorney

His association with New Orleans and the law began when he attended Tulane Law School. After a short period of service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he became city attorney and then assistant district attorney for Orleans Parish, which encompasses most of urban New Orleans. In 1961, to the surprise of most of the local politicians, he was elected District Attorney.

The years since his first election have been stormy ones. He drove the gamblers and the B-girls from Bourbon Street; he bitterly attacked the police for their complacency toward crime; and in 1962 he became locked in a battle with all eight of the city's Criminal Court Judges because of their refusal to approve funds which he had requested for an in-depth investigation of crime in New Orleans.

The judges charged him with defamation of character and criminal libel and fined him \$1,000, but on appeal the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the conviction in a milestone decision outlining the citizen's right to criticize public officials.

Popularity

Although Garrison has not endeared himself to the local "powers that be," through the years he has gained considerable popularity with the citizens of Orleans Parish, who are, after all, the people who pay his salary and the ones whose interests he protects and represents.

He cleaned up the French Quarter, but not to the point of ruining it from a fun standpoint, and destroying its attractiveness to conventioners. He chased the gamblers across the river into Jefferson Parish. He championed civil liberties in a city with deep rooted Southern prejudices, and he appointed a Negro assistant District Attorney. In late 1964, he won reelection over the strong opposition of the local political establishment.

In the next few years, his career became less controversial, and, everything being equal, he could have looked forward to more years as D.A., perhaps to a judgeship, or returning to the private practice of law. For a reasonably young attorney, Jim Garrison seemed to have "had it made."

The Clay Shaw Case

Why, then, did he involve himself in the Clay Shaw prosecution which has brought him nothing but grief, frustration, and heartache?

It has been suggested by some people that the Shaw case has been a figment of Garrison's imagination, purposely conceived in late 1966 and promoted because of his political ambitions. In the light of how the case developed, this theory seems to have perhaps some surface plausibility; but Garrison, as an experienced prosecutor with a remarkably successful record of convictions behind him, must have known the risks involved in putting his whole career on the line in a single case, a case with very little merit. As he himself put it in an October, 1966, interview by Playboy Magazine:

I was perfectly aware that I might have signed my political death warrant the moment I launched this case — but I couldn't care less as long as I can shed some light on John Kennedy's assassination.

New Orleans: Where Lee Harvey Oswald Resided

There were other factors which led to Garrison's fateful decision. Popular belief to the contrary, his interest in the assassination as a prosecutor began, not in 1966, but in 1963. In fact it began on the day John Kennedy was killed. Garrison had been a great admirer of JFK and was terribly distraught by his murder. He also happened to be the District Attorney in the city in which Lee Harvey Oswald had grown up and in which he had resided until shortly before the assassination. It occurred to Garrison, that, if the assassination were the result of a conspiracy, as was the first reaction of many people, it would not be beyond the realm of possibility — indeed probability — that the roots of the conspiracy might lie in New Orleans. Moreover, immediately after the assassination, Herman Kohlman, one of his assistant District Attorneys, received a tip from Jack Martin, a local investigator with intelligence connections, suggesting that they should pick up and question a certain David Ferrie in connection with the murder.

David Ferrie

David Ferrie was well known to both Kohlman and Garrison; he was even better known to the New Orleans police as a brilliant ex-Eastern Airlines pilot, a notorious homo-sexual, a career researcher, a Civil Air Patrol organizer, a mystic, and interestingly enough, a man who had very active contacts with both the Central Intelligence Agency and the Mafia. In fact, at the exact time of the assassination he was sitting in a New Orleans courtroom with Carlos Marcello, the alleged New Orleans underworld chieftain. Ferrie was acting as an investigator for Marcello's defense attorney. Marcello, who was being tried for violation of the federal deportation laws, won a smashing legal victory on the very day, November 22, 1963, when Kennedy was shot.

Right after court adjourned, Ferrie rushed out and picked up two young "roommates," Alvin Beauboeuf and Melvin Coffey, and headed for Texas via auto. Later, when questioned about the trip, Ferrie at first said that they were going duck hunting; then, subsequently, he said they were going ice-skating; in fact, he had done neither. The threesome had driven to Houston and then to Galveston where Ferrie had spent several hours waiting next to a pay telephone for reasons at this time unknown. On the afternoon and evening of November 24th, the threesome drove back to New Orleans, after which Ferrie proceeded alone to Hammond, Louisiana (the hometown of Clay Shaw), and back to New Orleans on Monday, November 25. At this point he was arrested and

questioned by the D.A. and his staff, and then turned over to FBI agents who questioned him briefly and released him. After pursuing several other seemingly fruitless leads, Garrison closed his books on the case, satisfied that he had done his part in attempting to unravel the mysteries of the Kennedy murder.

Visit With Senator Russell Long

For the next three years, as far as Garrison was concerned, the case remained closed. Many others, however, had doubts, and the case would not stay buried. Here in his own words is a description of Garrison's re-entry into the case in November, 1966:

Until (then) I had complete faith in the Warren Report ... But then ... I visited New York City with Senator Russell Long; and when the subject of the assassination came up, (Long) expressed grave doubts about the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin. Now, this disturbed me, because here was the Majority Whip of the U.S. Senate speaking, not some publicity hound with an ideological axe to grind; and if at this late juncture he still entertained serious reservations about the Commission's determinations, maybe there was more to the assassination than met the eye.

So I began reading every book and magazine article on the assassination I could get my hands on — my tombstone may be inscribed "Curiosity Killed the D.A." — and I found my own doubts growing. Finally, I put aside all other business and started to wade through the Warren Commission's own 26 volumes of supportive evidence and testimony. That was the clincher. It's impossible for anyone possessed of reasonable objectivity and a fair degree of intelligence to read those 26 volumes and not reach the conclusion that the Warren Commission was wrong in every one of its major conclusions pertaining to the assassination. For me, that was the end of innocence ... Weisberg and Mark Lane sparked my general doubts about the assassination; but more importantly, they led me into specific areas of inquiry. After I realized that something was seriously wrong, I had no alternative but to face the fact that Oswald had arrived in Dallas only a short time before the assassination and that prior to that time he had lived in New Orleans for over six months. I became curious about what this alleged assassin was doing while under my jurisdiction, and my staff began an investigation of Oswald's activities and contacts in the New Orleans area. We interviewed people the Warren Commission had never questioned; and a whole new world began opening up. As I studied Oswald's movements in Dallas, my mind turned back to the aftermath of the assassination in 1963, when my office questioned three men — David Ferrie, Alvin Beauboeuf, and Melvin Coffey — on suspicion of being involved in the assassination. I began to wonder if we hadn't dismissed these three men too lightly, and we reopened our investigation into their activities.

Following leads furnished by critics of the Warren Report, Garrison and his staff began to hit pay dirt immediately. In addition to Ferrie, Beauboeuf, and Coffey, they began to look into the activities of Oswald's Marine buddy, Kerry Thornley, and his New Orleans lawyer, Dean Andrews. They

The underlined portions are neither understated!

looked, too, for the mysterious Clay Bertrand. They sought and found solid leads to link Ferrie, Oswald, and Ruby. They found footprints leading toward the two Cuban factions, anti-Castro and pro-Castro.

Secrecy

Again contrary to current popular belief, Garrison proceeded with his investigation in absolute secrecy. He realized full well its importance and its sensitivity. His realization was strengthened when it became clear that he was crossing the paths of the CIA, the FBI, the Warren Commission and possibly others. He began quietly to line up support for his investigation in the community. A group, known as Truth or Consequences, was formed among local business and professional men, and they lent much moral and some financial support to the probe.

Failure of Secrecy

As the investigation widened and began to produce results, it became too big a story to keep under cover, and it was finally broken by Rosemary James, a local reporter, in mid February of 1967. Then things really began to happen. Garrison had overnight become the subject of worldwide attention ... including the attention of the federal government.

Unwisely, Garrison gave a series of press interviews, and answered questions with speculation when he did not have the hard facts. Much of this speculation dealt with the ultimate force or forces he suspected might have been behind the assassination. Mention was made of various federal agencies, the "military-industrial complex," Cubans, "right wing extremists," and others. These sensational charges coming from a responsible official whetted the American public's well known appetite for a conspiracy angle.

Meanwhile, Garrison's investigation was progressing rapidly. It was his intention to arrest David Ferrie and to charge him with conspiring with Lee Harvey Oswald, "Clay Bertrand" (an alias), and others to kill John F. Kennedy. Several days before the planned arrest, Ferrie actually came to Garrison, sought and received physical protection from unspecified persons. He seemed terrified, but after several days of protective custody, and before Garrison was ready to formally charge him, Ferrie returned to his apartment. Within 72 hours he was dead. The coroner's verdict was that Ferrie died of natural causes, i.e., a heart attack. Whether it was a natural death or not may never be known, but it is clear that the timing of Ferrie's demise did little to decrease Garrison's suspicions of conspiracy.

Warning

In retrospect, this turn of events should have been a warning to Garrison to take a long hard look before proceeding further. As matters stood at that time, the principal suspects (Oswald, Ferrie, and Ruby) were all dead; the identity of the other suspect, "Clay Bertrand", had not yet been established. But, Garrison had a number of witnesses at that time who claimed that they could and would identify Clay Shaw as the mysterious "Clay Bertrand." The prosecutor was particularly counting on Perry Russo and Dean Andrews.

If discretion had been the better part of valor, Garrison would have gone no further with the prosecution of the case, at least at that time. After

all he was openly challenging the integrity of the whole Federal Establishment, including Chief Justice Warren, J. Edgar Hoover, members of the Warren Commission, the White House, and the Kennedy Clan. He was a lone, local prosecutor, with local jurisdiction, little money, and a tiny staff.

Delay

Why he proceeded, no one except Garrison really knows, but proceed he did.

He ordered Shaw arrested, and his Rubicon had been crossed with no turning back. He would either win, or he would be destroyed by the federal government. The tactic chosen to frustrate Garrison's prosecution was delay. Delay was needed to blacken Garrison's reputation, undermine his effectiveness as a prosecutor, and erode the underpinnings of his case. Part of the delay that ensued was, of course, inherent in normal criminal procedures. Shaw's lawyers filed several motions even before the pre-trial hearing. Garrison, of course, was pushing for a speedy trial at every turn.

Beginning in September 1967, Shaw's lawyers filed motions for delays of the trial. These were granted. Finally, when it became evident that no further delay could be secured through the local courts, the defense forces turned to their friendly ally and advisor, the federal government. They filed a petition in the Federal District Court in New Orleans, asking it to rule (1) that the Warren Commission Report is binding upon all courts in the United States, and (2) that all further prosecution of Clay Shaw be enjoined. These requests were preposterous from a legal standpoint; local law enforcement would collapse if federal courts could enjoin local prosecutors from bringing malefactors to trial. However, this did not prevent Federal District Judge Frederick J. R. Heebe from issuing a restraining order. A further hearing by a three-judge Federal panel resulted in the denial of both Shaw's requested rulings, but the court permitted the injunction against Garrison to stand pending an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, thus delaying the trial into 1969. Eventually the highest court agreed unanimously that Garrison had every legal right to bring Shaw to trial. The trial finally got under way almost two years after Shaw's arrest.

Help to Clay Shaw

The federal government made good use of the two year delay in its effort to blacken Garrison's name and wreck his case. Federal officials openly and blatantly went out of their way to help Shaw and his lawyers, despite the fact that the United States officially had no role in the Shaw Case.

Foremost among these members of the federal government to aid Clay Shaw were then Attorney General Ramsey Clark, highest legal officer, and Chief Justice Earl Warren, highest ranking judicial officer.

Ramsey Clark

Ramsey Clark's nomination as Attorney General came up before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 22, 1967, the same day that Shaw was officially charged with conspiracy in New Orleans. Immediately upon hearing of Shaw's arrest, and before his confirmation by the full Senate, Mr. Clark announced that in November and December of 1963, the FBI had made an investigation of Clay Shaw and had found him innocent of any complicity in the assassination. He did not explain why the FBI had investigated Clay Shaw.

When asked what he thought of the new Attorney General's statement, Clay Shaw said, not unexpectedly, "I'm gratified." As Garrison later commented, "Not many defendants have the Attorney General of the United States testifying as character witness, even before the trial is set."

Ramsey Clark's rather pointed effort to help Shaw backfired when reporters began asking "why". Why had the FBI checked Shaw? And why had the Attorney General made a point of helping a defendant charged in a state court for a state crime? Later, on the day of Clark's comment, a spokesman for the U.S. Dept. of Justice explained that the earlier investigation of Shaw had been because of the supposed identity of Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw. The latter explanation only made matters worse and, eventually (on June 2) at the request of Shaw's lawyers, the Justice Department stated that the Attorney General's original statement had been untrue and that no investigation of Shaw had ever been made, because none had been necessary. A more logical explanation is that there had been no FBI investigation of Clay Shaw per se in 1963, but his name had come up in the probe of "Clay Bertrand."

Earl Warren

At about the same time Ramsey Clark was making his first attempt to give Shaw a boost, another voice was heard from abroad. The voice was that of Chief Justice Earl Warren, who was traveling in Peru. When asked about Shaw's possible implication in the assassination, Warren said, "I have not heard anything which would change the (Warren Commission) Report in any way, shape, or form."

Ramsey Clark Again

Not satisfied with his first fluff, Attorney General Clark tried again on October 13, 1967. Following a speech to the Student Legal Forum at the University of Virginia, he told students and newsmen that Garrison had taken "a perfectly fine man, Clay Shaw, and ruined him just for personal aggrandizement." He added, "Much as I may hate to do it, I might just have to prosecute Jim Garrison." He did not say what Federal charges might be brought against Garrison.

When these remarks hit the Nation's front pages the next day, the Department of Justice realized how unethical Clark's remarks must have seemed, as Shaw's trial was still pending. A spokesman for the Attorney General — who had not been present in Charlottesville to hear the remarks — denied that Clark had said anything concerning Shaw or Garrison, but had confined his remarks to a purely hypothetical question which had been posed: Ray Barry, the reporter who had given the story to the Associated Press, retorted, "The quotes were exactly word-for-word."

Army Medical Records

A galling example of the duplicity of the federal government in this case concerns the availability of Army medical records. When prosecutor Garrison attempted, through judicial channels, to subpoena defendant Shaw's Army records for purposes of aiding in a criminal prosecution, he was informed by the Federal Government that such records were confidential and could not be released for any purpose without consent of the person involved. Yet, someone in the Federal Government "leaked" Garrison's records to a Chicago reporter, and the next morning the Nation read all of the confidential details of Garrison's psychiatric treatment of seventeen years

previously. Needless to say, the individual who "leaked" the records was never found, and no punishment for him seems imminent today.

Surveillance and Harassment

During this whole period Garrison and his staff were subject to almost constant surveillance and harassment at the hands of federal agents. As Dick Billings, a former Life reporter put it:

Contending with Garrison has been Washington's problem for some time. Officially, the federal government won't admit he's worthy of concern, while in fact the FBI watches every move he makes. Agents trail him whenever he leaves New Orleans. (There is a story on the West Coast that the way to find Garrison when he comes to town is to call the FBI.)

No Cooperation

However, the real pinch of the shoe was felt in the complete inability of Garrison to elicit a shred of the normal and routine cooperation that exists between local prosecutors and the Federal Government, particularly the Department of Justice and the FBI. In the vast majority of cases, local prosecutors can count on federal agents and federal agencies to supply information and witnesses as needed for prosecution. But such was not the case here. Garrison got no information, no witnesses, nothing. And as can be imagined, this made the prosecution of Shaw infinitely more difficult.

Subpoena of Allen W. Dulles

Frustration was compounded when Garrison attempted to subpoena Allen W. Dulles, former head of the CIA, before the local Grand Jury. Dulles was needed to give testimony relative to whether or not Lee Harvey Oswald, one of the alleged conspirators along with Clay Shaw and David Ferrie, might or might not have had any type of association with the CIA. As Mr. Dulles was residing in Washington, D.C., the only proper way in which he could be served with a subpoena was under the Uniform Out-of-State Witness Act to which both the State of Louisiana and the District of Columbia are parties. If a Louisiana witness is needed in D.C., the local Parish D. A. has the witness served with a subpoena and a judicial hearing is held to see if the witness should be extradited back to D.C. Conversely, when a D.C. witness is required for a trial in Louisiana, the U.S. Attorney in the District of Columbia has the subpoena served and a hearing is held in Washington. It is purely routine. But not when Garrison wished to subpoena Allen Dulles before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury. The following is the answer the prosecutor received back from Mr. David Bress, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia:

This will acknowledge your letter of March 6, 1968, concerning the Uniform Act to Secure Attendance of Witnesses from without a State in Criminal Proceedings in which you request us to represent your interests in compelling the attendance of a witness before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury.

We decline to represent you in this matter. I am returning the documents you forwarded, including the check, so that you may pursue the matter yourself or arrange for other counsel.

As Alcock commented, "You can't arrange for

the Nashville grand jury could serve but one purpose: intimidation to remain silent.

Internal Revenue Service

The federal government did not rely solely on the Department of Justice and the Courts to "lean" on Jim Garrison. Other federal agencies got into the act.

Although he files a "short form" federal income tax return, Jim Garrison has undergone an intensive civil and criminal tax investigation since he sought to open the Warren Commission findings. On one occasion, two criminal investigators from IRS showed up at Garrison's office, warned him of his rights, and began asking him questions. As he related it,

I asked if they were looking into possible criminal violation of the Federal tax laws. When they replied "Yes," I said, "We are in the business of putting people in jail, and I'm not going to help you put me in jail." They then left rather apologetically.

To this point, IRS has come up with nothing on Garrison, but each year they can try again, until they "get him".

Securities and Exchange Commission

Soon thereafter, the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington took a swing at Garrison, which ultimately boomeranged. The Philadelphia Inquirer of October 4, 1968, ran the following story from New Orleans:

Two finance companies that collapsed, Louisiana Loan & Thrift Corp., New Orleans, and Arkansas Loan & Thrift Corp., Van Buren, Ark., have touched off an investigation by the SEC and a Federal grand jury in New Orleans.

The Inquirer seeks to uncover possible links between organized crime and State and local politicians, including Jim Garrison, district attorney of New Orleans Parish.

Government men see some evidence organized crime may have had a role in jeopardizing the more than \$6 million in assets of the finance companies.

The widening inquiry in the collapse of the two finance firms is being conducted by a Federal grand jury here and by the SEC. Criminal indictments may result. Some Federal men hope the case will expose how organized crime had a role in dissipating the more than \$6 million in assets of the finance companies. The assets came largely from more than 3000 savings accounts solicited from the public.

After much fanfare in the papers and resultant bad publicity, the SEC found that it could not link Garrison to the "scandal." However, it did "net" several large fish in the local pond, including the Governor and Attorney General of Louisiana.

The foregoing is a fairly conclusive account of the publicly known efforts of the federal government to interfere with Garrison's trial of Clay Shaw and his public challenge of the conclusions of the Warren Commission Report.

In June 1971 the New York Times and other newspapers began to publish the "Pentagon Papers" -

(Continued in next column)

DANIEL ELLSBERG

1. From Edmund C. Berkeley
Editor, Computers and Automation

Like many other persons in the United States during June, we watched with fascination the struggle between the press of the United States (The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, etc.) and the Administration under President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell over the publication of the details of some 7000 pages of Pentagon documents, classified as secret and dealing with the history of United States involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Fortunately for the people of the United States, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the documents could be published and that the Administration was in error in charging that this history could not be published on grounds of national security. No security of the nation was involved - only the security of a group of men in the government, presidents like Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and officials like McNamara, Rostow, and Rusk.

The Pentagon papers show an appalling history of deception of the people of the United States by the government of the United States. For example, when President Lyndon B. Johnson campaigned in 1964 for reelection, saying that he was not going to send American soldiers to combat in Vietnam, he was lying - he had made the decision and put the processes in motion to do just that.

Thanks to a hawk who became a dove, Daniel Ellsberg, at one time an analyst in the Defense Department, and now a research associate at Mass. Inst. of Technology, the story now becomes known. He was the person who made copies of the documents and gave them to the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and other papers.

In July, the New York Times Book Division published "The Pentagon Papers," a paperback book of over 600 pages, containing a narrative, summaries, extracts, and comments by New York Times reporters, based on the original 7000 pages of Pentagon documents. Over one million copies have been printed; at time of writing a second printing is under way.

Some of the things that Daniel Ellsberg has said in the last few weeks in answer to questions from the press are worth recording in the pages of "Computers and Automation". We also are a part of the U.S. press that is interested in the task of telling the truth where hitherto lies have been uttered.

(Continued on next page)

an inside history of 25 years of war in Vietnam pursued by the federal government with thorough deception of the people of the United States. This deception suggests that there is much more still to be found out about the federal government's interference with Garrison's challenge of the Warren Commission Report.