

Editor *Post 11/3/68*

The Garrison Story

I am greatly disturbed by your Dec. 29 article on the medical records of New Orleans District Attorney James Garrison. This kind of "psychiatric smear" is irrelevant and destructive. Also, medical records are confidential documents, and should not be made public merely because they come into the hands of a . . . reporter. Good medical care requires free and open communication between doctor and patient; this communication can be free and open only if both parties are confident that the records of their communication will remain private. Your article destroys this confidence. By printing it, you have done a disservice to Mr. Garrison and to society.

ROBERT PERLMAN, M.D.
Washington.

What right do you have to publish the medical records of James C. Garrison?

The article of Dec. 29, on page one of *The Washington Post* describing Mr. Garrison's medical history is the epitome of irresponsible journalism. Regardless of how these records were obtained, your decision to publish them indicates a lack of good judgment on your part. By publishing this information, you have become a party to a slander campaign against Mr. Garrison.

If you disagree with Mr. Garrison's behavior, you have every right to say so, but your attempt to discredit his mental capability is reminiscent of the practices of the late Senator

Joseph McCarthy.

PAUL W. MARSHALL.
Alexandria.

We are currently witnessing attempts by certain members of the mass media and Governmental officials at different levels to gradually discredit, by various reprehensible methods, the man, New Orleans District Attorney James Garrison, and his work concerning the Kennedy assassination.

Maybe at last these vicious tactics may backfire and point up 1) the paradox of the ideal of freedom of speech and the suppression, by almost all means, of those who would attempt to speak freely, and, 2) the oft-used cliché "where there is smoke, there is fire."

There are those of us who were skeptical of Garrison's findings, but the latest assassination of his character has caused us to renew our concern in the case.

Our concern may not be appreciated, and our voices may be ignored, because we may not really be free, but that should not stop us from acting like we are free persons.

EILEEN ROSEN.
Arlington.