

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1975

Letters to the Editor

Of Eisenhower and the C.I.A. Plots

To the Editor:

On the basis of my service with President Eisenhower from 1954 to 1961 and out of respect for his memory, I would like it known that the recent report of the Senate Committee on Intelligence regarding the subject of assassination activities, and the news reporting based upon it, are according to my knowledge incorrect and unfounded in the reference they make to his actions and his views.

Together with Gordon Gray, then President Eisenhower's special assistant for national security affairs, and John Eisenhower, then my assistant, I was in a position—as staff secretary and defense liaison officer, with duties including staff assistance on day-to-day security and foreign policy activities—to know his thinking in this regard.

There was no instance whatsoever, within my knowledge and memory, of such a course of action being proposed to him or reported to him, in N.S.C. meetings or otherwise—that is, neither explicitly nor tacitly was his approval ever sought or ever gained. Nor would such actions have been in accord with the Eisenhower goals of a peaceful world order and improved understanding among nations, to which he was so deeply and enduringly dedicated.

I gave testimony along the foregoing lines before the Senate Committee last July. It is my understanding that Gordon Gray and John Eisenhower testified to the same effect.

In this regard, I consider that the brief statement in the committee report as carried by the press that "...others attending those meetings testified that they did not recall hearing such a Presidential order" [for assassination] is so inadequate a representation of the views I gave, and I believe of theirs as well, as to serve

to obscure rather than clarify the President's true attitude in this matter.

There can, of course, be no objection to careful, nonpartisan inquiry to determine whether appropriate controls were established and were observed in a matter of this sensitivity and importance.

But any associating of President Eisenhower with activities of this kind, on the basis of ambiguous and inferential testimony of the nature cited in the report, is in my opinion neither proper nor just to the memory of this outstanding American, a man devoted to our country's highest values and finest ideals.

ANDREW J. GOODPASTER
General, U.S. Army (Ret.)
Alexandria, Va., Nov. 25, 1975

To the Editor:

I have read in their entirety the excerpts from the Senate Committee's report on intelligence activities which The Times published a few days ago. If they accurately reflect the nature of the report as a whole, the report is seriously flawed in one respect.

By its own language the report characterizes the pertinent evidence as "conflicting," "ambiguous" and "inconclusive," but the writers of it apparently were so determined to implicate a President in the Lumumba affair that, although lacking adequate evidence, they did it anyway by surmise ("reasonable inference" they called it). To my mind, this is thoroughly irresponsible and strikes at the credibility of the whole report.

Character assassination of a President who was highly revered for his integrity and who is no longer here to be heard is hardly the road back to the basic principles on which our nation was founded and developed.

DOUGLAS CAMPBELL
Cos Cob, Conn., Nov. 25, 1975