
IN THE
United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 16,498

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Respondents.

Petition for
review of an order
of the
Federal
Communications
Commission

**EXHIBIT TO BRIEF FOR PETITIONER COLUMBIA
BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.**

LLOYD N. CUTLER
J. ROGER WOLLENBERG
TIMOTHY B. DYK
DANIEL MARCUS
ROBERT A. WARDEN
900 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

RICHARD W. JENCKS
51 West 52 Street
New York, New York 10019
*Counsel for Petitioner,
Columbia Broadcasting
System, Inc.*

Of Counsel:

HERBERT WECHSLER
435 West 116th Street
New York, New York 10027

NEWTON N. MINOW
208 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

INDEX

	PAGE
I. ERIC SEVAREID COMMENTARIES (CBS EVENING NEWS WITH WALTER CRONKITE): NOVEMBER 22, 1966-OCTOBER 12, 1967	
November 22, 1966	2
December 5, 1966	3
December 13, 1966	4
January 3, 1967	6
January 5, 1967	7
January 20, 1967	9
January 24, 1967	10
January 30, 1967	11
February 14, 1967	12
February 17, 1967	14
February 28, 1967	15
March 2, 1967	17
March 3, 1967	18
March 7, 1967	19
March 14, 1967	20
March 17, 1967	22
April 18, 1967	23
April 27, 1967	25
April 28, 1967	26
May 2, 1967	27
May 4, 1967	28
June 15, 1967	30
June 21, 1967	31
June 27, 1967	33
August 31, 1967	34

	PAGE
September 5, 1967	35
September 7, 1967	37
September 12, 1967	38
September 13, 1967	40
September 14, 1967	41
October 12, 1967	42
II. FACE THE NATION: MARCH 13, 1966-OCTOBER 15, 1967	
March 13, 1966: Representative Melvin Laird ..	44
March 27, 1966: Representative Gerald R. Ford	46
April 17, 1966: Senator Vance Hartke	47
May 1, 1966: Senator Eugene J. McCarthy	48
May 8, 1966: Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.	50
May 15, 1966: Barry Goldwater	51
June 12, 1966: Governor George W. Romney ..	51
June 19, 1966: Stokely Carmichael	54
July 10, 1966: Senator Jacob K. Javits	57
August 21, 1966: Pierre Salinger	57
October 9, 1966: Senator John Stennis	59
November 20, 1966: Floyd B. McKissick	59
December 11, 1966: Governor Robert E. Smylie and Governor John A. Love	60
January 8, 1967: Dr. James L. Goddard (Com- missioner of FDA)	60
January 29, 1967: Senator George Murphy	61
February 5, 1967: Dr. Clark Kerr	63
February 12, 1967: Representative George Mahon	64
February 26, 1967: Barry Goldwater	65
March 5, 1967: Senator Mike Mansfield	66

	PAGE
March 12, 1967: Attorney General Ramsey Clark	67
March 19, 1967: Senator J. William Fulbright ..	68
April 9, 1967: Senator Thruston B. Morton ...	70
April 16, 1967: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. ...	71
April 30, 1967: Edward Bennett Williams	73
May 14, 1967: Senator Russell B. Long	75
May 21, 1967: Senator Thomas J. Dodd	76
May 28, 1967: Senators John Sherman Cooper and George S. McGovern	76
July 9, 1967: Whitney M. Young, Jr.	77
July 23, 1967: Governor Richard J. Hughes ...	77
August 6, 1967: Senator Everett Dirksen	78
August 20, 1967: Sargent Shriver	80
September 3, 1967: Senator William Proxmire	82
September 17, 1967: Reverend James E. Groppi	83
October 15, 1967: Senator Stuart Symington ...	87

III. SELECTED CBS DOCUMENTARIES

CBS News Inquiry, "The Warren Report," June 25-28, 1967	89
CBS Reports, "Black Power, White Backlash," September 27, 1966	105
CBS News Special Report, "Civil Rights: The View from the South," July 12, 1966	114
CBS Reports, "Murder and the Right to Bear Arms," August 7, 1966	116
CBS Reports, "Robert F. Kennedy," June 20, 1967	119
CBS Reports, "The New Left," September 12, 1967	123

EXHIBIT

Collected below are excerpts from three types of programs broadcast over the CBS television network during 1966 and 1967 which contained statements that at least arguably constitute "personal attacks" under the Commission's new rules. These statements are indicated by italics.

Part I of the Exhibit consists of 31 commentaries by Eric Sevareid broadcast on the *CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite* during a recent one-year period. We have reprinted these 31 commentaries in full to demonstrate how statements that may be "personal attacks" under the rules are an integral part of Mr. Sevareid's comments on current issues.

Part II of the Exhibit contains examples of similar statements that were made during 34 of the 85 weekly broadcasts of the CBS news interview series, *Face The Nation*, from March, 1966 to October, 1967.

Part III of the Exhibit contains more extensive excerpts from six selected news documentaries produced by CBS during 1966 and 1967 and broadcast in the *CBS Reports* series or as *CBS News Specials*. These represent examples of programs that treat all sides of important public issues fairly and objectively but which cannot keep the public fully informed without including many statements that may be "personal attacks" under the new rules. The personal qualities of individuals, particularly their honesty and integrity, are an important element in the reporting of their conduct, whenever that conduct becomes a matter of public concern. In some of the examples, a reply from the individual or group "attacked" is also carried on the same program, but as the excerpts show, it is plainly impracticable to do so every time a "personal attack" occurs.

**I. ERIC SEVAREID COMMENTARIES (CBS EVENING NEWS
WITH WALTER CRONKITE): NOVEMBER 22, 1966-
OCTOBER 12, 1967**

November 22, 1966

SEVAREID: November 22nd has become a more painful, poignant day of memory, yearly renewed, than Armistice Day or Memorial Day.

Mass tragedy becomes impersonalized after a time, but one man senselessly killed, one leader of captivating mind and personality struck down in the prime of his powers and fame, this is comprehensible tragedy and pain preserved.

This country shows few signs so far of getting over John F. Kennedy. His career in life and his moments of dying are revived like re-opened wounds in endless books and articles and pictures and in the running quarrel over the official conclusions about his murder, a quarrel ranging from scholarly, dispassionate reassessments to the most shabby, fortune-seeking literary racketeering.

Meanwhile the remarkable, indomitable Kennedy family and their friends have looked at the future and planned, very much like a government in exile as they have been called. And meanwhile, too, the man who took over the immense burden, steadied the country through the great emotional crisis, completed the social legislation President Kennedy had planned and much more besides, won election in his own right by the greatest vote in the national history, this man works at his Texas ranch and also ponders the future. He must feel a certain perplexity. After three years of extraordinary accomplishments, millions of voters have just given his party the back of their hand. And polls indicate that *a Midwest governor whose views and command of national and international problems remain obscure* could defeat Mr. Johnson were the election held today.

Back in Admiral Dewey's time, the Will Rogers of the period, Mr. Dooley, said: "Republics are not always ungrateful. Only when they give you much gratitude, do you want to freeze some of it or it won't keep." A gap has opened between President Johnson and much of the intellectual community and between him and most of the youth. The bloody and baffling Vietnam has much to do with it. But there is an additional cause for the disaffection of youth, always the most relentless of critics. They are bored when the President suggests they count their blessings. They feel only their pains. The reason is that youth is not equipped to measure from where we once were to where we are and see the progress or to measure across to other societies and see the contrasts as men of Mr. Johnson's age and experience instinctively do. Youth can measure only from now to their imagined ideals. If they could do otherwise, of course, they wouldn't be youth and that, no doubt, would be a pity.

December 5, 1966

SEVAREID: The new wave of milling about at the University of California in Berkeley is probably symbolic of many things. Certainly symbolic of the truth that the battle between the generations like the battle between the sexes is a condition of human nature. It is ultimately unresolvable. If it were resolvable life would probably be much more boring.

An observation, of course, that does neither the striking students nor the fed-up University administration any practical good at the moment. But the distant observer does get the impression that many of the chronic demonstrators labor under the feeling that they are a "put-upon" generation. To those of middle age and older they seem, on the contrary, the most privileged college generation this

country has ever known. And maybe that's part of the basic trouble. At any rate, the class of 1917, let's say, or 1941, is not about to shed tears of sympathy for them.

Unless my history is off, the first real nationwide student protest movement was that of the thirties when the economy had broken down and fascism and war were rising in the world. We had our parades, demonstrations and mass meetings but my own memory is devoid of actions that forcibly prevented the physical functioning of the University administration, faculty or facilities. And it must have been a rare occasion in those days when passionate student believers in free speech tried to prevent others from speaking their piece as some Harvard students did to Secretary of Defense McNamara the other day.

The idea used to be that a—in the center of learning, coercion had no place; that reason and debate alone settled issues if they could be settled. The use of force can only beget the use of counter-force. It takes generations to build a university's qualities, it takes very little time to tear it down. Some Latin American universities are the best examples of the collapse of standards in both teaching and learning when control by students or government agents is allowed to expand. No law of history or nature says that the brain drain away from these Latin universities cannot be duplicated at Berkeley.

Beyond that it seems safe to say that *there is, at least, a small hard-core of students and non-student hangers-on at Berkeley who have no interest in rectifying wrongs but whose total interest, emotional or political, is in disintegration. And they have nothing concrete to replace what they want to destroy.*

December 13, 1966

SEVAREID: This political community requires constant drama to feel alive and it's been rubbing its hands in anti-

cipation of another hot time in the old town in the form of a public fight between Senator Robert Kennedy and G-man J. Edgar Hoover.

Each man is a national institution, *each possesses a powerful publicity machine, each is a gut fighter with, what is know around here, as the instinct for the jugular.* But today both men kept silence while Senator Long of Missouri announced plans to summon them next month to subcommittee hearing. The subject, of course, is the messy one of telephone wire-tapping and bugging electronic devices. Courts have been getting very concerned about the extent of this and some government prosecutions have been stalled because of the use of evidence obtained by these means.

Mr. Hoover says that Kennedy when he was Attorney General not only knew what the FBI was doing in this realm but that the practice expanded under Kennedy's tenure. Kennedy says that maybe he should have known about it but that he didn't. On the surface, at least, either the irresistible force, Mr. Kennedy, or the immovable object, Mr. Hoover, is telling less than the truth. The subcommittee hearing, if it comes off, ought to do very well in the audience ratings.

Of more importance will be the final resolution of this question of electrical and electronic snooping. It is both a moral and a Constitutional question. The Fourth Amendment says persons shall be secure against unreasonable search and seizure, so, what is reasonable. The Communications Act of 1934 forbids interception and divulgence of telephone communications. The FBI has gone on the assumption that if the communications were not divulged outside of government it was all right. Some state laws permit it if a court order is obtained in advance.

There is no federal statute covering non-telephone bugging. In '65, President Johnson issued an order prohibiting

bugging except in national security cases like spying and requiring express consent of the Attorney General. Mr. Kennedy was Attorney General before that order came along. Whether he gave blanket authority to the FBI to do what it was doing in criminal cases or whether the FBI assumed it had such authority from him, is presumably part of the current squabble.

The Long sub-committee is trying to frame new laws on this matter and the Supreme Court may soon clarify its own somewhat uncertain stand when it rules on a case challenging the New York State law which permits wire-tapping with a court order. It is one more example of the endless process of reconciling the Constitution with the realities of the technological age. A process that very often damages or enhances the reputation of public personalities.

January 3, 1967

SEVAREID: A few weeks ago the pathetic lost little creature named Jack Ruby was acting strangely in his Dallas cell. *"He's hamming it up," said the jailers. He began to breathe heavily. "A bad cold," said the jail doctors. Then he seemed really sick. "Pneumonia," said the doctors at first.*

Today Ruby died of cancer. *With rigorous, unbroken consistency Dallas officialdom fumbled to the end. Consider the record moving backwards in time: The other day Ruby's brothers smuggled a tape recorder into his hospital room right under the eyes of the policeman on constant duty. Three months ago a higher court threw out the "murder with malice of forethought" verdict on Rudy because his Dallas trial had been conducted so sloppily under such prejudicial conditions. During that trial the courthouse was thrown into panic when several prisoners in the cells upstairs broke out. One of them using a pistol-like object made of soap. And on the day Ruby killed Oswald*

he was allowed to mix freely with the police and reporters in the city hall basement. What was familiar was okay. The police had tipped off reporters and cameramen as to the time and place of moving Oswald to jail.

There's a first name cameraderie among Dallas authorities and all who hang about them. Jack Ruby, night joint proprietor, a quarrelsome, emotionally unstable person carried a pistol by right of a police permit to carry it.

Go back further. A few minutes after President Kennedy was killed, the policeman who ran into the Book Depository Building saw Lee Harvey Oswald in the refectory. "He's okay, he works here," said the man in charge. That was good enough for the policeman. *The man who was police chief when Oswald was killed continued in office a long time. The man who was sheriff when the absurd jail break occurred continued. So did the judge who presided over the tragic comic trial. All nice men, all well liked in Dallas. And that, so it seemed to me, at the time, was the heart of the trouble.*

Dallas is at the adolescent awkward age. It grew up too quickly. It is a metropolis in body but not yet in spirit. Government remains a personal thing as in a small town courthouse. With size and sophistication go formality, impersonality, rigid rules and standards. But Dallas officialdom hates to part with its breezy, informal, friendly, nick-naming spirit. And at the awkward age, very awkward things happen.

January 5, 1967

SEVAREID: It begins to look as if two men, not one, will dominate the scene when Congress gets back to work. President Johnson and his programs will be competing for attention with Representative Adam Clayton Powell and his woes.

Just what the House Democratic caucus will do about Powell's committee chairmanship or what the House itself may do about his seat in Congress seems very uncertain at the moment. *One thing is certain, whatever is done will not be done in an atmosphere of civic majesty, calmly and serenely proceeding to the administration of justice. It will be a donnybrook with mass meetings, packed galleries, the shaken finger and the beaten breast. Mr. Powell set the tone with his statement claiming that an enormous political conspiracy is out to get him in order to get at black people and black progress. That will be even harder to prove than the specific charges against Mr. Powell.*

Guilt is personal and most of the Congressmen who have Powell in their gun sights want to punish Mr. Powell, period. But Powell answers by doing what many an accused person has done. He generalizes himself. He transforms himself from an individual into a cause, an issue, a race, a section of humanity in history. He must win his fight, he says, in the name of coming generations of black children who will one day decide the future of this country. Translated that sentence seems to mean that Mr. Powell regards himself as the anvil on which the future shape of the United States itself will be hammered out. *Whether he reads that sentence with misty eye or mischievous grin is an open question to those who know him best. Along with the generalization ploy Powell's friends also use the singling-out ploy. This is the notion that an institution has no right to investigate or punish one man for wrongdoing when others are also suspected of wrongdoing. On this principal no policeman can grab the suspect nearest him on the grounds that other suspects are vanishing around the corner.*

The fact is that Mr. Powell singled himself out; repeatedly, so often, so publicly, over so long a time it became impossible even for fellow Congressmen who generally loathe these showdowns to sit on their hands any longer.

January 20, 1967

SEVAREID: This is Eric Severeid.

The United States House of Representatives has by no means seen the last of Representative the Reverend Adam Clayton Powell. The betting here is that the committee of his peers who will sit in judgment will return him to his seat though not to his chairmanship. *In sum, Adam is expected to be allowed back into Eden but not to get his hands on that forbidden fruit again.*

Nor has the country heard the last of the Reverend. His direct pipeline to the Lord apparently failed him when the House was voting on his fate but he retains his pipeline to tens of thousands of his fervent followers and his voice is coming through to them loud and clear. They remain convinced that his punishment was entirely the result of race prejudice and he is not about to dissuade them. His recording ought to do well. Senator Dirksen, who also implies on occasion that he is positioned just a bit closer to the right hand of the Almighty than the rest of us, has done well with his recording. He sings of gallant men. He extols the high morality of men who exemplify the best in America.

Mr. Powell takes the opposite tack. He sings the cynic's song. All that counts is money. America has replaced the Holy Ghost in its new Trinity with God the Almighty dollar he tells his people. So get the dollars, get the green power. He is not being hypocritical here. He is not asking his followers to do something he has not been willing to do himself. That is the mark of a true leader.

His indictment of the American civilization does seem a bit sweeping. There was that little item of a civil war in which several hundred thousand Americans lost their lives and limbs because they believed slavery to be immoral.

But he has a point, nevertheless; it will not be lost on his Negro followers. It ought not be lost on white America either.

Someone recently calculated that if all Negroes in the South alone enjoyed the same education, the same opportunities to earn and to rise in their work that whites enjoy, the economy of the South would boom by an additional ten to twelve billion dollars. The great thing about green power is that it works to everybody's advantage, white or black.

January 24, 1967

SEVAREID: This phrase, *credibility gap*, has become a tiresome cliché already. But the very fact of its existence suggests that the condition is unusual. *It is unusual only in degree but I must say that in a quarter century of reporting Washington, I have never seen it in such high degree as this.*

My immediate fear is that the gap lies not only between the journalists and the truth but between our national leadership and the truth. I fear the intellectual lag. I fear that yesterday's truths are becoming today's dogma. Is Mao Tse-tung's China really to be compared with Hitler's Germany? Is Vietnam really today's Czechoslovakia? Does communism always and everywhere require physical containment or does it not have within itself its own built-in breaking mechanism, its own containment? Is it true today as the Administration believes and as seemed very true in the thirties and forties that peace and freedom are indivisible? Or is it the real truth that peace and freedom will continue to co-exist with war and tyranny as they have co-existed through most of human history? Up to what point is it the responsibility of the United States to try to renovate the economies, institutions, the ways of life of

distant and alien societies and can this, in fact, be really done? Is democracy an exportable item at all?

It is a basic faith of our foreign policy that peace, democracy and material progress are not each of them merely good in themselves but that they are interdependent. I try to find evidence from history that this may be so but I find very little. Talk of renovating, uplifting almost all the world, of creating what Secretary Rusk calls "a world order" to govern relations between the nations. But we are in and of the world with our due share of ignorance and sloth and fears, angers and prejudice, so much so that we have not been able to renovate our own society, the fearful problems of which pile higher and higher. Again and again, we have to remind ourselves of that truth that John Adams perceived as he walked this hill long ago. "Power always thinks it has a great soul." In that thought lies the secret of the terrible and sometimes fatal mistakes made by every great national power in the past. If our country is indeed the last best hope on earth, it is imperative that somehow, somehow, America prove to be the exception in this long litany of power misused.

January 30, 1967

SEVAREID: The most scholarly student of foreign policy on Capitol Hill has recommenced his public seminar, open to anyone whose mind is still open to second thoughts about the vast and troublesome role of the United States as a world power. Senator Fulbright has the time and inclination to think about the fundamentals and about tomorrow while most Administration officials must fight their in and out baskets containing the passing but pressing miseries of the day.

Perhaps there was a time when a leisurely, philosophical inquiry into the fate of nations seemed a normal thing in

this capital. In today's busy world the Fulbright hearings seem incongruous and *to some observers, usually those who don't grasp the nature of the Senator's concern, he is being academic, fusty and fuzzy. To some others conscious that we are in the middle of a dangerous war he is a bothersome dog in the manger.* But there is no ideal time for a search into the national motives and if we are having a search in the middle of a war, it's because it is this war that has sparked the concern. We fight a war with no agreement about the nature of the enemy, whether it is communism in general, North Vietnam or the national power of China. And this new series of hearings has opened at a moment when the relationship of forces in the world seems to be turned upside down, vastly different from the postwar period in which the basic American policies of containment and interventionism were formulated.

As this inquiry opens the head of atheistic Communist Russia is formally calling on the Pope in Rome. As this inquiry opens the biggest nation in the world, Communist China, is tearing itself apart and may possibly collapse back into a collection of regional authorities. Our old alliances are wearing thin, our old identification with the principles of the United Nations seems to be wearing thin. Increasingly, said Senator Fulbright, today, America is becoming the sole judge of the necessity and the merit of its actions. One might add that a few years ago we knew what we were against as well as what we were for. Today we still know what we are for. What we are against, just why, just where, is the question.

February 14, 1967

SEVAREID: The CIA, Central Intelligence Agency, is a by-product of the Cold War era and America's uncomfortable, unfamiliar new role as a world military power. We

are perhaps the last big nation to get into the spy and counter-spy business in a large-scale sustained manner.

This agency has done many things well, some things badly. It is not a power unto itself as some nervous citizens think. But it does have a self-generated momentum behind it, *it does move quietly into areas and operations where its methods and usefulness are questionable to say the least.*

Last year it was revealed that some men working in the Michigan State University aid projects in Vietnam were CIA agents. Last year a research center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology severed its financial ties with the CIA apparently to protect the Institute's reputation for integrity. At that time a Senate sub-committee studied the secret agency's role in university research. The Senators were not made aware that *for fifteen years the agency has been helping to subsidize a purely student organization, the National Student Association, a kind of confederation of campus governing groups. This has not involved research, it has probably not involved espionage, it has involved propaganda.*

When it began we were in a dangerous Cold War with Communist powers. Student conferences around the world were an instrument of Communist propaganda. Student delegates from Communist countries were chosen by those regimes and propagated the Communist line. Their amateur status was a joke, but every sophisticated person knew this. *What was not known was that some American student representatives were also being subsidized by government, through the CIA.* Many of those representatives themselves did not know this. But the amateur status of American students abroad like that of American athletes was supposed to be real and honest. It could be argued then that in this respect we have dissembled more than the Communist regimes.

This kind of operation at that level has almost nothing to do with the national security. Traditionally the CIA refuses to account to the public for its doings, pleading security, and rightly so in many cases. Today it again refuses to account publicly for its involvement in this student affair. But it may be hard put to keep its silence this time for this time *it can be fairly charged with expanding its mandate beyond reason or need.*

February 17, 1967

SEVAREID: A decade and more ago, any American had to be careful about the organizations he joined, the funds he contributed to, the public meetings he attended, the neighbors he had in his house, because the remotest connection with a Communist could ruin a person.

Today any American had better be careful about his organizations, funds, meetings and neighbors because his own government—in the form of the Central Intelligence Agency—might be involved somewhere. The god of history is obviously a humorist who loves practical jokes. When Washington can get itself into as big a lather over the secret operation of its own officials, as it got into over the secret operations of Communist enemies, it must mean something. Maybe it means that the Cold War is effectively over, the world a steadier, less dangerous place, human beings relaxing back into older, more comfortable habits. This is probably the only pleasurable lesson to be drawn from the uproar over the secret agency's involvement in the American student affairs.

Today the defense is having its day in court, so to speak. *The C. I. A. is letting out word that it was ordered to do what it did—and one can imagine its agents sobbing with grief as they accepted the hateful assignment.* Various senators and representatives on subcommittees that deal

with the C. I. A. say they knew about these operations all along and for the life of them can't see what's wrong. Mr. Allen Dulles, former C. I. A. chief, says the operations after all stopped Communists in the student area. What has stopped Communist advances among students is the same general trend that stopped Communist military, political and economic advances: their own excesses, military alliances against them, the rise of nationalism in the new countries, the magnetic attraction of prosperity in the Western nations and decisive episodes like the Cuban missile crisis and the great China-Russia schism.

Intellectual cloak-and-dagging among students has to be regarded as a wrist slap among blows for human freedom and by no means worth the compromising of organizations that stood for individual and intellectual freedom. It is the ancient argument about means and ends, about external threats to the nation's body and internal threats to its soul. It was Adolf Hitler, if I remember correctly, who observed that a great strength of the totalitarian societies was that they obliged their enemies to imitate them.

February 28, 1967

SEVAREID: Henry R. Luce died this morning in the new America, the arid, open, exciting Southwest, where this reporter has been spending the last few days.

Perhaps the key to this quiet, withdrawn publishing genius was his passionate curiosity about whatever was new, from a kitchen gadget to a religious conception. His mind lived constantly at the cutting edge of human thought and conduct. He may have been the greatest popularizer of ideas in this century, yet he did it without talking down to his readers.

Luce started from nothing and made a prodigious fortune. Perhaps the best description of him was that of a

friend, some time ago, who said Luce was a dreamer with a keen sense of double entry bookkeeping.

Luce was a tall, spare man with a quality of grayness about his face and dress and manner. He listened far better than he conversed. He was rather deaf and he used this as his protective device when he was bored with what was being said.

He was a visionary in the good sense of the word, with the maximum view of the United States and its potential for the human race. It was he who coined the phrase, "The American Century." Many men disapproved of his visions, not all liked the way he expressed them, but none discounted the boldness and force he put behind them.

He had a genius for choosing his reporters and writers, from courthouse cynics to poets of considerable quality. Periodically, he lost some of the most individualistic among them who objected to the system of group rewrite and what it did to their material, or who refused to write news according to a policy line handed down from the top.

His publications had a way of brushing with glamour everything they described. *Fortune* made businessmen see themselves as historic figures; *Life* brought the weekly news visually alive in a way never done before. *Time* made the most remote, provincial reader feel that he was on the sophisticated inside.

The enduring argument about Henry Luce has always centered on Time, which he labeled a news magazine. It strained in every sentence to avoid dullness, which often meant straining truth. It was a weekly casserole of intermingled fact and opinion, both fascinating and deeply disturbing when it began. Its style enlivened the language, and to some degree it caricatured the language. *Many journalists have always distrusted it; nearly all have always read it.* By any accounting, Henry Luce revolutionized journalism in this century. It took a big man to do that.

March 2, 1967

SEVAREID: Senator Robert Kennedy's great advantage in getting public response is his last name. His great disadvantage in getting response from the Johnson administration is also his last name. *If, by some magic, he discovered the perfect key for unlocking the riddle of Vietnam, President Johnson would suffer considerably before accepting it from Kennedy.* In his long and eloquent and far-reaching Senate speech today, Mr. Kennedy does not discover the magic key. He does add to the atmospheric pressure on this administration for suspending the bombing of North Vietnam. He begs that we take seriously the recommendations of Secretary General U Thant and Kosygin of Russia, who seem convinced that stopping the bombing not only can, but will, open the way to peace negotiations. Whether the president will directly acknowledge this speech at all is problematical. Secretary Rusk will respond with his familiar litany, that we must first know from the enemy what will happen if we make this concession. It seems fairly clear that Kennedy regards as the more ominous question, what will happen if we do not make this concession. And he quotes Edmund Burke: "Conciliation failing, force remains: but force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left." So suspend the bombing, said Mr. Kennedy, tell the enemy we'll be at the negotiating table within a week. If they don't respond at once, maintain the bombing pause for a substantial period. Then re-examine the questions of bombing, and/or building some kind of wall across that country. If we get talks started, there should be an international team of observers to check on enemy moves to infiltrate and American moves to reinforce. There is no magic in his formula; he is simply saying take the chance and suspend the bombing. He thinks that what we may win is far greater than what we may lose, our professional

military, pro-bombers, notwithstanding. Mr. Kennedy employs the recent statement of Secretary of Defense McNamara, the one Kennedy appointee regarded as highly by the president as by the Kennedys, the McNamara statement that will be used again and again: "I don't believe the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor would any bombing that I would contemplate in the future would significantly reduce, the actual flow of men and materials to the south."

March 3, 1967

SEVAREID: Secretary Rusk implies the Russians are sincere in wanting Vietnam ended by negotiations; but *the Russian President Podgorny, perhaps angered by the latest American intensification of the war, says that the Johnson Administration wants peace by military victory. Some United States Senators also entertain that thought from time to time, but to believe it is to believe the President guilty of an enormous duplicity.* It is also to believe that he expects victory, and soon; but he has said nothing to suggest that, and even the fiercer hawks have softened their once happy predictions.

The Senate debate yesterday, sparked by Mr. Kennedy's speech, avoided the issue of whether we should have gone into Vietnam in the first place. By the conventional wisdom around here that is a moot question, irrelevant to the problem of settling the war. But that question remains the ghost at the banquet and cannot be dismissed. The reason is that every suggestion for ending the war—withdrawal, retiring to fortified positions, destroying North Vietnam—all are related to the real value of the American stake in Vietnam. Because there is no agreement on that, there is no clearly preferable strategy. If for example Americans were overwhelmingly convinced that the integrity of South Vietnam

were essential to the security of the United States or to peace in the world, as Mr. Rusk used to suggest, then there would be very little hesitation about knocking out North Vietnam, China or the civilians notwithstanding. But we are uncertain of our course because we are uncertain of our case.

In some ways, the closest parallel to the Vietnam war is our war against Mexico in 1846. Ultimately it extended our boundaries to the Rio Grande and the Pacific Ocean, but it split the Congress, press and people as Vietnam has done. *It roused much of the intellectual community against President Polk, who was accused of duplicity and of manipulating Congress (notably by Congressman Abraham Lincoln) just as Mr. Johnson is sometimes accused.* Various West Point graduates resigned their army commissions rather than fight in the Mexican War. The young Lieutenant Ulysses S. Grant fought in the war but, according to his biographers, regretted that all his life. Vietnam is physical, intellectual, moral, political travail for the American people. But it has its precedent, if that be of any comfort.

March 7, 1967

SEVAREID: *Jimmy Hoffa, convicted by the courts, is in jail. By his drive, brains and boldness he reached one of the highest pinnacles ever attained in the American labor business and his methods cut him down. Adam Clayton Powell, convicted by the House of Representatives and fugitive from the courts, is on a sunny southern isle. By his drive, brains and boldness he reached perhaps the most powerful position ever attained by a Negro politician in this country and his methods cut him down.*

Hoffa is a primitive, a carry-over, an old-time street scrapper, surviving in an era of labor leaders with mani-

cured hands and uniformed chauffeurs. Powell is an educated, sophisticated man who could have been one of the greatest lawmakers of our time or the historic leader of the civil rights revolution. *But both men sneered at the rules which most other big men respect as they climb to the top.* And this raises the interesting question about them. Both men regard themselves as tougher and stronger than other men, and perhaps most Americans would agree. *But it can be argued that they were not strong men, but weak men. Impatience and flamboyance have nothing much to do with strength. The compulsion to win every battle, to admit no mistake, is not toughness but febrility. There are many ways to win and hold power and lasting honor in this country but all of them require a patient stamina these men did not possess. What John L. Lewis had, Hoffa did not; what Martin Luther King has, Powell did not.*

The brilliant, driving, but fatally weak personality is not new to history. Centuries ago Plutarch wrote this about the Roman half-hero Coriolanus, who lost an election: "He could not bear the affront with any patience. He had always indulged his temper and had regarded the proud and contentious element of human nature as a sort of nobleness and magnanimity. Reason and discipline had not imbued him with that solidity and equanimity which enters so largely into the virtues of the statesman. Straightforward and direct and possessed with the idea that to vanquish and overbear all opposition is the true part of bravery, and never imagining that it was the weakness and womanishness of his nature that broke out, he retired, full of fury and bitterness against the people."

March 14, 1967

SEVAREID: It is almost three years since the administration made an agreement in principle with Moscow that each nation could establish consulates in the other, out-

side of their respective capital cities. The concern of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover that this might give the Russians an extra advantage in the business of spying seems to be dampened down. *Now the chief opposition to the treaty around the country comes from the highly organized extreme right wing groups; the chief opposition in the Senate from men whose careers have been identified in large measure with crusading anti-communism.*

The agreement would give immunity from arrest to those consular officials themselves and allow them to step in to protect their own nationals, Russians who get into trouble here, Americans who get into trouble there. And far more Americans travel in Russia than Russians travel here. These protections would be enforced even if no consulates were physically established in either country. The idea is simple reciprocity in the familiar world-wide pattern. Before and during the big war the United States and Russia had consulates on each others' territory, but they were withdrawn at the height of the cold war.

The first negotiations for this treaty were begun under President Eisenhower and he continues to support the effort. Faced with rebellion by moderate Republican Senators, Republican leader Dirksen has essentially withdrawn his own opposition.

But a two-thirds vote of those present is required for Senate ratification of a treaty. When it became apparent that outright rejection of the treaty was unlikely, its opponents, like Senator Mundt, resorted to amendments, barring implementation of the agreement until Soviet aid to North Vietnam has ceased, for one thing. But this treaty cannot be used as a political lever on Moscow for the reason that it's not that important in the practical sense. The Russians would simply refuse to ratify on any such terms, as we also would refuse were similar terms applied to us.

In the practical sense the treaty is useful but not critical. But as a symbol it does have a certain critical air about it. Since the Cuban missile crisis and the Russia-China split, the cold war has taken a different turn. Nobody expects Russia ever to love or trust America, or vice versa, but in their own interests the Russians are trying to get on better terms with the West. Presumably, this is what we have always wanted. The administration looks on this treaty as a small step in that direction, as an earnest of our intention that the trend towards east-west cooperation shall continue, hopefully leading to much bigger things, such as a treaty to discourage the spread of nuclear weapons around the world.

March 17, 1967

SEVAREID: This is Saint Patrick's Day and according to the rule book one ought to say something about the Irish. But the Irish can generally be counted on to take care of that themselves, particularly on this one day of the year.

It wouldn't do, on this day, to say that the news pastures are greener exactly on the other side of the continent, but exotic happenings do continue to bloom in southern California, where there's no politics like show business and no show business like politics.

The age of mass production produced the interchangeable part, and since the switch of Ronald Reagan to the governorship and George Murphy to the Senate it has been perfectly clear that the statesman need no longer be custom-made as in the old fogey days of long ago. Naturally the process works in reverse. *So Senator Dirksen has no trouble going into show business, recordings department, nor has Adam Clayton Powell. And Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty as a television compeer, raconteur and question answerer seems entirely natural, an appropriate development in na-*

ture's new scheme of things. After all, Yorty told the Ribicoff committee very frankly some time ago that a mayor in Los Angeles has very few powers. The next best thing to power is influence, and the next best thing to that is publicity.

In conversation many years ago the late Gertrude Stein explained to me that there was a new being in the world. She called it the "publicity saint," a person who didn't have to say or do anything that affected anything, but only had to exist in order to be publicized. Her leading example was Eleanor Roosevelt, which I thought inaccurate; mine was Bernard Baruch.

These days we have a whole new crop of publicity saints, though of minor orders. *At Mayor Yorty's ceremonial, it was natural that he would surround himself with those already beatified; no opening is regarded as complete any more without the presence of Mr. Pierre Salinger, for example. It is without point to ask what a publicity saint does. They don't have to do; they just have to be.* And only the most backward would ask Miss Zsa Zsa Gabor what she does, because she is, though purists in the study of this new species might quibble there. She not only is, she has.

April 18, 1967

SEVAREID: After his Latin American excursion in which he dealt with the complicated problems of the future, President Johnson is now immersed in the agonizing problems of the present. South America may be smoldering, but Southeast Asia is on fire.

Most of the large factors in the Vietnam war seem unchanged. Some military authorities here are implying that the fighting is reaching a decisive stage. They were saying that a year ago. Thousands of anti-war Americans have been massing in the streets demanding that we get

out of Vietnam. They were making that demand a year ago. High-ranking government officials are saying that Hanoi is encouraged to continue the war because of these protests in this country. And they were saying that a year ago. A spade is a spade; *the protestors and the government are calling each other murderers. This is the outer limit of democratic dialogue.* It is stark illustration of the decline of order, the loosening of the cement that holds this body politic together. *Another year of this and it may be questionable how much moral authority will remain vested in the presidency; it may also be questionable how much will remain vested in Martin Luther King, for one, who has now formally joined the war protest to the passions of the Negro revolution.*

But on the international, inter-governmental level, it would be wrong to say that nothing at all has improved. The rigid triangle composed of Hanoi, Washington and the Saigon regime does appear to have altered its shape. It is Saigon that has softened. Not long ago Marshall Ky was insisting on no dealing whatever with the local Vietcong; indeed, he was demanding the invasion of North Vietnam. Recently, when Ceylon proposed a standstill in the fighting and dealing with the VC, the Saigon regime accepted this. Today it accepted, in advance of Washington, Canada's suggestion of a mutual pullback from the demilitarized zone.

This does not mean that these things will actually occur. It may not mean that the ruling junta in Saigon has had a change of its private heart. What it means is that there are new forces at work inside South Vietnam, local political forces, represented by the presence of the temporary Parliament, and by the gathering election campaign. The generals are bowing to the spirit of these new groups and processes. That spirit is for compromise and peace. To accept that spirit is the way to win election, which tells us

a lot about the mood of the ordinary Vietnamese. In sum, one of the stubborn roadblocks in the path to peace is being reduced, and that is something.

April 27, 1967

SEVAREID: *The committee recommendation that Senator Dodd of Connecticut be formally censured is expected to be followed by the full Senate.* The committee finding was a unanimous vote of its respected members, and after *the severe punishment of Adam Clayton Powell on the House side*, it would be exceeding strange were the Senate to relent on Dodd.

There is a principle of randomness in politics as in nature; things come in clusters, *so we have had Bobby Baker, then Powell, now Dodd.* Each has intensified interest in the others and made impossible any sweeping under the carpet operation.

Every few years the Congress goes through some kind of crisis about members' personal conduct, so every few years there is a new effort to write some kind of ground rules on the use of government expense accounts and campaign funds, on acceptance of gifts from lobbyists, on conflict of interest between a member's public duties and his private business connections. It's an extremely difficult task, so fuzzy are so many of the borderline cases.

Congress is judge and jury, prosecutor and defense for its members. It has no separate watchdog, save the press. Men who labor in the executive branch do have a watchdog, the Congress. It has demanded the purity of Caesar's wife for administration people, and so have various presidents, including President Johnson. The result is that the federal administration is generally regarded as very clean, cleaner than most city or state governments. *But it is also very probably true that the federal Congress*

is cleaner than most of the legislatures in the states. The popular notion that congressmen are natural crooks comes from the experience of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th. It is a notion that many congressmen privately but bitterly resent as they go quietly broke in office.

Their mail from constituents these days has been full of epithets, and they are scarcely in a charitable mood toward Powell or Dodd, and very uncharitable toward Dodd's office staff people who rifled his files while working for him. And if these people now receive some attention from the Justice Department, most senators will not be displeased. They all have an office staff of their own.

April 28, 1967

SEVAREID: The square-shouldered, square-jawed General Westmoreland mounted the tribune today, but not as a hero with victory to report; he came more as an emissary of the fighting troops and he was as much sympathized with as admired, for he struggles with what may be the most difficult, unglamorous assignment ever given an American commander. No one can be sure that his war of attrition, his search-and-destroy strategy, is the best strategy in Vietnam because no one can be sure about the hypothetical alternatives; but the Congress gives him the automatic benefit of the doubt on this, partly because it knows he fights under severe and necessary political restrictions.

His speech today was more of a factual military report than his speech to the editors on Monday. It was a softer speech. He did not talk about "unpatriotic acts at home" as he did on Monday; he merely said that the enemy believes that America's resolve is its Achilles' heel.

It has been clear since Monday that if the Administration thought Westmoreland's soldierly presence would tend to silence the critics and draw the country closer together,

behind the President, if it thought that, it was wrong; the effect has been the opposite. In his speech Monday, if not today, he exacerbated the argument. *Congressional critics don't enjoy being called unpatriotic, even if only by loose implication; if the general meant only the flag and draft card burners, everyone wishes he had said so.*

Today's speech was much more carefully vetted in Washington than his Monday's speech. When he said on Monday that he could see no end to the war in sight, he intensified the domestic debate; he did not diminish it, because there are many potential hawks who have restrained their desire to smash up North Vietnam because of the thought that military victory in the field may be close at hand, and there are many potential doves who have restrained their desire to appease Hanoi or get out of Vietnam because of the same thought.

Now with the war's commander stating flatly that the end of the fighting is not in sight, men on both sides of the domestic argument will feel less restraint, and will go at it hammer and tongs.

May 2, 1967

SEVAREID: It is not likely that President Johnson or Secretaries Rusk and McNamara will be losing any sleep over their so-called trial for war crimes, which opened today in Stockholm. The effects of gratuitous insults generally wane rapidly.

This affair in Stockholm is an anti-American propaganda ploy. It is being staged there because the bulk of the British left wing wanted nothing to do with it, and because de Gaulle would not permit it to take place in France. Even the Soviet Union allows very little publicity about it. But many fiery denunciations of Washington will come out of it, will be printed and broadcast around much of the

world, finding some believers, and having a reverse effect on others because of the sheer blatancy of the business.

It would receive almost no attention were it not associated with the name of Lord Bertrand Russell, though he will not attend in person. Lord Russell has been one of the shining intellects of this century, whose works will be studied for generations. He is now 95 years old. From his home in Wales he operates what one journalist has called a protest factory. Statements protesting almost anything, in particular almost anything the United States government says or does, pour out under his name. *Much of it is the work of a tense, humorless young American expatriate named Ralph Schoenman, one of a small band of far left Americans, some of them committed Communists, who have operated in England for several years.*

Some who know him argue that Lord Russell is not at all senile. But his stability might be judged by the facts that he once called both President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan murderers worse than Hitler, that at one time he advocated preventive war against the Soviet Union, that *he regards the Warren Commission Report as a part of a giant conspiracy*, that he claims the United States has put 8 million Vietnamese into concentration camps. That, incidentally, would be one half the population of South Vietnam.

If the Vietnam war is an affront to reason, for many people Lord Russell's brand of opposition to it is a mutilation of reason.

May 4, 1967

SEVAREID: What follows scarcely comes under the heading of pointing with pride or viewing with alarm; it occupies that misty middle ground called pondering with perplexity.

What is a bit perplexing these days is the number and variety of Americans busy writing higher laws. *The draft card burners are responding to a higher law, they say, than the Selective Service Act; leaders of various street demonstrations are invoking higher laws than city ordinances governing traffic and public order. If things get much worse the scholars will have to write a new definition of anarchy.* It won't mean the absence of law any more; it will mean a superabundance of laws, with every citizen free to choose those he feels like obeying. A country can grow rich in saints and martyrs that way, but a boom market in self-conscious morality is bound to crash sooner or later.

One of the higher laws developing these days among some of the civil rights demonstrators seems to be the rule that unless there is bread for everyone there shall be no cake for anyone. So Dr. Martin Luther King argues that because the housing situation in Louisville is bad, Louisville doesn't really deserve to have the Kentucky Derby and some of his young followers entertain notions about breaking it up.

At Darmouth College several hundred students have discovered a higher meaning to the constitutional guarantee of free speech. It means the freedom to howl down anybody with a different view and to threaten him with bodily harm, as they did with ex-Governor George Wallace. These students are quite certain their morality is higher than Wallace's, a proposition now open to doubt. Their unspoken conviction is that the young and left-wing are naturally pure; the middle-aged and right-wing naturally impure. It all leaves bewildered citizens groping hopelessly to find the difference between the students who smashed Wallace's car and that Dallas woman who spat on the late Adlai Stevenson, the difference between today's left-wing intimidation and yesterday's right-wing intimidation by McCarthyism.

The McCarthyites, too, were following what they conceived to be higher laws.

The spectacle of the more self-righteous young students these days irresistibly brings to mind a remark once made by Winston Churchill. He said he admired a manly man and a womanly woman, but he said, "I cannot stand a boyly boy."

June 15, 1967

SEVAREID: The Senate of the United States is not a chowder and marching club at the best of times, and it reaches its most joyless level when it must sit as a court in judgment on one of its members. It is a court of 100 this week, since Dodd of Connecticut can vote on his own case, and all its proceedings are conducted in the spirit of more sorrow than anger, *except on occasion when Dodd's defender, Long of Louisiana, turns purple of complexion, matching his prose.* The transaction has none of the atmosphere of a criminal case, though money is the subject matter. No member seems to be thinking of the defendant as larcenous. *The alleged misdeeds at issue are in the realm of carelessness, but on a scale beyond normal proportions. Senator Dodd appears to have been afflicted with what one observer here calls a "splendid inattention to detail."*

Any senator is part individual, part institution, or so he feels. In the Orient, individuals dare not lose face; in the West institutions dare not, and *the offense Mr. Dodd is charged with by the Ethics Committee is damage to the reputation of the institution.* Senators are painfully aware that there is always a layer of the population that regards legislators as crooks, which is not often true, and the House chamber did what it did to Congressman Powell, which adds to the pressure for action on the Senator from Connecticut. So the highest authority appealed to by Senator

Stennis, spokesman for the prosecution, is the Senate, while the defendant, whose personal honor and soul are at stake, has called upon the Lord as his witness. Mr. Dodd has defined himself as technically responsible, but not guilty. It is conceivable that the senators will vote on the two questions, double billing for airplane fares and using testimonial dinner receipts for personal needs, that they will vote on them separately. This could result in differing verdicts and leave Mr. Dodd's status about as cloudy as the issues are now. The great difficulty is that there are no written rules about how testimonial dinner monies should be used, only for political purposes, or are they to be regarded as personal gifts to the senator? The verdict on Dodd ought to lay down the precedent on this matter, so the Senate seems to be using Mr. Dodd as a guinea pig as well as making him an example.

Dodd himself has no doubts as to where the line on money morality is drawn. *If he had bought minks, a Cadillac or a yacht, he implied, that would have been wrong; this suggests that rabbit fur, a Chevy, and a rowboat are more respectable.*

It is easy to identify part of the senator's appeal to his constituents. He looked so augustly senatorial, and yet was always so spectacularly broke.

June 21, 1967

SEVAREID: *The remarkable young man known as Muhammed Ali or Cassius Clay had an unconvincing case for refusing military service, and apparently expected to be found guilty.* Had he won his case there would certainly have been widespread resentment on the part of other young men who do serve, to say nothing of the families of those who have found injury or death in the service. Yet for any one who has known and tried to understand this young man, there

must be a sense of regret and loss over what he has come to, and a sense of shock at the severity of his sentence, because there is a large core of goodness, of high morality, in this young athlete. This will sound strange to those familiar with *his public posturing and boasting and vaingloriousness*. That side of his nature has existed in contradiction to his private gentleness, his acts of generous concern for his friends, his family, and especially for the Negro youngsters who idolized him.

Beginning at a very tender age, this phenomenal boy had to bear a tremendous weight of public attention. He was bright, highly emotional, but woefully uneducated and confused about just who he was and what it was all about. In spite of his family background, he was uprooted in a different and more drastic way than most young Negroes in the American society. He had to find something he could cling to, and *he found it among the black muslim sect, and what they regard as their faith. He seemed to feel that this had brought a coherence to his life; it has now brought him to the gates of prison*. He has turned his tremendous energies into the direction of deliberate martyrdom, as have some others trying to lead in the national Negro upheaval. It is hard to see that this advances their cause to a lasting degree. It is permissible to speculate, at least, that the leadership for the long haul will come from the ranks of those who work within the rules and find their lost pride in contexts that the whole country, not only militant Negroes, accept and understand. And if there is one obvious group of Negroes now accomplishing this, it is those young men who took the opposite road from Muhammed Ali—the Negro privates, corporals sergeants, officers in Vietnam. In battle, color has no meaning to anybody; all that is respected is competence and the ability to lead. And it is in this strange war, dubious as its purposes and outcome may be,

that Negro Americans are establishing a record that has to be respected, producing individual leaders whom Negroes generally will have to listen to and look to in the generation ahead.

June 27, 1967

SEVAREID: This is Eric Sevareid. *President Johnson indulged his pet peeve in Baltimore today. He blew in public the gasket he usually ignites in private gatherings.*

Practically all Presidents begin by feeling the press is a thorn in their flesh; practically all of them acquire the feeling it is a sword in their side. Some have left office convinced it is a knife in their back. Mr. Johnson seems to have achieved stage three already.

When Thomas Jefferson left office he was reading only one paper, the *Richmond Inquirer*. He didn't trust the contents of the others, except for the advertisements. President Eisenhower, midway in office, concentrated on the *New York Herald Tribune*; it saw things his way. In recent months, both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Truman have been advising President Johnson to ignore the press, print and broadcast, and just go ahead and do what he thinks is right. That is as hard for Mr. Johnson as lifting himself by his bootstraps, too hard for a man with the habit of devouring newspapers and broadcasts, and *who wants to regard the press as the creator of both the credibility and the likeability gaps.*

Mr. Johnson is a positive thinker. Accomplishments should make news as exciting as failures or protests he feels. Antiwar protestors who tramped around the Pentagon got attention, while 10,000 young Americans enlisted in the armed forces and got no attention. Well, news is what editors decide it is, and they can and do fall into ruts at times. But the theory, or the instinct, is that news is what

is different and unusual. Protestors trampling the Pentagon tulip beds is regarded as something unusual, army enlistments as usual. Suppose it were the other way around and army enlistments got headlines and pictures as extraordinary events, while tulip trampers were ignored because they were ordinary events. This would surely mean that American society was in a dreadful state, to say nothing of its tulips. The argument can be carried too far, but as a working hypothesis one can say that a nation that features bad news is probably a good and sound nation; one that features good news is likely to be a badly run, unsound nation. The press of most totalitarian countries is full of good news.

Intellectuals, especially those in alien countries, get mixed up about all this. Ordinary people don't. If all barriers to emigration and immigration were suddenly lifted all over the world, there would be a mighty movement of peoples, most of it in one direction, toward this country, in spite of all those awful things its own press and the foreign press have been saying about it.

August 31, 1967

SEVAREID: The assemblage in Chicago that Mike Wallace is reporting looks more like a camp meeting than a political operation to most people here in Washington. Conceivably the framework of a left wing third party on the national, presidential level could be put together but probably not much more than a framework. The money, organization, and leadership required for a third party to have any influence, to say nothing of winning any electoral college votes, must all be of a high order, and the assembly in Chicago doesn't appear to have even a candidate.

They are finding unity in a general state of mind only, not in a program or personality. At least they know they are

against the war and against the President, and in favor of rapid progress toward equality for Negro Americans. But they seem to differ vastly in their ideas of how to reach their goals. They are mostly young, of the "you can't trust anybody over 30" vintage, but they don't appear to be terribly trustful of one another either. That is one trouble with intellectuals in collective politics; the imagination that allowed them to see great goals also obliges them to see a thousand shadings of philosophy and policy. They can fragment a major issue into minor issues with alacrity and conviction. Mike Wallace reports that the Chicago gathering is surprisingly devoid of both structure and passion. *The last left wing third party effort organized in Chicago was Henry Wallace's Progressive party in 1948, which I was covering for CBS NEWS. It was the precise opposite, highly structured, intensely passionate, in part at least because it was dominated by Communists, of whom very few are in Chicago now.*

Unless an unlikely miracle happens in Chicago over the next few days, the real third party danger to President Johnson next year will come from another Wallace, George, of Alabama. A danger to Mr. Johnson, but perhaps even more to the Republican party in the South. George Wallace can't possibly win, but it's still conceivable that his movement could deny a clear electoral majority to either major party candidate and throw the presidential choice into the House of Representatives, and that would mean a combination camp meeting, fishfry and Donnybrook wondrous to behold.

September 5, 1967

SEVAREID: There is a theory that husbands can achieve happiness in marriage if they will frequently repeat those three little words, "I was wrong." Normally ambitious

politicians, like military generals, find themselves unable to utter those words, but now Governor George Romney has done it, and it will be interesting to see if he can achieve his nomination ambitions by this reversal of political tradition.

He was wrong, he now says, when he endorsed the Vietnam war after a trip there two years ago. That is as far as his humility goes in this instance. He appears to put the blame on American officers and diplomats in Vietnam who, he says, brainwashed him. But then, he went on, he went to the books and really learned something about this war, the Communist movement in Vietnam and the long history of that little country, and as a result he no longer believes that our massive intervention was ever necessary to save Southeast Asia from Communist and/or Chinese domination. He now believes we have in effect created the conflict and also involved other Asian countries in it.

In now denying the very validity of the war, Romney has broken the pattern of all the potential presidential candidates. None of the others has gone anywhere near this far. But Mr. Romney has joined a distinct and growing pattern involving scores of other serious-minded citizens, in Congress and out, who did not make a sustained independent effort to examine the basic flow of history in Southeast Asia until it was too late and our massive commitments made. This is what can happen when there is no formal declaration of war, formally debated, when the simple possession of mobile power tends to make action easier than thought.

This current wave of deep doubt about the war's justification is usually regarded by high officials here not as evidence of an enlightenment, but as a failure of nerve. A weakening of will when the going gets tough, they usually call it. This does not appear to be a very precise diagnosis.

The tough going has simply forced the tough re-examination of premises. The operative doubts today are not about the will or character of the American people, but about the wisdom of the official policy.

September 7, 1967

SEVAREID: This is Eric Severeid in Washington. In this political world, when you can't solve a problem, you divide it. Another wall, of a sort, remindful of the line in Korea, the Berlin Wall, and the wall that did exist in Jerusalem, in going to go up between North and South Vietnam, built by American military engineers. This one will be barbed wire and electronic warning devices. General Westmoreland has resisted the idea for two years, feeling the troops could not be spared for it. Either he has enough men now, the many rear echelon bases having been largely completed, or he has been overruled.

Secretary McNamara denies, however, that we are going to an essentially defensive strategy in Vietnam, as so many have urged for so long, the latest being Sir Robert Thompson, Britain's leading expert on Vietnam and guerrilla warfare. But this announcement today is at least the first step in the direction of a defensive strategy. No word as to whether the fortified line would extend through Laos, where the best established enemy infiltration roads lie. If it is extended all the way, that would mean in effect handing northern Laos over to the enemy, perhaps for good.

This was the important McNamara statement today. *The remarks that will produce the real fun and games, of course, were those about Governor George Romney, who, says McNamara, an ex-auto manufacturer himself, is blind to the truth.*

Romney, as you know, claims American officials in Vietnam brainwashed him into supporting the war two years

ago. This shows signs of becoming one of politics' immortal remarks. It may not be quite on the scale of the run, Romanism and rebellion remark that booted a presidential election in the eighties, but it will have a life of its own, and could conceivably cost Romney the nomination. Today everybody is hammering at him, columnists, commentators, Democrats and even some fellow Republicans, notably Mr. Nixon's campaign chairman. President Johnson is saying nothing publicly, but is reported to be enjoying the spectacle.

At least the remark has landed Romney back on page one, and he had been slipping off. All prophesies about American politics are dangerous, so it is much too soon for anyone to conclude that Romney's chances are fatally damaged. The important fact remains that he is the only candidate who has flatly denied the usefulness of this war. All the others support it in one way or another, and it's interesting to imagine what [position] those others will take should the war be ended in this next year. As critics of President Johnson, they could find themselves finessed, out on a breaking limb, and Romney could stand clear with the argument that the war was never worth it in the first place.

Well, speculation is free, and like most free things, not worth very much. A year is a very long time amid the wild pleasures of American politics.

September 12, 1967

SEVAREID: This is Eric Severeid in Washington.

The start of a national custom ought to be news, and it looks as if a new annual custom started today with the children's carnival on the White House grounds. It may be that sociological viewers with alarm will see ominous parallels—caliope playing while Rome, Newark, Detroit and East St. Louis burn, or pastoral gamboling, Versailles

fashion, *while H. Rapsierre Brown teaches guillotine building in New York schools*. But if the custom is still with us next year and the year after, we may consider that the republic has survived this era of do-it-yourself arson and oratorical buncombe.

Not that the cheerful custom won't run into troubles. Today the fair was for the children of cabinet, court, congressional and federal agency notables. It will probably be denounced as an establishment carnival and next year be countered by a protest demonstration in Lafayette Square, led by the offspring of civil servants just below the appointive level. Or it may be denounced as an example of militaristic imperialism since the Marine Band provides the music. *Back in the 30s, after all, the American Communists denounced the Boy Scouts as an instrument of fascism*.

Apparently this fall carnival is to be in addition to, not a substitute for, the springtime Easter egg roll on the White House grounds. The carnival probably originated with a presidential task force charged with thinking up new traditions, but the egg rolling affair has a long history, evolving out of the ancient Scottish ritual of rolling oat cakes down a hill at Easter time. In Scotland, anything easy is regarded as immoral, and the oat cake is not what one would call a natural roller, nor is the egg.

The egg rolling custom escaped congressional investigation. This autumn carnival may not. Great cities are struggling to get classrooms opened while teachers strike by the thousands, federal appropriations to encourage education run into billions, yet the President invites all these kids to a carnival on a school day. In our time, any kid who handed the home room teacher a written excuse for an absence which said "went to a carnival" would have done after-class time at the blackboard for five days running.

If the carnival is a Johnsonian masterstroke for increasing the future Democratic vote, this can be offset by the adult White House gardeners. The reports are that they are going Republican in a body.

September 13, 1967

SEVAREID: This is Eric Severeid in Washington. From the general drift of Republican talk these days the innocent bystander gets the impression that *the Republican strategy for next year will be to head off the Johnson war party at Credibility Gap. Governor Romney thinks the administration has been brainwashing everybody, Governor Reagan says a new credibility gap has developed, Richard Nixon implies that practically no foreigners anywhere trust the United States any more.*

The average country gets along with just one credibility gap, but since the United States does everything wholesale, in job lots, we are developing gaps everywhere one looks, including one-man, do-it-yourself credibility gaps like Governor Romney's. But two major gaps have emerged. One is the believability of the administration when it explains the situation. The other is the believability of the Republican leaders when they explain the remedies for the situation.

House Leader Gerald Ford, for example, on the Vietnam war. Succeed or get out is the correct formula, he says. Since no one in power knows just how to do either, this hasn't helped very much. Demand that the South Vietnamese army fight harder or else, says Mr. Ford. Endless such demands have had no particular results in the past, and Mr. Ford does not explain what "else" means. Maybe he means we should court martial the Vietnamese army.

California's Senator George Murphy, for example. Unleash our military leaders, he says, and the war would be over in a month. Since no military leader in this capital makes this claim, to the President or to the public, Mr. Murphy can enjoy exclusive rights to his own gap.

California's Governor Reagan, for example. Sharply escalate the war, he says. Unless he means invading North Vietnam, which would double our trouble, this must mean knocking out or blockading the ports of the north. Quite apart from the risk of producing even heavier Russian involvement, the fact is that no military leader here, whatever the color of his uniform, has been willing to say "yes" when asked by the President if neutralizing the ports would produce a radical change in the course of the war.

But no one can fairly criticize these Republican spokesmen for lack of leadership. They seem to be way out in front, ahead of the admirals and the generals.

September 14, 1967

SEVAREID: The most basic, primitive political issue of all is law and order, the physical safety of citizens. All other issues fade when that issue becomes dominant, and the dominance of that issue in any country means automatically that the country is in real trouble. It's at least conceivable that the law and order will be the determining issue for next year's national election, though it did not become that in the '64 election, in spite of Mr. Goldwater's efforts.

Today President Johnson touched a national nerve and accepted a challenge. For nearly two months there has been no impressive statement by the President about crime and mass violence in American cities, and everywhere in the country a strong but vague feeling has persisted that he should have said and done more, especially about *the demagogues like H. Rap Brown who have been, in effect, yelling*

fire in a crowded theater. "Poisonous propagandists," Mr. Johnson called such men today, men who provoke others to destruction and themselves flee the consequences.

The challenge he accepted was laid down two weeks ago by Republican congressional leaders, including Dirksen and Ford. They accused the Johnson administration of retreating from the problem of crime and violence, of losing the war against crime. They were immediately answered by administration officials who accused them of scuttling Johnson—proposed legislation on crime, and of trying to help with nothing more than partisan press releases, and the President echoed this countercharge today with an expression of scorn for those who only make speeches and get their pictures taken talking about crime. As to the riots, he made his basic philosophy clear. They are not to be treated as any part of the civil rights movement in this country. They are to be treated as criminal acts. No matter what the sociological and psychological root causes of the riots, the riots themselves are not to be justified.

And the President found it necessary to remind the people of something we tend to forget, that in the American system order in the streets has always been considered a local responsibility, that most big cities have more policemen than the entire federal government, that America, unlike much of Europe, possesses no national police force. The men who founded this nation saw in such an institution an instrument of tyranny. But it may be that in time we will have to reconsider that proposition.

October 12, 1967

SEVAREID: The Secretary of State of the United States is 58 years old. He has had the office longer than any man in this century save Cordell Hull. Unlike Hull he has no personal constituency among senators. He values more highly

the esteem of the academic intellectual community from which he came, and has lost much of it. Dean Rusk is smoking more, talking louder, and enjoying it all less. He has also gone broke in office. He hangs onto office for the history books, to vindicate his Vietnam policies before stepping down. In the course of his painful pilgrim's progress he, like many others in the State Department and White House, has developed a loathing of academic critics, particularly those who assume peace negotiations will begin if only we stop bombing North Vietnam. To Rusk, all the real evidence is the other way.

His life experience has oriented him more towards Asia than any previous Secretary of State. He was assistant secretary, once, for the Far East, and believed the North Korean attack in 1950 meant that Stalin was willing to risk World War III, a proposition now deeply doubted. Earlier, in World War II, Rusk was a political officer on General Stilwell's China-Burma-India staff. Around the end of the war, Dean Rusk was one of the men organizing the dropping of supplies to none other than Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam.

He was Secretary of State during the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban missile crises. Just where he stood on either issue remains something of a mystery. The same cannot be said of Rusk on Vietnam. He is positive, adamant, unchanging.

The pent-up passions in this tired, courtly Georgian burst out today. Heat was added to the general argument here, but no light. He said what he has said over and over again. The argument remains stuck on dead center, because the core of the debate is not so much over strategies for peace or victory as over basic premises. Rusk is baffled that intelligent men cannot understand that Vietnam is

vital to our security. They are baffled that Rusk cannot understand that Vietnam is no such thing.

Things have reached the point where one feels justified in making the otherwise presumptuous statement that no office-holder, congressman or citizen has a right to be listened to any longer unless he has thoroughly studied the history of world Communism these last 20 years, the history of modern China, the Vietminh, Vietcong movements, and the story of the French experience in that country. Rusk has, but so has Fulbright. It is not a matter of who is better informed, but who draws the truest lessons from the information.

II. FACE THE NATION: MARCH 13, 1966- OCTOBER 15, 1967

March 13, 1966: Representative Melvin Laird

* * *

Representative Laird: But I would like to tell you one thing.

That is, that the defense needs of this country are being under-estimated. They were under-estimated in the President's budget of 1966 when it was originally submitted by some \$15 billion. The supplemental request which we will act upon in the House of Representatives on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week—I think the American people were led to believe that that was all the money that would be necessary for the remaining portion of fiscal year 1966. It is simply not true. We will have another supplemental bill for defense spending even to cover military pay before us within a very short period of time.

The 1967 budget, Martin, is under-estimated again. As a matter of fact, the Army manpower limitations that were

in that 1967 budget, two days after the budget was submitted to the Congress, had been removed, making that budget out of date.

Mr. Agronsky: *Are you contending that the President, that the Administration is deliberately misrepresenting both the monetary and manpower needs of this war to the American people today?*

Representative Laird: *No. They want to finance it on a supplemental basis instead of a pay-as-you-go basis—they want to come in on a supplemental basis and have refused in 1966 to estimate adequately what the needs would be in Southeast Asia, as well as the needs to meet the other defense requirements which we have all over the world.*

Now, this is done for one reason, and it is important to get this point across. It is done so that the other programs of the Great Society can be funded in the budget. And it is done because they know the Congress will always come along and finance national security and defense needs at a later time.

Mr. Agronsky: *Well, if it is not misrepresentation, what do you call it?*

Mr. Herman: Yes, that is the point. There is a complication of language in here which I am not sure most of the audience will get. You say they want to do it on a supplemental basis. I don't think most Americans know what a supplemental basis means. You mean that they are under——

Representative Laird: Well, they don't want to put it in their budget estimate.

Mr. Herman: They are under-stating it originally.

Representative Laird: Now, in 1966—they are under-stating it. Take this fiscal year in which we are currently.

Mr. Herman: *Deliberately under-stating it.*

Representative Laird: *Deliberately under-stating it, I believe.* And I have so charged over a period of the last few months.

Back when the Defense bill was up in 1966—for the 1966 fiscal year, we filed a minority report stating that the defense needs were under-estimated, and we made this very clear in our minority views. *This is done deliberately so that the American people get the first impact, as they did in the 1966 budget, when it was announced that it was going to be under \$100 billion.* There was a great hue and cry all over what a grand job the President had done in submitting a budget less than \$100 billion. *Those of us on the Defense Appropriations Committee—and we so stated in our report—knew full well that this was a phoney figure,* because the defense needs were not adequately estimated, not a single dollar was put in the bill to carry on for the escalation of the war in Vietnam in the submission that was made in January for the 1966 fiscal year.

* * *

March 27, 1966: Representative Gerald R. Ford

* * *

Mr. Novak: Would you campaign for *an out-and-out segregationist, like Strom Thurmond or Jim Martin?*

Representative Ford: I don't think you can categorize these people as outright segregationists. I think this is an unfair accusation. And I believe——

Mr. Schoumacher: *Is it unfair to call Strom Thurmond a segregationist?*

Representative Ford: Let me talk about Jim Martin, because he serves with me in the House of Representatives. I know that Jim Martin and the other Republicans from the State of Alabama worked very closely with me and others

in the House to develop a voting rights bill that even today, Dave, I think it a better bill than the law that we have on the statute books. These men worked very effectively and honestly to come up with a voting rights bill that would be applicable in every one of the fifty states. And any man or any group of men, such as Jim Martin and the others, who take this approach, in no way, no way, are the kind of segregationists that you are implying.

Mr. Novak: There are different kinds of segregationists?

* * *

Representative Ford: I think the prospects, Dave, are getting better and better for the Republicans to make significant gains in the House of Representatives. At the moment I do not think the prospects are such that we can look forward to a majority in the House. But public opinion today is rapidly swinging away from the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, and there is greater and greater Republican support throughout the country. *And if the Administration's credibility erodes in the next few months as it has in the last few months*, there is a distinct possibility the Republicans will gain control in the House.

I happen to think we are laying a good groundwork, we are getting good candidates, we are better organized, we are more unified, *and the Democrats are losing credibility*, they are disorganized, and I think the American people are getting sympathetic to the kind of a program and the candidates we are offering.

* * *

April 17, 1966: Senator Vance Hartke

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *Senator Hartke, when you say that the American people need more light about our policy in Viet-*

nam, do you mean that President Johnson has not been sufficiently candid about American policy there?

Senator Hartke: I think all of [us] recognize today that there is a deep-seated feeling in South Vietnam that we are not especially well liked over there. It has become quite evident. Now this not something new. I think that if anyone had read Marguerite Higgins' book, the late Marguerite Higgins, that you could have easily seen this. And it is unfortunate that she died before someone had a chance to really answer these questions.

Now, either one of two things is true. Either the pipeline of information from Vietnam has been clogged up and the information is not coming here or *otherwise somebody on that end or on this end has not told all the people of America what is the truth about the attitude of the South Vietnamese people toward America.*

I think that Ambassador Lodge, the number one man in that part of the country, owes an explanation to the American people. He is over Westmoreland. He is the President's—he is the President's representative there. He is one of his advisers and if his advice has been bad then I think the American people should judge it accordingly.

Mr. Shaffer: Senator, do you think Ambassador Lodge should be recalled from the embassy there in Saigon?

Senator Hartke: I think this is a decision for the President but *I do think he owes the American people an explanation.*

* * *

May 1, 1966: Senator Eugene J. McCarthy

* * *

Mr. Bell: Senator, what is your chief complaint against the way the President is running the war at this point?

Senator McCarthy: Well, I think along the way I would have made two complaints. I don't think the explanations

that have come to us along the way have been as solid as they should have been. I think the kind of forecast that the men would be out in '65 by Christmas. This is the kind of a statement which should not have been made. There was talk last year that the Monsoon Season would be the critical time and that after this we would expect some significant change in policy. Now the Secretary of Defense is talking about the Monsoon Season again as though this had some great significance. I don't think it had significance last year and I don't think it's as significant as they are making it out to be now. We are setting up kind of absolute, almost absolute standards by which we are supposed to be guided, and then having these one by one somehow show weaknesses.

* * *

Mr Morton: Senator, you mentioned these Administration predictions that didn't pan out, *is this, do you think, a lack of candor on the Administration's part or was it just that Secretary MacNamara, for example, was badly informed about how the war was going?*

Senator McCarthy: *Well, I would not charge them with lack of candor, but I think it indicates a kind of rashness on the part of the Secretary of Defense, at least, which is subject to some challenge.*

Mr. Agronsky: *A deficiency in judgment?*

Senator McCarthy: *Well, it could be a deficiency in judgment.* Perhaps so. I think there have been many mistakes in judgment with references to Viet Nam. I recall the night before the Khanh government fell we were at a White House briefing, 15 or 20 Senators, and at about nine o'clock we were told there were always qualifications, but that this looked like a pretty stable, acceptable government. Well, the next morning paper had the story it had been overthrown. Well, I expect it was happening about the time, well, we

weren't really being reassured, but the statements were positive. And after an experience or two of this kind I think you inevitably begin to raise some questions and have some doubts.

* * *

May 8, 1966: Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.

* * *

Mr. Wallace: *You are quoted by the New York Times as having said recently in a radio interview down at Princeton University that you find Lyndon Johnson "gullible on Vietnam."* I wonder if you would elaborate.

Mr. Schlesinger: *Yes, that remark was made in reference to the Honolulu Conference.*

Mr. Agronsky: The connection with Ky, the relationship to the Ky Government.

Mr. Schlesinger: The relationship to the Ky Government, because it seems to me that any President of the United States who passively accepts information he gets from the Department of State and from the Military on Vietnam, and supposes that it is true on the basis of the experience of several years of showing how mixed and erroneous this information sometimes is, is making a mistake. Why the Department of State could ever have told President Johnson that General Ky was so popular in South Vietnam that he should tie his personal prestige to the Ky regime, this in view of the mortality rate of every government in Saigon for the past three years, seems to me inconceivable. *And the adjective "gullible" simply means to the continued passive acceptance of judgments from people who have been proven so wrong, so consistently wrong in the past.*

* * *

May 15, 1966: Barry Goldwater

* * *

Mr. Pierpoint: *Senator, do you favor doing something about the Vietnicks, the anti-Vietnam demonstrators and the draft-card burners; and if so, what?*

Mr. Goldwater: Oh, we have had those fellows with us as long as I can remember and you are going to have them in every conflict we run into. *I can remember as a boy before World War I we had them. The only difference was I think they were a little cleaner looking. They had better haircuts and didn't use four-letter words.* But they objected to war and we have many people who honestly in their hearts in this country object to war, and we provide for these people. They are conscientious objectors, they don't have to go to war. So this is nothing new and I don't think there is anything you can do about it.

Now when we find professors engaging in the fields of tyranny, in my opinion, now I think the law is very clear. We can use the law. But we haven't done——

Mr. Steel: What law affects professors, sir, I don't understand——

Mr. Goldwater: Well, any man. *I just pulled professors out of a hat because I think of the one from one of the eastern schools that went to Vietnam and was making statements that he hoped that the Viet Cong would beat the United States. This, in my opinion, is treason, pure and simple, and we have laws that prohibit that and control it. . . .*

* * *

June 12, 1966: Governor George W. Romney

* * *

Mr. Benton: *Well, Mr. Reagan has not gone as far as you have gone in condemning the Birch Society, for*

example, which was another strong issue of yours at the '64 convention. But to bring the question down to this, do you think you could support Mr. Reagan's candidacy? Would he make a better Governor for California than Governor Brown? Would you like to see Mr. Reagan elected?

Governor Romney: I have indicated to Mr. Reagan that I would like to see him elected and I think his election would be a strengthening thing for the Republican Party. Now, my understanding is that Mr. Reagan has not solicited the support of what you might call *the extreme right-wing group, the Birch group*. He hasn't repudiated their support but he hasn't sought it.

Mr. Agronsky: Well, would you repudiate it?

Governor Romney: Yes.

Mr. Agronsky: Why shouldn't he?

Governor Romney: Well, I don't think that everybody in the Republican Party has to be marching down precisely the same road on anything—everything. Now, if he was encouraging *the fanatic right-wing group*, that would be one thing. I have no information to indicate that he is doing that.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *Governor, the Senate Minority Leader, Everett Dirksen of Illinois, has criticized the Johnson administration on Vietnamese policy on the grounds that the administration has been guilty of a lack of candor in reporting the position of our government to the American people. Would you agree?*

Governor Romney: *Yes, I think there is a gap in credibility.* As a matter of fact this gap has been a serious problem. It was a serious problem in connection with convincing nations that we were really willing to negotiate on a

sound basis and I think it is still a real problem. I think there is a lack of confidence in the statements of the people responsible for keeping the American people fully informed.

Mr. Agronsky: *Credibility is a polite way of saying that the administration is not telling the truth to the American people.*

Governor Romney: *Well, it might be the withholding of certain information or other things other than just deliberate misrepresentation. I don't think this involves necessarily deliberate misrepresentation. But for instance I think the American people were quite shocked after what was said about there having been no reason to believe that Hanoi would engage in negotiations of any kind—to learn that Hanoi had actually made proposals back in the fall of 1964 for discussions and the fact that such proposals had been made was not disclosed until it was disclosed in an unusual way. It wasn't disclosed by those responsible and those who should have disclosed it.*

Mr. Benton: Do you think more could be done in that respect?

Governor Romney: *Well, I think that there has been a gradual deterioration in a feeling of confidence about what our government says in this respect. After all, there has been the Sylvester statements, there have been instances where a lack of information was made available. There have been statements in the newspapers that figure on fatalities and so on were not—casualties were not completely accurate. And these many things have tended to create a lack of confidence.*

And I think also the overly optimistic predictions as to the course of events in South Vietnam has created a lack of confidence.

* * *

June 19, 1966: Stokely Carmichael

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Mr. Carmichael, you say that you would achieve black power by using the franchise, by using the vote. Yet you have also said that your organization in Lowndes County, while out to take power legally, if it were stopped by the government from doing it legally—and I quote your words now—“we are going to take it the way everyone else took it, including the way Americans took it in the American Revolution.” This would seem to imply that you are advocating taking power by force and violence by the over-throw, in effect, of the government. Is that what you meant?

Mr. Carmichael: Let me say this: *In Lowndes County that county is 80 per cent black and 20 per cent white. It has been ruled by that minority by force, by violence and by every illegal trick that one can think of. Now the black people in Lowndes County have organized themselves around the question and around the issue that they have been oppressed, which is their blackness. They have been oppressed because they are black. And, like any other group in the country, they have organized around the issue of oppression. The unions, the workers organize around the question of low wages. And they are going to try to achieve taking over the power structure according to the democratic processes in this country. Now, if no one is willing to assure the fact that that process is carried on, then that leaves the black people of Lowndes County, it seems to me, no alternative except to stay in the condition in which they have been for the last hundred years.*

* * *

Mr. Doyle: . . . Last Thursday you witnessed people registering to vote in Greenwood, Mississippi in the county

court house. That night you told a rally of young people "*every court house in Mississippi should be burned down tomorrow so we can get rid of the dirt.*" My question is how do statements like this—and you have made many of them—which incite both your friends and your enemies, how do they advance the cause of Negro equality?

Mr. Carmichael: Well, number one, the cause of black equality will be decided by the black people because they are the oppressed. That is what we have to understand. *And it is a reality that all the court houses in Mississippi are full of filth and dirt, that there is no such thing as justice in any of those court houses for black people, and the history of Mississippi speaks for itself. The history of the murders, from Emmett Till all the way down to the shooting of Mr. Meredith just two weeks ago speaks to Mississippi.*

Mr. Doyle: Can you register voters if you burn down court houses and are you going to burn down court houses——

Mr. Carmichael: I was talking about a literal translation that—I wasn't talking about figuratively, I was talking about literally getting rid of the people inside those court houses, *getting rid of the Raineyes and the Prices who are still sheriffs.*

* * *

Mr. Hart: Mr. Carmichael, if you are after economic power, how is the Negro in the delta of Mississippi who is lucky to make \$500 a year, what kind of handle does he have on any kind of economic power?

Mr. Carmichael: He doesn't. That is why he has to grab——

Mr. Agronsky: How do you propose to give it to him?

Mr. Carmichael: I don't. I say that he first grasps the political power that is now available to him. You grasp

what you can. He now has at his disposal via the voting rights bill, political power. He grasps that political power and then he starts through that seeing what terms he can use. He controls the C. A. P. Board (phonetic) if he has the political power so that *the Chief of Police of Indianola—who was the Chief of Police last year that beat up black people—who is now the C. A. P. director in Sunflower County, Mississippi*—will not have that power. That Eastland does not have the power and cannot say the things he says. For example, he said on April 22nd, and I quote: “I have objected to the sending of every federal registrar into Mississippi. Ordinarily the Justice Department will inform me the day it plans to send a registrar into a Mississippi county and I have been able to block some.” . . .

* * *

Mr. Hart: Mr. Carmichael, you had a chance to sit down with President Johnson at the White House Conference. Why didn't you?

Mr. Carmichael: We outlined that very clearly. Number one, we felt that the problems of racism in this country does not exist in the black community, it exists in the white community, and that we didn't see why we needed a conference to talk about fulfilling our rights.

Mr. Agronsky: Why not take that opportunity to tell the President?

Mr. Carmichael: We have other reasons. Number two, *we felt that the President was calling that conference at a time when his international prestige in this country was at a low ebb and he was going to use us to try and build up his prestige* and we refused to be a part of that.

Number three—

Mr. Agronsky: *And you thought the whole approach was phony, was that it?*

Mr. Carmichael: *That is correct.*

Number three, he was using—he is at this time carrying on a war in Vietnam which flagrantly violates the life of colored people. It is foolish for us to sit down and talk about human rights.

* * *

July 10, 1966: Senator Jacob K. Javits

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Senator Javits, a man in political life is often faced with some hard questions. That is kind of an apologia for a very harsh evaluation that has been made of you that I want to quote to you and would like to have your response on. *It is in connection with General Julius Klein and the Senate Ethics Committee investigation of Senator Dodd, who, as you know, through his letters, through the interchange of correspondence with Senator Dodd brought Dodd eventually before the Senate Ethics Committee.*

Now, the columnist, Drew Pearson, on June 16, remarked of your own support of General Julius Klein in a letter to General Klein that you are "either politically stupid or else inextricably beholden to General Julius Klein". Would you like to respond to both of those observations.

Senator Javits: *Well, fortunately that is only Drew Pearson's opinion and he has been proved wrong many times before. . . .*

* * *

August 21, 1966: Pierre Salinger

* * *

. . . . I do feel that we did make serious public information errors during the war in Veitnam during the time that I was Press Secretary to the President in not being more candid about our involvement in that war. And I think those errors have paid off poorly for us in the years that followed.

Mr. Strawser: You don't think public relations really ruled, then, in the making of Vietnam policy?

Mr. Salinger: No, I don't think public relations did rule. I think there was some very solid policy considerations for what went on. But, as I say in the book, I think they were a mistake.

* * *

Mr. Kalb: Yes, but your book takes a somewhat different position vis-a-vis the President's attitude toward Secretary Rusk than Schlesinger's book. You were both very intimately involved in the whole thing. How come there could be such a disparity of views?

Mr. Salinger: Well, Mr. Kalb, all I can say is that I am writing from the standpoint of what I knew as an individual. *I am not writing on the basis of hearsay or try to report meetings where I was not present.* And in the times that I talked to President Kennedy—and I saw him four, five, and six times a day—I never heard him discuss nor did he ever mention to me the possibility that he was thinking of replacing Secretary Rusk after the first term. And that is all I can report.

Mr. Kalb: *Are you suggesting that a historian like Arthur Schlesinger would be reporting hearsay, is that—*

Mr. Salinger: Well, let's not involve Mr. Schlesinger in this for a minute

* * *

Mr. Kalb: Why do you think that *there is such an enormous, again, credibility gap on the Warren Commission Report?* It is true that all over the world you have this and there are many people who are exposed to American society who know the way America ticks—

* * *

October 9, 1966: Senator John Stennis

* * *

Mr. Shaffer: Well, Senator, one of those who is responsible for the guidelines is the Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe. And, you know, *one of your prominent southern colleagues in the House called him a misfit, an idiot, ignorant, said he talks like a Communist and he said he should be dismissed.*

Senator Stennis: Well, I don't agree. I don't make such attacks as that. I do not agree with it, those descriptions. *But I do say that Mr. Howe is a zealot to a degree.* And, I tell you frankly, I think his instructions come from the White House. I think he has been told to make a showing on this thing, regardless, make a showing percentage-wise, and hurry it up, get the job along—and he is acting under those kind of instructions.

* * *

November 20, 1966: Floyd B. McKissick

* * *

Mr. McKissick: . . . But one of the salient factors which stands out to my mind is the fact that there is sufficient racism in this country, north, south, east and west, there are sufficient people with prejudice, and this prejudice can be used by any political party or candidate. And that was shown in the New York election, for example, where the Civilian Review Board was defeated, primarily because of *racist advertising showing a white woman walking down the street without police protection, and this type of thing, creating the innuendo that a great big black man was going to grab her and the police would not be free.*

* * *

December 11, 1966: Governor Robert E. Smylie and
Governor John A. Love

* * *

Mr. Wallace: Governor Smylie, Robert Welch, the head of the Birch Society, said just within the past week that your defeat in the Republican Primary in Idaho, and also Ronald Reagan's win in California, are largely the result of the efforts of the Birch Society. Do you agree?

Governor Smylie: *Well, I think that this probably is another straw of evidence, the absolute lack of credibility of Mr. Welch and his public relations expert, Mr. Rousselot who I think said the same thing. I know that the Birch Society was active against me in Idaho simply because I don't think that secret societies have got any place in the American political system if it is going to be a free political system. And I have said this time and again. I firmly and sincerely believe it. I will continue to believe it and I will continue to say it. And if they continue to oppose me, why, I will have to bear this burden. But don't think they were decisive.*

Mr. Wallace: In California?

Governor Smylie: I don't think so there, either. I just don't think that this thing reaches that proportion. *It is a dangerous thing because it is well funded, secret in nature, conspiratorial in its activities, and, for that reason, outside the mainstream of American political life.*

* * *

January 8, 1967: Dr. James L. Goddard (Commissioner
of FDA)

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: And it moves us very directly to the whole question of false or misleading advertising.

Dr. Goddard: Yes.

Mr. Mintz: I would like to ask a question about that. *The Journal of the American Medical Association assures its readers, "Every statement", in its drug advertisements must be backed up "by substantiated facts or we won't run it."*

You have said that a misleading ad to a physician can be construed to be a clear and present danger to the patient. Your agency has now started civil actions charging false or misleading advertising of three prescription drugs. All of these ads were in the Journal of the AMA. Your agency also has four criminal proceedings instituted, one of them for false drug advertising. Two of these cases, two out of four, involved the Journal, and I ask why is it that the American Medical Association seems to be turning up so frequently as a sponsor of false advertising for prescription drugs, to its own members, I might add?

Dr. Goddard: I don't believe that one could characterize the AMA as being a sponsor of these ads. The evaluation of drug advertising is a very difficult matter. We find with our very small staff of four people involved in this that the detailed evaluation will take as much as ten man days for one ad.

Now, I don't see how any journal, and there are indeed many medical journals that accept advertising, can in effect go into the depths of review that is required to assure the readership that every claim made is indeed accurate and fairly presented.

* * *

January 29, 1967: Senator George Murphy

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: But in any case, what the Academic Senate said was that *the dismissal of Kerr was reckless and precipitate and said—I quote it now—"It constitutes*

destructive political intervention in the affairs of the University”.

It then goes on to say——

Senator Murphy: This may be possible. I would not presume to question their point of view. But the politics on the Board of Regents—if you will go back carefully, you will find that most of the political appointees on there were appointed by Governor Brown. Actually Reagan only has his own vote, and Bob Finch, who came in as Lieutenant Governor, and one other.

Now, the Board of Directors was made up of people appointed by Governor Brown.

So if there has been politics in it, it certainly would not have been of Reagan’s doing. It would have been a result of the Democratic administration preceding him.

Mr. Agronsky: *But could we get your opinion as to whether or not this was a destructive political intervention in the affairs of the University, as the Senate contends.*

Senator Murphy: No, I don’t—well, let me just speak now as an ordinary taxpayer in California.

There has been trouble in the University for some time. The University has been upset. The curriculum has been upset. Many of the classes have been upset. *People from off the campus have been coming there, trouble-makers. And many of them you and I have known over the years. And we know their purposes. We know that they are more interested in stirring up some sort of a revolution more for the sake of having a revolution.*

Now we decide—is this good for the University or bad. I personally think it is bad. And I think that Chancellor Kerr, or President Kerr should have done something about it to preserve—it is like the conditions here in Washington. We talk about the danger in the streets at night in our big cities, in New York. I think now it is the duty of gov-

ernment to protect the good, law-abiding, decent citizen, just as it is the duty of the head of the University to keep law and order going there so that the good, hard-working student can go about his business of getting an education.

* * *

I don't think—this University has been in the print now for the last two-and-a-half, three years, because of these turbulent troubles up there. *And while there are great stories about one young man, Mario Savio, as to whether he should be readmitted or not—I think this whole thing was a little ridiculous, if you will forgive me. I don't think he went there for the purpose of education. I think he went there for the purpose of stirring up more trouble. And I think it is time somebody said so clearly and concisely, so there can be no misunderstanding.*

* * *

February 5, 1967: Dr. Clark Kerr

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *Now the political aspect, you make it very clear that the moment Governor Reagan was elected, you had had it.*

Dr. Kerr: Yes. I came very close to having had it at that point. Yes.

Mr. Agronsky: Then you feel then your dismissal was political?

Dr. Kerr: *Well, as I said before there is more to it than that, but essentially it is political.*

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Dr. Kerr, you were constantly criticized by Governor Reagan throughout his campaign and there was an enormous amount of talk about this all over the country, that *at the University at Berkeley the students had*

abused freedom of speech, that it was license rather than freedom that had been allowed to them, that they had really gone too far and that they should—you should have been more rigid in controlling demonstrations and in permitting them access to the campus and all the things that went on over those years. Do you feel, looking back now, that you were too lax?

Dr. Kerr: No, I don't. I don't really think so, by and large. Remember, to begin with, that there are nine campuses at the University of California and that I was President of the whole University; that there has always been a Chancellor at Berkeley with a major concern for the campus. *There were excesses by the students at Berkeley and I greatly regret them. I think the problem at Berkeley was more that there was too heavy a hand than that there was too light a hand. I think the Chancellor at Berkeley in October of 1964 moved too quickly in bringing in the massive police force. . . .*

* * *

February 12, 1967: Representative George Mahon

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Mr. Chairman, how do you feel about it yourself? *Many supporters of the President feel that this book deliberately denigrates the President and his family in the way it reports on matters that occurred immediately after the assassination. Would you agree with that? Do you think that the book is unfair to the Johnson family?*

Mr. Mahon: *Well, yes, I think it is unfair and I think it is inaccurate,* but I don't think it has done the President any injury because I think the American people are fair-minded and they have resented some of these implications and so forth.

Mr. MacNeil: What inaccuracies have you found in the book, sir?

Mr. Mahon: Well, I was just noticing one in the picture the other day where it was said none of the President's assistants were present at the swearing in, and here was O'Donnell in a wide angle film picture that was shown in the paper. I mean, I haven't read all of the book. There are so many more important things happening in the world that this emotional thing doesn't appeal to me a great deal. I have read some of the press reports about it but we have got more important business to do like trying to determine what to do about the \$158 billion that the President has requested we appropriate at this session of Congress.

* * *

February 26, 1967: Barry Goldwater

* * *

Mr. Pierpoint: Senator, Defense Secretary McNamara said recently, and I quote him here—"I don't believe the bombing has significantly reduced or would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the south". Do you agree with that statement?

Senator Goldwater: I would agree as far as the men, the infiltration. The infiltration increased I think by about 12,000 men last year. That is difficult to stop in those jungles. It is almost impossible. But material—if we destroy the material at the point of its landing, where it is stored, then there is nothing to transport. And I would disagree most violently with the Secretary's suggestion that it hasn't done any good. He said it was doing good just a few months ago. *That's Old Yo-yo—you never know what he is going to say.*

* * *

March 5, 1967: Senator Mike Mansfield

* * *

Mr. White: Well, I thought perhaps you might be interested in another question which has been recently involved a lot, and *that is the matter of the CIA and the so-called subsidy-of-the-students movement which, as I understand it, meant in effect that CIA money was used to finance American students to go to foreign student convocations which we felt and which experience had rather shown would otherwise have been entirely packed by Communists. Now, at the time this was first published, first brought to notice, you were quoted as expressing some anxiety about Big Brotherism—*

Senator Mansfield: *That is correct.*

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *Do you feel the CIA was operating outside the area of its competence and jurisdiction?*

Senator Mansfield: *I certainly do.*

Mr. Schoumacher: *But this is a criticism apparently not leveled at the CIA. You are leveling this at the Administration which must have ordered it to get into this.*

Senator Mansfield: *The question was raised relative to the CIA. I am answering it relative to the CIA and as far as the President is concerned, if that is what you are driving at, I am sure the President had an overall idea what was going on but perhaps, and very likely, he didn't have an idea that this particular series of incidents was going on.*

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: . . . *Governor Romney of Michigan has contended that the policy of President Johnson in Vietnam is governed by political expediency. How would you respond to that.*

Senator Mansfield: *I wouldn't agree with Governor Romney. I wish he would be a little more specific and explicit in where he stands. He is going all over the rainbow and nobody knows where the Governor of Michigan stands. If he is going to be a Presidential candidate, he will have to take a stand sometime, some way.*

* * *

March 12, 1967: Attorney General Ramsey Clark

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *Mr. Attorney General, one of the first arrests that has been made by the District Attorney of New Orleans, Mr. Garrison, is of a gentleman called Clay Shaw, which the Attorney General says is an alias for a man named Clay Bertrand, who is mentioned in the Warren Report.*

One of your first statements, when you became Attorney General, was that the FBI had already investigated and had cleared Clay Shaw of any part in the assassination of President Kennedy; yet, Shaw's name is never mentioned anywhere in the Warren Commission report.

Why is that, and is there an identity between Shaw and Bertrand?

Attorney General Clark: Under the circumstances, that is, in view of the fact that there will be a hearing in New Orleans Tuesday, I really think it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the case. *Mr. Garrison has not offered us any evidence that he may have. I am unable to say why he hasn't done this. It would seem to me the natural thing for any prosecutor to do.* But, as of this time, and without real doubt, I would stand by Mr. Hoover's remarks in November of 1966, that not one shred of evi-

dence links any other conspirator to Oswald in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *Don't you find it curious, sir, that the District Attorney of New Orleans, having all of the evidence that is at your disposal persists in this investigation and indicates that he has new evidence which he has not turned over to the Federal Government or to you as you requested?*

Attorney General Clark: *Yes, I find it curious and I find it disturbing and I find it saddening.*

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Mr. Attorney General, to lead you to another area, an area I know that concerns you very much too, the area of wire tapping and electronic eavesdropping, from your knowledge of the Justice Department operations, and you have been in the Department for six years, I believe, *would you say that the blame for wire tapping when Robert Kennedy was Attorney General should be allocated to Mr. Kennedy, or, as Mr. Kennedy has said, should be laid at the door really, of the FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover?*

Attorney General Clark: Well, I am not in the business of blaming anybody. I am happy to say that I was in the Lands Division for four years, the first four years of my service to the Department of Justice, and we have yet to find any wire tapping in any Lands Division case. I don't think any will be revealed.

* * *

March 19, 1967: Senator J. William Fulbright

* * *

Senator Fulbright: . . . Here at home it seems to me that they are doing a number of things that are very disturbing

to me, not that we are not the richest and most powerful country, economically and militarily; but within the last few weeks and months we have had very disturbing developments in the House of Representatives and the Senate, indicating something is amiss, I think, in our attitude of our people and what is going on in the basic institutions of our society. *And then the CIA revelations which were a great shock to me have also indicated what I believe to be a sickness in our society.* The acceptance of those revelations is very shocking, in my opinion, because *it indicates a departure from what I thought was our traditional democratic system and a confusion of ends and means which to me is very disturbing.* Another small thing is the tendency of the Executive to take the Congress for granted and to downgrade its significance in our system of government. All of this disturbs me, that fundamentally there is something wrong with our present society.

* * *

Mr. Morton: *Senator, you obviously feel that the administration is guilty of not telling very much about this whole area.*

Senator Fulbright: *I didn't know I was alone in that thought. I thought that this was sort of held in general.*

* * *

Mr. Marder: *You started out by saying, sir, that the CIA revelation was a great shock to you.*

Senator Fulbright: *It was a great shock to me.*

Mr. Marder: Have you not held some hearings or a hearing in private and what are your intentions so far as your committee is concerned about—

Senator Fulbright: Well, it isn't my committee. I have just been invited on two occasions to participate in the committee which is controlled by the members of the Ap-

propriations and Armed Services Committees. You know who they are. I don't want to take the time to recall them. But I didn't learn very much more there than was revealed in the Washington Post article by Mr. Harwood. What shocks me is not that the CIA itself is doing it. I don't blame the CIA. It is the attitude of mind in this country that accepts this kind of activity without being concerned about it. *I think this is very, very subversive of our democratic concepts of society. This was what I meant when I said confusing the means and the ends. We are approaching, it seems to me, the same kind of ideas here and practices which we greatly object to in the Communist system.*

* * *

April 9, 1967: Senator Thruston B. Morton

* * *

Mr. Kenworthy: *Senator, yesterday Bobby Baker, the former Secretary of the Democratic Majority, was sentenced for from one to three years. You also have the situation now of the Ethics Committee, in the stipulation, has agreed with Senator Dodd that the Senator from Connecticut has used campaign funds for personal expenditures. You have the Powell case on the House side. Your colleague from Kentucky, Senator Cooper, was instrumental in setting up the Ethics Committee. What are your views on what should be done and are the Republicans going to have a party position on this question? There is a growing cynicism in the country about the Congress.*

* * *

Senator Morton: Well, I think—the Dodd case and the Powell case are quite different and I don't think—I think in the minds of the public they are probably associated as one and the same thing. I think in the case of Senator

Dodd, from what I have read and from the hearings that have been public here, *his problem seems to be more the Internal Revenue Service at this point, that he does have a problem there.*

* * *

Mr. Kenworthy: *Senator, you mentioned the problem that he may have with the Internal Revenue Service on using campaign money for personal expenditures. Might he not also have a problem with the State of Connecticut because their Corrupt Practices Act up there has very strict limitation on how money can be used?*

Senator Morton: *Yes, he would have a problem there.*

* * *

Mr. Mac Neil: *Do you think there has been enough exposure of anything like this? I mean you are suggesting that the Senator has had a criminal violation here in the Internal Revenue field.*

Senator Morton: *Well, I—*

Mr. MacNeil: *Can the Senate just ignore that?*

Senator Morton: *No, I don't think we can ignore that at all.*

* * *

April 16, 1967: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

* * *

Mr. Poston: *Dr. King, as foremost advocate of non-violence and of inter-racial cooperation in this field, how did it feel to be sharing the platform with the prophet of Black Power, who not only urges racial violence, who not only urges self-segregation for Negroes, but who calls your President and my President a buffoon, and the Secretary of State a fool, and the Secretary of Defense, who has done more to bring about integration of the Army, a racist.*

Dr. King: Well, I certainly would not say these things myself. I have been on the platform with many people—even members of my own staff—who would say things that I would not say.

It is very difficult, as you know, to get a unanimity of opinion on any issue. And I would not go that far. I would never call the President a fool or whatever he was called, or the Secretary of State a fool, or Mr. McNamara a racist. I do not happen to feel that Mr. McNamara is a racist . . .

* * *

Mr. Poston: There are many who claim that the Vietnam war has contributed less to the crippling of the civil rights movement than the development of the white backlash, than the demonstrations and the riots that occurred in Chicago and Atlanta. And so therefore we have lost support of one of our strongest civil rights advocates, Senator Douglas. We have brought about the defeat—we have brought about the election of *a segregationist Governor in Georgia*. And we did not get accomplished, as I think you urged, the defeat of Mayor Daley in Chicago.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Dr. King, we have very little time left. *I wonder if you can tell me if you regard racism as behind the manner in which the House of Representatives treated Adam Clayton Powell.*

Dr. King: *I certainly do.* This is very obvious to me, and many other persons in the Negro community.

The fact that Congress had not set up a uniform code of conduct applicable to all Congressmen when it dealt with Congressman Powell; the fact that the Senate, the other part of the Congress, will not unseat Mr. Dodd, and will certainly not take him from his committees, tells me that we are dealing here with race and racial overtones.

* * *

April 30, 1967 : Edward Bennett Williams

* * *

Mr. Williams: Yes, I will start with wiretapping. I am against lawless law enforcement. Wiretapping and eavesdropping are lawless law enforcement. That is what we are talking about tomorrow—Law Day. The theme is nobody is above the law; nobody is beneath it. I don't think there is any law enforcement agency in the United States that is above the law. I don't think that anybody can break the law in order to enforce it.

Mr. Agronsky: *What agencies do you have in mind that are breaking the law?*

Mr. Williams: *Well, we have had wholesale disclosures, Mr. Agronsky, in the past year of microphone surveillances that have been conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1961 to 1965. Senator Long's committee has exposed violations of the right of privacy by Internal Revenue agents. I think that the President is very sensitive to this problem. In his State of the Union Message and again in his Crime Message to the Congress, he called for strong legislation, unambiguously and unqualifiedly outlawing wiretapping, making it punishable by five years in prison, and unambiguously and unqualifiedly outlawing eavesdropping and making it punishable by five years in prison.*

Mr. Agronsky: Certainly the federal agencies that engage in these things are not liable to five years imprisonment or—

Mr. Williams: The right of privacy bill which is now pending in the Senate is hopefully going to be enacted and it will correct any ambiguities that exist now with respect to the law. But I think it is quite clear, Mr. Agronsky, that *what those agencies have done in the past four years have contravened both the federal statutes, state statutes and the Constitution of the United States. And I think that*

perhaps they should give an accounting of this stewardship to the Long committee. Senator Long is holding hearings now on the Right of Privacy Act which was submitted by Attorney General Clark. And I think incident to consideration of that bill that there should be testimony taken as to just how far, how widespread the invasion of the right of privacy of American citizens has gone in the past four years.

Mr. Agronsky: Would you call J. Edgar Hoover to account before this committee? Should he be?

Mr. Williams: *I think that either he or some other high-ranking official in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who knows the facts should give a full explanation of the conduct of the agents in the past four years. They admittedly used hidden microphones and hidden transmitters in hotels, in offices, in private homes, in apartment houses to listen to conversations of citizens some of whom weren't suspected of any crime. And these microphones and these transmitters were monitored on a 24-hour basis. Thousands of man-hours were deployed to this form of electronic surveillance. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent. When the thing was unearthed the President deplored it. Attorney General Clark has deplored it. Remedial legislation is now pending and I think that in order for the Congress to enact intelligently legislation in this area it should have the benefit of full information on the subject. It has not yet had full information on the subject.*

Mr. Agronsky: *Do you think the FBI has abused this power?*

Mr. Williams: *Abused the power of—*

Mr. Agronsky: *Of wiretapping?*

Mr. Williams: *I believe it has abused the power. I believe that the revelations of what was done between 1961 and 1965 shows a wholesale invasion into the right of pri-*

vacy of the American citizens. It shows a violation of the Fourth Amendment. I believe that it shows violations of state statutes. We know, they admitted that they violated the Nevada State statute on eavesdropping, a criminal statute. And we know now that this has been done in Miami, in Washington, in New York, in Kansas City, in Chicago, in Los Angeles, and in many, many other large metropolitan areas in the United States.

* * *

May 14, 1967: Senator Russell B. Long

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Senator, there's another case in which you're very much interested in that also concerns a former FBI agent, your colleague, Senator Dodd. Have you been able to win any support to stand with you against the censure of Senator Dodd, as the majority of your colleagues have—

Senator Long: I don't know what other Senators are going to do about that, Mr. Agronsky. I am convinced of a number of things. One, that Tom Dodd violated no law. He violated no rule of the Senate. What he did is a kind of thing that has happened many times before. He is guilty in my judgment only of being poor to the extent that he had to call upon his neighbors and his friends for financial assistance both to be elected to the office and to pay the expenses of being a Senator the way he thought that he should try to conduct himself as a Senator. In addition to that, he is guilty of hiring *some treacherous employees who went through his files by night and took out four thousand letters and documents that they thought could be used by scandal columnists to embarrass him. They didn't turn those letters over to the police. They turned them over to some sensation-seeking columnists,*

and those people wrote columns putting those things in the worst possible light.

* * *

May 21, 1967: Senator Thomas J. Dodd

* * *

Mr. Mudd: *Well, I thought your main blame was directed at Mr. O'Hare for his sloppy bookkeeping in Washington, but I wasn't aware that Mr. Sullivan was culpable—*

Senator Dodd: *I didn't say Mr. Sullivan was in the same category with Mr. O'Hare.* Sullivan got the bills that were sent up principally from Washington. He wouldn't know whether this bill was a campaign bill or not. And because the funds were mingled and not segregated they were paid out . . .

* * *

Mr. Bell: *Senator, there is a story in the morning paper about one of your colleagues, Senator Long of Missouri, who received \$48,000, according to this story, over a course of many months for referring law cases to a certain St. Louis law firm.* Have you done any of that, referring cases to certain lawyers? And do you think this is ethical for a United States Senator to do?

* * *

May 28, 1967: Senators John Sherman Cooper and George S. McGovern

* * *

Mr. Lisagor: . . . You have said in that notable speech that you made—the New York Times called it a notable speech—on Vietnam, that *the Administration is "faced with a credibility gap as wide as the Grand Canyon."* Un-

der those circumstances, could you run as a kind of ballot-mate of President Johnson's?

* * *

July 9, 1967: Whitney M. Young, Jr.

Mr. Young: I did not mean to suggest that there was going to be an adherence to President Johnson. I think a lot depends on who the candidates are, who the Republicans will put up to run, whether they will run Ronald Reagan or whether they will run Mr. Nixon or whether they will run Governor Rockefeller. And a lot depends on the platforms and the climate and the mood that comes out of the conventions. *If we have a repeat of the 1964 conventions, where there was obviously an anti-Negro feeling and a subtle racism—talk about crime in the streets and "your home is your castle"—and if there is an election of a candidate who either overtly or covertly is appealing to the so-called back-lash vote of the country, and President Johnson is the Democratic nominee, then obviously he will get it.*

* * *

July 23, 1967: Governor Richard J. Hughes

* * *

Mr. Hardy: *Governor, what of the charges of police brutality in both instances, in Newark and Plainfield, the direct cause, the spark that started things more or less could be laid to a charge of police brutality? And this was also one of the chief grievances of the group of people in Plainfield that rioted, more or less.*

Governor Hughes: I don't know. Police brutality, yes. I don't pretend that all policemen are perfect but I tell you that if this country is swayed aside into a general loss of

confidence in police and law and order we have got to begin to think about what we are going to do to replace the police.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Well, Governor, let's return to Mr. Dean's point that you knew about these things and that nothing happened. Here you made an application for participation in a federal program—or the City of Newark did, and this is well known now—that begins with a statement that among major American cities Newark and its citizens face the highest percentage of substandard housing, the most crime per hundred-thousand of population, the heaviest per-capita tax burden, the sharpest shifts in population, the highest rate of venereal disease and the highest rate of new cases of tuberculosis and maternal mortality. This was before the riots began. They worked on this for a year or two. *You knew that all these things things happened. The Mayor of Newark knew that all these things were happening.*

Governor Hughes: Well, if you are implying any guilt of inattention to it, Martin, no, this country—

* * *

August 6, 1967: Senator Everett Dirksen

Mr. Agronsky: *Senator Dirksen, a recent Republican Party statement read by you blamed President Johnson for the racial riots. Your Republican colleague, Senator Thruston Morton, denounced this as irresponsible. Do you agree?*

Senator Dirksen: Well, I did not fashion that statement. I was a sort of an intermediary who was impressed into service to read that statement. But a committee actually fashioned that statement.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Senator Dirksen, though the statement was a Republican Coordinating Committee statement, you did read it, and you still really have not answered me, sir. *Do you agree with Senator Morton's denunciation of it as irresponsible?*

Senator Dirksen: Well, I have not gone as far quite as might be implied by that statement. I like to be rather cautious and careful about any allegations or accusations that I make. And so I think I would be content to let that answer drop just about there.

* * *

Mr. Lisagor: *Your House colleague, Representative Gerald Ford, has said of the Viet Nam war that it has been shockingly mismanaged. He seems to know what is going on there. Do you agree with that, or don't you?*

Senator Dirksen: Well, I hope there is somebody who knows. But I think it would be high pretense on my part if I tried to undertake the role of an expert on Viet Nam. I have to take it for what it is. And I try to be a realist about it. Who do we have the Joint Chiefs? Why do we have the best that the Army could offer by way of a staff under the leadership of General Westmoreland out in Viet Nam? And then of course either ignore or brush aside their demands and their advices?

* * *

Mr. Hart: *That sounds like a repudiation of the statement blaming the President for the riots.*

Senator Dirksen: I didn't blame the President for the riots.

Mr. Hart: The statement you read—

Senator Dirksen: Well, I didn't blame the President for the riots. I made it clear as crystal that I read a statement that was brought about by a committee of three.

Mr. Agronsky: How could you lend yourself to reading it, sir, if you did not agree with it?

Senator Dirksen: Look—you are a party functionary, and when you have maybe forty, fifty people around, and they think you ought to read what was agreed upon by the Coordinating Committee, and unanimously—

Mr. Agronsky: *Senator Morton, who is a former Chairman of the Republican National Committee, a member of your party, denounced it as irresponsible. He would not have read it.*

Senator Dirksen: Who else denounced it as irresponsible? Who else? Now that you bring up an individual—who else?

Mr. Agronsky: No members of the Republican Party did that I am aware of.

* * *

Mr. Lisagor: On this question of intent, Senator, *Governor Romney has said that people like Stokely Carmichael, one of the militant Negro leaders, now in Cuba, ought to be charged with treason.* Do you think that ought to happen?

Senator Dirksen: Well, treason is precisely defined as giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Now you have to prove it. And I would be the last man to ever put the finger of treason on anybody unless there was a pretty clear showing, because that is a terribly sinister charge to make.

Mr. Agronsky: *Does that mean you would not be against the naming of Carmichael as a traitor?*

Senator Dirksen: *Well, if you can establish that fact. . . .*

* * *

August 20, 1967: Sargent Shriver

Mr. Agronsky: *Mr. Shriver, a parade of police and municipal officials have charged that the poverty program*

workers have helped incite riots in this country. What is your answer?

Mr. Shriver: Well, I don't think it is true or accurate. We have about 65,000 persons employed in the twenty-eight cities where there have been disturbances. These are either full-time or part-time employees. Of these 65,000 people who live in the ghettos and work in the ghettos, 13 have been arrested so far. In fact, I think it is a miracle that so few of these people who are right in the ghettos where the riots occur have been involved in any way in the actual riot activity.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *To take a specific example, Jesse Gray of Harlem, who led, as you know, two demonstrations here in the House of Representatives, or attempted to lead a second one last week, is a \$50 a day consultant for the Office of Economic Opportunity. How do you explain that?*

Mr. Shriver: Well, first of all he is not a consultant for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Agronsky: For the Harlem Youth Administration, which is funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Shriver: That's right. And in New York they have the right to employ the people that they wish to have and to fire the people that they wish to fire. *I have spoken on three or four occasions to the officials in New York City reasonable for the New York City antipoverty program and have urged them to strike Mr. Gray off the rolls as a consultant.* They, however, have the right not to do that. And it is their judgment, not mine, their judgment that his participation in this program in New York is valuable to them. One of the things that Americans don't understand about our program well enough is the fact that it is a local program. It is locally managed, locally directed.

The local people hire and fire the local employees. We don't have that authority in Washington. So Mr. Gray is a local employee of a local antipoverty program in New York. He has been employed by local people and he works under the city government of New York.

Mr. Raspberry: Mr. Shriver, you made quite a point in your testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee that only, as you say, 13 *paid poverty workers have been involved with the rioters and in the rioting*. It seems that either they are involved in these disturbances or they are not in touch with the bottom-of-the-barrel poor who are involved. How do you get out of this kind of dilemma?

* * *

September 3, 1967: Senator William Proxmire

Mr. Herman: But [the cost of the Vietnam war] is one of the key figures that you need to understand which way—

Senator Proxmire: We should have that. We ought to have that and we haven't gotten it.

Mr. Herman: Now why haven't you got it? Is it because they have not been able to figure it out or are they withholding it from you?

Senator Proxmire: Well, it is difficult to figure out with precision. But I just can't understand why the administration cannot give us a more accurate picture at the end of August, when Mr. Schultze appeared before our committee, the Director of the Budget, why they can't give us a more accurate figure at the end of August than they could in January. And he couldn't. He didn't give us any updated figure. The best figure we've gotten is from Senator John Stennis, of the Preparedness Subcommittee, who told us that he anticipated an increase of between \$4 and \$6 billion.

Mr. Herman: Well, have you any idea why they may be unable to give you or unwilling to give you these important figures?

Senator Proxmire: I don't know. I think that some people contend that if they gave us these figures, the arguments against some of the administration's programs might be stronger. But I can't say why they can't give us more accurate figures. But they should.

Mr. Herman: Is it perhaps to keep the tax increase, the surcharge from being labeled the "Vietnam tax"?

Senator Proxmire: No, I think it is being labeled by those who oppose the Vietnam actions a "Vietnam tax" anyway.

Mr. Agronsky: *You said, Senator, that you thought they were withholding information perhaps on the grounds that it might go against some of their other administration proposals.*

Senator Proxmire: *Yes.*

Mr. Agronsky: What do you mean by that?

Senator Proxmire: Well, I said this is the view of some people. It is not my view. I think that some people feel that the administration is very anxious to get their antipoverty program through, their educational programs, programs I suppose and I think are necessary in the national interest, to get those adopted. *And in order to get them adopted they have to fog up situations a little bit as far as other costs are concerned. . . .*

* * *

September 17, 1967: Reverend James E. Groppi

* * *

Mr. Pappas: You said, Father Groppi, that Milwaukee needs good housing. Well, Mayor Maier has offered to

bring in open housing on a county-wide level. Why are you insistent, so insistent upon having it only in Milwaukee?

Father Groppi: First of all because on a county-wide level, for one thing, it would not come until next spring. *This appears to us to be another promise, you see, a means to placate the black community so that we stop our demonstrations. And then when next spring comes we get nothing anyway.* We're interested in anything that will bring about decent housing for black people. *The Mayor has a habit of passing the buck. Here he is passing it to the county. Previously he passed it to the state.* We believe that the city should take the lead in fair housing.

* * *

Mr. Hanley: —*the Archbishop has said that there is no foundation to any charges that the church is tiptoeing in civil rights because it is afraid to offend its more affluent membership. Would you agree with this?*

Father Groppi: *No, I would not agree with this* because I have been in some of the parishes on the South Side. I don't only like to point to the South Side because this is existing consistently throughout the white community. The plight of the black man is not preached. The Gospel of Jesus Christ, for example, when we talk about the Parable of the Good Samaritan, clergymen consider this imprudent to talk about the black man and the injustice that has been exhibited towards the black man in our society. We don't hear sermons on interracial justice.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: You wouldn't certainly go as far as *Rap Brown and SNCC in promoting violence and calling for violence as a demonstration of the black power*—

Father Groppi: As far as Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael are concerned—I have said this before and I say it again—I have never sat down and talked to Rap Brown. I have never talked to Stokely Carmichael. And

therefore I do not make judgments as far as to what they are teaching. The only thing I know about Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown is what I read in the papers and this makes me a little cautious. But objectively as far as what Stokely Carmichael is preaching, and as far as what Rap Brown is preaching, morally I see no problem as far as violence is concerned. There are various moral opinions as far as the use of violence for the attainment of one's rights, for the overthrow of an oppressive government. Tactically and strategically perhaps you could argue this——

* * *

Father Groppi: . . . First—at times, you see, when you look at the demonstrations, for example, in the labor movement, in women struggling for equality. Even with Ghandi's demonstrations in India there were certain times when violence came forth. You can't expect to have a nonviolent movement which completely remains nonviolent. There are times when you are going to have sporadic outbursts of violence, granted. You talk about the Mayor's office but no one talks about the fact that *the police department threw teargas in our Freedom House and burned the place down, held the fire department back so that this fire got a good start*. And we sat there and watched that. No one talks about the fact that they threw teargas in the church and in the convent and in the rectory. No one talks about *the fact of police brutality*, you see. No one talks about the fact that they arrested 58 people, running inside our Freedom House and dragging them out when we had a peaceful assembly on our own property, you see. This is my kind of—when you start talking about saying this is wrong, then I'll say well maybe the young men should not have torn up the Mayor's office. But, you see, *the image of the Mayor of the City of Milwaukee in the black community*

is this, it is an oppressor. We know what he did when that disturbance occurred on Third Street. People called it a riot; we called it a civil disturbance. Some of the Youth Council members called it a social revolution. The Mayor called in the National Guard, put the entire city under a curfew. Now what happened when we tried to exercise our American constitutional right of demonstration and protest in a nonviolent way on the South Side? Well, we nearly got killed down there, and I mean it. They wanted to annihilate us.

Mr. Pappas: But didn't—

Father Groppi: And yet he refused to give us the kind of protection that was necessary. So here were these young men, militant and angry, sitting in his office. They arrested a few of the leaders, you know, and here was this man's office. They got carried away and they tore the place up. \$3,000 damage, I would say about that much damage was done to the Freedom House by the police department.

Mr. Pappas: Didn't the teargas come after you tried to march against the Mayor's proclamation?

Father Groppi: No. The teargas—

Mr. Pappas: It was the first time you were arrested, yes.

Father Groppi: No. We had two demonstrations on the South Side. The Mayor, instead of giving us protection to exercise our right of free speech, brought out his proclamation refusing all demonstrations and all peaceful assemblies—I don't know what in the world he called it. It was rather ambiguous. Our lawyers are still looking at it and they claim it is unconstitutional.

Mr. Agronsky: Well, he rescinded it.

Father Groppi: Sure he rescinded it, because I think he knew that it would not hold up in court.

* * *

October 15, 1967: Senator Stuart Symington

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: Senator, your Chairmanship of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is giving you a unique opportunity to see the conflict in the position of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There is a fundamental conflict, is there not, on various targets.

Senator Symington: Mr. Agronsky, I am not the Chairman. Senator Stennis is the Chairman. I am the ranking member. Yes, there appears—

Mr. Agronsky: Of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

Senator Symington: Yes. And there is a very basic difference. We knew of that difference, that is why we wanted to have these hearings. *With all due respect to the Secretary, he's a fine American, dedicated and patriotic, but he is not until recent years a military expert.* And it worries me that we have been so ineffective in Vietnam and at the same time that *he has so consistently ignored the recommendations of the best that we've got in the military.*

Mr. Glass: Well, then—

Senator Symington: And this has been brought out by these hearings.

Mr. Glass:—do we need a military expert, then, to take over the Pentagon?

Senator Symington: No, I wouldn't say that. I think civilian control is vital, but I would hope under the next civilian control or future civilian control that we would have more progress in Vietnam. And I am one who believes that if we'd listen just a little bit to the best that we have

in the military, with respect to how to conduct the war, that we would have done better than we've done so far.

Mr. Agronsky: *Do you think that the Secretary of Defense, then, by his position, is hampering the conduct of the war by the United States—*

Senator Symington: I wouldn't want to draw any conclusions of any character. I am very fond of the Secretary of Defense, I think it is most unfortunate—of course he has a right of decision, that's our way of life. We have civilian control of our government. But I do think that these hearings have brought out the depth of the disagreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and all other military commanders. And I think it is unfortunate that the American people at one time felt there was general agreement among the military with the way that this war was being conducted. That is not true, Mr. Agronsky, and I say that based on my four recent trips to Vietnam.

* * *

Mr. Agronsky: *And what Mr. Glass is asking you—and I will put it even more bluntly—do you think that the Secretary of Defense is hampering the war effort and should resign?*

Senator Symington: I would not want to comment on that because as to whether he does or does not resign is up to the President of the United States. And I think he is a fine American. *I would hope, however, in the future that he listens more to the Joint Chiefs of Staff because I do not think that the results of this war, the bonus on this war, you might say, after the last two or three years, is something that would justify our continuing with the present policies that we have.*

III. SELECTED CBS DOCUMENTARIES

CBS News Inquiry, "The Warren Report," June 25-28, 1967

* * *

Cronkite: And that was to be that—an official version of the assassination, arrived at by men of unimpeachable credentials, after what the world was assured was the most searching investigation in history.

Yet in the two and a half years since the Warren Report, a steady and growing stream of books, magazine articles, even plays and a motion picture, have challenged the Commission and its findings; have offered new theories, new assassins, and new reasons.

Only a few weeks ago, a Harris poll revealed that seven out of ten Americans are convinced that there remain many "important unanswered questions," that the whole truth has not been told.

A Gallup poll shows more than six of every ten Americans question that there was a lone assassin.

Man: *Well, I don't think that all the facts were brought out. I think something was held back.*

Woman: I think there were more involved in it than just Oswald.

Woman: *The only thing that disturbs me is the fact that they've sealed away some of the evidence and I think that's rather disturbing to most people.*

Woman: I've read the Warren Report, and as I say, I think those men are men of honesty and integrity. And I think they were asked to do a tremendous job within a very short period of time after the assassination, and I think they did the very best they could.

* * *

Cronkite: *There is an old axiom among lawyers that nothing carries more weight with a jury, or is less reliable, than eyewitness testimony. In this case we have just learned that the testimony of assassination earwitnesses also is unreliable. In a moment of utter horror and confusion, in a bowl certain to start echoes, it's too much to expect that human ears will register and correctly recall the number and sequence of a series of quick shots.*

* * *

Wallace: *One question is asked again and again: Why doesn't Jim Garrison give his information, if it is valid information, why doesn't he give it to the Federal Government? Now that everything is out in the open the C.I.A. could hardly stand in your way again, could they? Why don't you take this information that you have and cooperate with the Federal Government?*

Garrison: *Well, that would be one approach, Mike. Or I could take my files and take them up on the Mississippi River Bridge and throw them in the river. It'd be about the same result.*

Wallace: *You mean, they just don't want any other solution from that in the Warren Report?*

Garrison: *Well, isn't that kind of obvious? Where do you think that pressure's coming from, that prevents witnesses and defendants from being brought back to our state?*

Wallace: *Where is that pressure coming from?*

Garrison: *It's coming from Washington, obviously.*

Wallace: *For what reason?*

Garrison: *Because there are individuals in Washington who do not want the truth about the Kennedy murder to come out.*

Wallace: *Where are those individuals? Are they in the White House? Are they in the C.I.A.? Are they in the F.B.I.? Where are they?*

Garrison: *I think the probability is that you'll find them in the Justice Department and the Central Intelligence Agency.*

Wallace: You're asking a good many questions, but you haven't got the answers to those questions. You have a theory as to why indeed the President might have been assassinated by a group of dissidents. . . .

Garrison: No. Your statement is incorrect. We have more than a theory. We have conversations about the assassination of the President of the United States, and it does not include only the conversation brought out at the preliminary hearings. We have money passed, with regard to the assassination of the President of the United States. We have individuals involved in the planning. And we can make the case completely. I can't make any more comments about the case, except to say anybody that thinks it's just a theory is going to be awfully surprised when it comes to trial.

Wallace: *Garrison says Clay Shaw used the alias Clay Bertrand, or Clem Bertrand. At Shaw's preliminary hearing Perry Russo testified that Shaw used the name Clem Bertrand the night of the alleged meeting to plot the assassination. It was obviously a crucial point in Garrison's presentation at that hearing.*

But a week ago NBC said it has discovered that Clay Bertrand is not Clay Shaw. NBC said the man who uses that alias is a New Orleans homosexual, whose real name — not disclosed in the broadcast — has been turned over to the Justice Department.

Cronkite: Garrison's problems multiplied yesterday. His chief aide, William Gurvich, who conferred recently with Senator Robert Kennedy, abruptly resigned.

Gurvich was questioned by Bill Reed, News Director of WWL-TV, New Orleans, and CBS News reporter Edward Rabel.

Rabel: Mr. Gurvich, why did you resign as Mr. Garrison's chief aide in this investigation?

Gurvich: I was very dissatisfied with the way the investigation was being conducted, and I saw no reason for the investigation — and decided that if the job of an investigator is to find the truth, then I was to find it. I found it. And this led to my resignation.

Rabel: Well, what then is the truth?

Gurvich: *The truth, as I see it, is that Mr. Shaw should never have been arrested.*

Rabel: Why did you decide to see Senator Robert Kennedy?

Gurvich: Ed, I went to Senator Kennedy because he was a brother of the late President Kennedy, to tell him we could shed no light on the death of his brother, and not to be hoping for such. After I told him that, *he appeared to be rather disgusted to think that someone was exploiting his brother's death, and—by bringing it up, over and over again, and doing what has been done in this investigation.*

Reed: *There's been talk of allegations, of wrong-doing, of coercion, of possible bribery on the part of investigators — of certain investigators for the District Attorney. To your knowledge, are these allegations true?*

Gurvich: *Unquestionably, things have happened in the District Attorney's Office that definitely warrants an investigation by the Parish Grand Jury, as well as the Federal Grand Jury.*

Reed: *Would you say these methods were illegal?*

Gurvich: *I would say very illegal, and unethical.*

Reed: Can you give us any specifics?

Gurvich: I would rather save that for the Grand Juries, Bill, if I may.

Reed: Is this on the part of just one or two investigators, or does it involve the whole staff, or perhaps Mr. Garrison . . .

Gurvich: It involves more than two people.

Reed: *More than two people. Do you believe Mr. Garrison had knowledge of these activities?*

Gurvich: *Yeah—of course, he did. He ordered it.*

Reed: *He ordered it?*

Gurvich: *He ordered it. Yes, sir.*

Rabel: *Why did he feel it was necessary to order such activities?*

Gurvich: *That I cannot explain. I am not a psychiatrist.*

Reed: *Mr. Garrison said the C.I.A. has attempted to block his investigation . . .*

Gurvich: *His purpose for bringing the C.I.A. in, Bill, is this: As he put it, they can't afford to answer. He can say what he damn well pleases about that agency, and they'll never reply.*

* * *

But the whole atmosphere of his investigations, and the charges that have been made by news organizations concerning it, are not such as to inspire confidence. It may be that Garrison will finally show that there was a lunatic fringe in dark and devious conspiracy. But, so far, he has shown us nothing to link the events he alleges to have taken place in New Orleans, and the events we know to have taken place in Dallas.

* * *

Cronkite: *But the most recent, most spectacular development in the Oswald case involves the C.I.A. It involves, too, the spectacular District Attorney of New Orleans, a man they call the Jolly Green Giant. It involves an arrest, hypnotism, truth serum, bribery charges, and, for the first time, an outline of a conspiracy. It certainly accounts for the recent national upsurge of suspicion concerning the conclusions of the Warren Report. And it raises a new question: Was the assassination plotted in New Orleans?*

Mike Wallace reports.

Wallace: New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison quietly began his own investigation of the assassination last fall. In a sense, he picked up where the Warren Commission had left off. Warren investigators questioned a number of people in New Orleans after the assassination, and they failed to implicate any of them. But the more Garrison went back over old ground apparently, the more fascinated he became with the possibility that a plot to kill President Kennedy actually began in New Orleans. By the time the story of his investigation broke four months ago he seemed supremely confident that he could make a case, that he had solved the assassination.

Garrison: Because I certainly wouldn't say with confidence that we would make arrests and have convictions afterwards if I did not know that we had solved the assassination of President Kennedy beyond any shadow of a doubt. I can't imagine that people would think that—that I would guess and say something like that rashly. There's no question about it. We know what cities were involved, we know how it was done—in the essential respects. We know the key individuals involved. And we're in the process of developing evidence now. I thought I made that clear days ago.

Wallace: He shocked New Orleans four months ago by arresting the socially prominent Clay Shaw, former director of the New Orleans International Trade Mart.

Garrison's charge was that Shaw had conspired with two other men to plot the assassination of President Kennedy. Garrison said Shaw had known David Ferrie, an eccentric former airline pilot who was found dead a week before Garrison had planned to arrest him. Incidentally, the coroner said Ferrie died of natural causes. But Garrison called it suicide.

He said Shaw also knew Lee Harvey Oswald; that Ferrie, Oswald, and Shaw met one night in the summer of

1963 and plotted the President's death. Clay Shaw said it was all fantastic.

Shaw: I am completely innocent of any such charges. I have not conspired with anyone, at any time, or any place, to murder our late and esteemed President John F. Kennedy, or any other individual. I have always had only the highest and utmost respect and admiration for Mr. Kennedy.

The charges filed against me have no foundation in fact or in law. I have not been apprised of the basis of these fantastic charges, and assume that in due course I will be furnished with this information, and will be afforded an opportunity to prove my innocence.

I did not know Harvey Lee Oswald, nor did I ever see or talk with him, or anyone who knew him at any time in my life.

Wallace: A preliminary hearing for Shaw was held two weeks after his arrest. The hearing was complete with a surprise mystery witness, Perry Raymond Russo, twenty-five-year-old insurance salesman, and friend of the late David Ferrie. Through three days of intense cross-examination *Russo held doggedly to his story, that he himself had been present when Shaw, Ferrie, and Oswald plotted the Kennedy assassination. Russo admitted at the hearing that he had been hypnotized three times by Garrison men.*

A writer for The Saturday Evening Post said he read transcripts of what went on at those sessions. *The writer suggested that Russo's entire performance at the hearing was the product of post-hypnotic suggestion.* Clay Shaw was ordered held for trial. It could be months before the trial actually takes place.

Meanwhile, various news organizations have reported serious charges against Jim Garrison and his staff, alleging bribery, intimidation, and efforts to plant and or manu-

facture evidence against Shaw. Last month Newsweek Magazine said Garrison's office had tried to bribe Alvin Beauboeuf, the twenty-one-year-old former friend of David Ferrie. Beauboeuf, the magazine said, was offered three thousand dollars to supply testimony that would shore up the conspiracy charge against Shaw.

Garrison promptly released an affidavit Beauboeuf had signed. The affidavit said no one working for Garrison had ever asked Beauboeuf to tell anything but the truth.

Subsequently, New Orleans police investigated the Beauboeuf charge and said Garrison's men had been falsely accused. But that was just the beginning. Three more bribery accusations have since come to light, two involving Louisiana prison inmates, one involving a nightclub and Turkish Bath operator. In each of those cases the charges that rewards were offered in return for allegedly false testimony or other help that would implicate Clay Shaw. We will hear Garrison's comment on those charges later in the broadcast.

* * *

Garrison has expanded the scope of his charges to include not only a Shaw-Oswald-Ruby link, but the C.I.A. as well. Further, Garrison says he knows that five anti-Castro Cuban guerrillas, not Lee Harvey Oswald, killed President Kennedy. He says the C.I.A. is concealing both the names and the whereabouts of the Cubans.

* * *

Mark Lane: There was one conclusion, one basic conclusion that the Commission reached, I think, which can be supported by the facts, and that was the Commission's conclusion that Ruby killed Oswald. But, of course, that took place on television. It would have been very difficult to deny that. *But, outside of that, there's not an important conclusion which can be supported by the facts and—and this is the problem.*