

History Department:
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Fall 2007

John Lennon's Deportation Hearings and the Role of the Media

Erin Kremer
History 489

Professor Teresa Sanislo
Cooperating Professor Dr. Jane Pederson

**Copyright for this work is owned by the author. This digital version is published by McIntyre Library,
University of Wisconsin Eau Claire with the consent of the author.**

Abstract

March 1972 brought John Lennon and Yoko Ono into conflict with the government, mainly the Immigration and Naturalization Service. After the Beatles broke up, Lennon and Ono became involved with a radical revolutionary group consisting of Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman which the government already was watching. Combined with the Lennon's political affiliations and current company actions were taken to deport the couple back to England because they were seen as a threat to the current Nixon administration. A contributing factor to the case was the media coverage and the stance they took against the government. I have chosen to focus mainly on print media and the articles appearing in the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and *Rolling Stone* surrounding John Lennon's hearings. The *Washington Post* had significant influence over the Watergate scandal of the Nixon administration, which was evolving at the same time as the deportation hearings; the *Rolling Stone* had a similar influence over Lennon's deportation hearing as it evolved. Investigative journalism was a new trend and both of these publications utilized the new style to break open these cases. Watergate and Lennon's hearings evolved at the same time and mirrored each other and the abuses of power being exerted by the Nixon government. Even though the media's coverage in the beginning months of the case was not enough to cause public awareness and outcry, eventually it was a key factor in his victory over the political misuse of a government agency, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) because of how the press presented the case with political intentions and for what they published.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Historiography.....	6
History of the Media and its Influence in the 1960s and 70s.....	9
Changing Role of the Media: Investigative Journalism.....	13
Leading up to the Hearings.....	15
The Dreaded Deportation Hearings.....	21
The Media’s Significant Influence.....	25
Coverage Begins.....	26
A Change in Support.....	37
The Memo.....	39
Conclusion.....	43

Introduction

“Suddenly I realized this was serious, they were coming for me, one way or another. They were harassing me.”¹ This was John Lennon’s reaction when in April 1972 he realized how serious the Nixon administration wanted him out of the country. He would walk out of his apartment and see agents standing across the street watching him; he would jump into a taxi and they would follow right behind in plain sight; he even discovered his phone and his lawyer’s phones were tapped. This was the extent of the FBI harassment intended to make people jumpy and paranoid. There was no doubt that Lennon’s every move was being accounted for and documented.

March 1972 brought John Lennon and Yoko Ono into conflict with the government, mainly the Immigration and Naturalization Service. After the Beatles broke up, Lennon and Ono became involved with a radical revolutionary group consisting of Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman which the government was already watching.² Combined with the Lennon’s political affiliations and current company actions were taken to deport the couple back to England because they were seen as a threat to the current Nixon administration.

A contributing factor to the case was the media coverage and the stance they took against the government. The coverage of the deportation hearings consisted of articles from newspapers all over the country, namely *New York Times (NYT)* and the *Washington Post*. Magazines also covered the trial; *Rolling Stone* having had the biggest impact. Lennon also received exposure by appearing on and hosting talk shows, doing interviews and contributing to charity benefits.

¹ Elizabeth Partridge, *John Lennon: All I want is the Truth*, (New York: Penguin Group, 2005) 173.

² Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman led some of the first protests against the Vietnam War. They were the cofounders of the group the Yippies which was the Youth International Party. Together, they played an instrumental role in the protests at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. They were charged with conspiracy and crossing state lines with the intention of rioting and placed on trial along with 5 others. They were nicknamed the “Chicago Seven.”

The three significant print media sources, *Times*, *Post* and *Rolling Stone* all had different histories and purposes for their publications. The sixties and seventies were a crucial time for the media as it was beginning to play a larger role in culture and turn towards investigative journalism as the events of the late 60s and early 70s occurred.

I have chosen to focus mainly on print media and the articles appearing in the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and *Rolling Stone* surrounding John Lennon's hearings. Lennon's publicized somewhat radical and unconventional peace protests and benefits produced serious suspicion of him within the government. The media's coverage of these radical events caused the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to start a file on John Lennon and eventually urged the INS decision to move towards deportment. Over the four year battle, some publications changed their views and the level of support wavered.

The *Washington Post* had significant influence over the Watergate scandal of the Nixon administration, which was evolving at the same time as the deportation hearings; and the *Rolling Stone* had a similar influence over Lennon's deportation hearing as it evolved.³ These two cases occurring at the same time mirrored each other through the abuses of power being exerted by the Nixon government. Though Lennon's deportation hearing is not as well known as Watergate, many of the same abuses seen in Watergate are evident in Lennon's case and it is these abuses that moved Congress toward impeachment. Without the media coverage of Watergate, mostly coming from the *Washington Post*, the coverage of John Lennon's hearings might have been very different. The *Post's* coverage of Watergate brought the abuses of power of the government to the fore front. Even though the media's coverage in the beginning months of the case was not enough to cause public awareness and outcry, eventually it was a key factor in his victory over

³ See Appendix

the political misuse of a government agency, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) because of how the press presented the case with political intentions and for what they published.

Historiography

There are many articles, books, memoirs and documentaries written about John Lennon and the Beatles. Some look at the Beatles as a group and as individuals and some focus on Lennon by himself and his life. The books on Lennon cover his life story from birth, to the Beatles, to his life after with Ono. Others look at Lennon's radical politics in the early to middle seventies. The most significant biographies written on Lennon include Jon Wiener's *Come Together: John Lennon in his Time*, Ray Coleman's *Lennon: The Definitive Biography* and Larry Kane's *Lennon Revealed*. Wiener's book is a riveting historical record of Lennon's life.⁴ Throughout his book he described the harassment and intimidation Lennon received from the Nixon administration. Wiener, a history professor at the University of California at Irvine, highlights Lennon's political affiliations and their consequences clearly in his work. Wiener uses many primary sources including newspaper and magazine articles, interviews with Lennon's friends and professional acquaintances, government files, radio and television broadcasts. Wiener also connects the abuse of power by the government in Lennon's hearings to the similar abuses of power exercised in the Watergate scandal. He does not directly address the press' influence in breaking the Watergate case and Lennon hearings which is center to my argument.

Coleman's "definitive biography" is highly regarded as the most thorough work ever written about anyone in music.⁵ He is a music journalist and former editor-in-chief of England's

⁴ Jon Wiener, *Come Together: John Lennon in his Time* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984)

⁵ Ray Coleman, *Lennon: The Definitive Biography* (New York: Harper Collins, 1985)

Melody Maker. Coleman had the advantage of working with the Beatles and Lennon for eighteen years from their early days in Liverpool. Research from family papers, photographs and extensive interviews produced a balanced and honest biography of the “great” John Lennon. Coleman argues the complexity of Lennon’s life with sincerity and sensitivity.

Kane’s work on Lennon comes from first hand experience with Lennon but also exclusive interviews with Ono and family.⁶ He also uses Wiener and Coleman’s books as sources. Kane is careful not to exclude Lennon’s imperfections and mistakes but also does not dwell on them. As with Coleman, Kane produces an honest portrait of Lennon struggled and triumphs of life. Kane is an Emmy Award-winning news anchor and American journalist who traveled with the Beatles during the North American tours. He has also written a critically and commercially acclaimed book, *Ticket to Ride*, in which he tells the stories of the 1964 and ’65 tours.

Instead of looking at Lennon and his life story, I will focus on the controversial deportation trial he and Ono endured from 1972 to 1976 and the media’s portrayal and coverage. I will discuss the controversial aspects of the trial, i.e. what the real reason was behind the deportation order versus the reasons brought up in court. My paper will analyze the mainstream media, its changing role and illustrate how it became an important factor in Lennon’s battle for permanent residency.

Also important to the Lennon deportation story is the Nixon administration and Watergate scandal. Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, the two reporters from the *Washington Post* who diligently worked to break the Watergate case, wrote two books solely on the Nixon administration and Watergate. *All the President’s Men*, which was also made into a motion-

⁶ Larry Kane, *Lennon Revealed* (Philadelphia: Running Press, 2005)

picture, tells the Watergate story from their own perspectives.⁷ The unique account of the scandal describes their struggles and successes in reporting what many other papers would not. Woodward and Bernstein used confidential, inside sources to corroborate what other sources said, as their editors required at least two sources for every piece of information. This book is a first-hand account of the risks and challenges that went into being a part of what forced President Nixon to resign.

Their second book *The Final Days* was more focused on the Nixon administration and the final 100 days in office.⁸ After Nixon's resignation some of their reliable sources said that the real story of the final days of the Nixon presidency was not adequately told. Woodward and Bernstein took a leave of absence from the *Post* and to begin conducting extensive, intense interviews with 394 people. Also used were notes, memoranda, correspondence, logs, calendars and diaries. Everything in the book comes from accounts of at least two people. While their previous book was more of the reporters account, this book was very much the story from inside the White House. It illustrated how desperate Nixon had become when he started suggesting they should hide evidence, manufacture missing evidence and destroy materials that were under subpoena.⁹

More specifically on Nixon and Watergate, Louis Liebovich, a professor of journalism at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, wrote *Richard Nixon, Watergate and the Press*.¹⁰ This book looks at Nixon's tumultuous relationship with the press from the beginning of his career in the late 50s and early 60s and how he blamed his defeats in 1960 for president and a California gubernatorial bid in 1962. He analyzed the changing role of the press, especially the

⁷ Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward, *All the President's Men* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974)

⁸ Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward, *The Final Days* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976)

⁹ *Ibid.*, 25-27.

¹⁰ Louis Liebovich, *Richard Nixon, Watergate and the Press* (Westport: Praeger, 2003)

Washington Post, during the Nixon administration and Watergate. Liebovich argued that historically presidents and the press are naturally at odds but that the antagonism tends to rise in times of controversy and no period in American history had lapsed into public dispute more than the Vietnam War and Watergate era.¹¹ He also argued why the *Post* was so influential in breaking the Watergate case. Liebovich stated that the *Post*'s stories written by Woodward and Bernstein were investigative in nature and revealed new details about the covert activities by the White House while other newspapers were using interviews with Washington officials from press conferences or court actions which were easily accessible sources.¹² He pointed out that Woodward and Bernstein pressed secretaries, assistance, clerical staffers and lower-level personnel to put pieces of the story together. They hardly had sources on the record in their stories and this prevented any other medium to contact those sources and use them as leads for their own investigation.¹³ Liebovich also attested to the fact that the reason no other paper went to the extent the *Post* did was because no one wanted to trail along behind the two reporters with the clear inside track.

History of the Media and its Influence in the 1960s and 70s

The media is an influential aspect of our lives. It informs us of the day's news and influences our opinions about current events. The American people are not the only ones who get information from the press; the United States government also uses the press to form judgments and gather information about people and events. The free press has the right to express any view point they want and with many media sources, multiple views are voiced.

¹¹ Liebovich, *Richard Nixon, Watergate and the Press*, 13.

¹² *Ibid.*, 68-69.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 71.

The *New York Times* was founded in 1851 by Henry J. Raymond and George Jones. They responded to the public outcry for a paper that gave the news and was not distorted by “eccentricities of a personal editorial attitude or tainted by excessive attention to folly, immorality and crime.”¹⁴ The character of the paper was and still is grounded in its excellence in news service, avoidance of extremes in editorial opinion and a general sobriety in manner. Originally in 1851 the paper was to include both all that was good in conservatism and radicalism while still avoiding the defects of either. *New York Times* founders also stood firm in their belief in Christianity and republicanism in the 1850s.¹⁵ Two main goals of the paper were to make it the best and cheapest daily family newspaper that people could depend on for the news and not be there for the advancement of any one person, party or organization. The paper tried to be an above average news source that the citizens of New York City and soon the entire nation could go to for the facts. The *New York Times* was meant to be well-rounded by portraying every side of the news by reporting on all the issues regardless of political affiliation.¹⁶

Stilson Hutchins founded the *Washington Post* in 1877. Hutchins plan for the paper was his long cherished dream of a daily Democratic newspaper in the national capital.¹⁷ Similar to the people of New York, the Washington D.C. wanted a first-rate paper. The *Post* was a child of the fierce passions of the times, especially the outcome of the Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876.¹⁸

¹⁴ Elmer Davis, *History of the New York Times, 1851-1921* (New York: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1921) 6.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁷ Chalmers M. Roberts, *The Washington Post, The First 100 Years* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977) 1.

¹⁸ The presidential election of 1876 led to what became known as the Compromise of 1877. Republican nominee Rutherford B. Hayes ran against Democrat Samuel J. Tilden. Tilden won the popular vote but when the electoral votes were counted the Tilden was one short of the necessary number. The three states in dispute were Louisiana, South Carolina and Florida. They each submitted two new sets of returns and a committee of electoral commission resolved the dispute. The Republican set of returns from Florida was accepted when the Republicans

Hutchins was a smart man; he knew that a quality Washington D.C. paper would command the daily attention of men in power in all branches of the national government. He was successful in offering more than any other Washington paper by developing more than just a partisan Democratic paper.

The *Washington Post* switched ownership a few times over their first hundred years but the quality of the paper never wavered. The *Post's* greatest triumph was their leading role in uncovering the scandals of the Nixon administration.¹⁹ Two main reporters took on the scandal, Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein. June 17, 1972 five men were arrested in the break-in of the Democratic Party's headquarters in the Watergate office building. The *Post* dove right into the story uncovering secret after secret. Months later, beginning on October 10, 1972 the *Post* ran a series of sensational stories.²⁰ The first story was a detailed account of how the FBI determined the Watergate break-in was directed by officials of the White House and the Committee for Re-election of the President. With this article, the entire puzzle came together.²¹ Another significant article highlighted the activities of Dwight Chapin, Herbert Kalmbach and H.R. Haldeman.²² These articles were available to 220 domestic news service subscribers but many editors did not print them; majority that did print them buried them on the inside pages.

The *Post* was on the defensive for almost a month as the White House made it a target of retribution.²³ December 8, 1973 brought another huge Woodward story that linked a White House office to one of the Watergate burglars. Over the next few weeks the entire story came

outvoted the Democrats. This produced a logjam. To resolve it the Democrats agreed that Hayes could assume office in return for the withdrawal of all remaining troops in the South. The Republicans agreed, thus the Compromise of 1877.

¹⁹ Roberts, *The Washington Post*, 431.

²⁰ Ibid, 435.

²¹ Ibid, 435.

²² Chapin was the Deputy Assistant to the President; Kalmbach was the Deputy Finance Chairman, CRP and the personal attorney to the President; Haldeman was the Assistant to the President and the White House Chief of Staff

²³ Roberts, *The Washington Post*, 439.

out. Finally the generally lonely Woodward articles which would appear on the front page under one-or-two column headlines were now appearing under eight-column banner lines.²⁴

This was entirely a new kind of journalism and reporting. The *Post* won the Pulitzer Prize for public service in 1973 and Woodward and Bernstein won all the other major reporting awards for 1972. The press was taking on a new role as Kathryn Graham, acting publisher of the *Washington Post* at the time of the Watergate scandal, said, “Our job is to relate what’s happening, as fairly and completely as we can—whether or not that is what the people want to hear and what officials want the people to hear.”²⁵

Jann Wenner established *The Rolling Stone* in the middle of the turbulent sixties. He was a young rock journalist who longed to meet his heroes.²⁶ Wenner founded *Rolling Stone* in 1967 to satisfy a large consumer demand. The strong overtone of *Rolling Stone* was the editors’ and writers’ abiding love for music. The sixties and seventies were full of scandals and violence; for the young college aged generation *Rolling Stone* became that generation’s voice, a lot of the time their only trustworthy voice.²⁷ The *Rolling Stone* was so significant that from 1970-1977 no other magazine was as honest or as imaginative. Their writers often wrote about subjects no other American publication would touch.²⁸ The *Rolling Stone*’s founder, twenty-one year old Wenner, was young and in touch with both popular culture and the emerging sub-culture thus no one had a better understanding of what was going on in the 1960s and 70s. In the book *Rolling Stone Magazine: An Uncensored History*, Porter Bibb, Wenner’s first publisher, said, “I don’t

²⁴ Roberts, *The Washington Post*, 439.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 443.

²⁶ Robert Draper, *Rolling Stone Magazine: The Uncensored History* (New York: Doubleday, 1990.) 6.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

think anybody's ever going to put together a journal that is as accurate a reflection of what's going on in the country as he did in *Rolling Stone*'s heyday."²⁹

Wenner's true love of music and his desire to meet music legends John Lennon, Mick Jagger and Bob Dylan led him to create *Rolling Stone* after he dropped out of college. Wenner knew his readers and he wanted to tell it to them straight. He urged his writers to "scrape away the bullshit. If the President lies, call him a liar; if Dylan is a poet, call him one."³⁰ Fortunately for Wenner, his music heroes Lennon and Jagger supported the magazine long before it was in their interest to do so. *Rolling Stone* became one of the most influential publications of the time.

Changing Role of the Media: Investigative Journalism

As Liebovich was arguing in his book on Nixon and the press, the role of the media was changing in the late 1960s and early 70s. Clark Mollenhoff, special counsel to President Nixon in 1969 and Pulitzer Prize winning journalist, lawyer and columnist, said in his book *Investigative Reporting: from the Courthouse to the White House* it was the combined effort of many experienced investigative reporters to create the climate for the government investigations that eventually forced Nixon out of office in 1974.³¹ These reporters were not discovering evidence that the government's investigators missed or overlooked; they were simply publicizing evidence already in the hands of the government investigators and prosecutors so it could not be covered up by Nixon or his men.³² This was a vital new role of the press. This new form of journalism had an indispensable task of focusing public attention on the arrogant misuse of White House power to obstruct justice. This type of journalism was most apparent in the *Post*

²⁹ Draper, *Rolling Stone Magazine*, 8.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 10.

³¹ Clark R. Mollenhoff, *Investigative Reporting: from the Courthouse to the White House* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1981)

³² *Ibid.*, 318.

dealing with the Watergate scandal evolving and *Rolling Stone* covering the Lennon hearings and how they evolved. The media in these two cases created a public awareness that a serious situation existed.³³

The key to investigative journalism was to talk to as many people as possible. Woodward and Bernstein paved the way by focusing on the bits and pieces of information carried in the minds and files of bookkeepers, administrators, technicians and operators in the White House. In both Watergate and the deportation hearings, the media started pressing for day-to-day stories and eventually these stories brought out informants and information.

Investigative journalists were learning that they needed to reach beyond media events such as new conferences, press releases, and official proceedings. These sources were edited and released with the message the government wanted to deliver regardless of truth. This new breed of journalists and reporters went beyond the official version. Investigative journalism showed the public that the press could do a good job of getting the truth out of pressured people.

³³ Mollenhoff, *Investigative Reporting*, 336.

Leading Up To the Hearings

John Lennon and the Beatles became a household name in the mid sixties in America but in reality, the Beatles had been around since 1957 in some form or another. They played small, run-down bars and clubs around Liverpool, London and all the way to Hamburg, Germany, where they spent a considerable amount of time. Finally in 1962 the Beatles landed a recording deal with a label within E.M.I., a recording corporation. By 1964, “Beatlemania” hit the United States. Widely popular, the Beatles toured the United States and the world until August 1966 when the Beatles gave their last live performance at Candlestick Park in San Francisco. Slowly the Beatles fell apart, beginning with the death of manager and friend, Brian Epstein in 1967, until the official break in 1970.

Unbeknown to the public, Lennon had always been a political person; manager Brian Epstein discouraged Lennon and the others from expressing their personal views. Lennon had a few notable controversial moments as a Beatle; beginning with his comment in 1966 about how religion is declining in England and that the “Beatles were more popular than Jesus.” This was Lennon’s first step away from the Beatles and towards political and antiwar activism.³⁴

At a press conference not long after Lennon made his “Jesus” statement, the Beatles as a group came out and said “We don’t like the war, war is wrong.” Lennon made a separate statement saying that “We think of it every day. We don’t like it. We don’t agree with it. We think it is wrong.”³⁵ This was a profound statement to make, first because it was very uncommon for a leading music group to take a political stand of any kind and second because while most people in England agreed that the war in Vietnam was wrong, hardly any could say

³⁴ Wiener, *Come Together*, 11.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

they thought about it everyday. Lennon was not afraid to be radical as he proved with his activism with Ono in the coming years.

John Lennon and Yoko Ono's relationship was controversial from the beginning as well because they both were still married and had young children. They began a business relationship in 1967 which grew into more by mid-1968. Lennon's wife, Cynthia, sued him for divorce on the grounds of adultery in August of '68. In February of 1969, Ono divorced her husband, Tony Cox, with whom she had a daughter Kyoko. Shortly after Cox and Ono's divorce, Lennon and Yoko Ono were married at Gibraltar in March of 1969.

There were a series of events that caused the FBI and the Nixon administration to look closer at Lennon and Ono. November 11, 1968 the *Two Virgins* album was released with a very controversial cover. Lennon and Ono decided to have the cover art a photograph of them naked, side by side, in a sense exposing themselves to the world. Lennon is quoted as saying, "It was a kind of statement and awakening for me; this is me, naked, with the woman I love." They wanted to emphasize that being yourself was what was important and that if everyone stopped pretending to be someone they were not, there would be peace.

The *Two Virgins* album was what grabbed American authorities' attention. Many states sold the album wrapped in brown paper as if it was pornography. Police in other states confiscated copies before they even got to record stores. Minnesota Congressman Ancher Nelson received angry hate mail from a constituent exclaiming, "Isn't there some way we can get this album off the market? You ask why the youth of today are like they are; this is one of the prime reasons. Ancher, I said to you, this has to stop, and I mean NOW!!"³⁶ This letter intended for a Congressman from Minnesota eventually found its way to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's

³⁶ Perry Kane, *Gimmie Some Truth: The Story of the John Lennon Deportation Case* (Bloomington: 1st Books Library, 2000) 31.

desk. The album had little effect on American youth and soon became hard to find. The real significance of the album was that it landed John Lennon's name on the enemies list of Hoover and the FBI.

After Lennon and Ono were married they began a series of events for peace. They were a very unconventional couple and expressed their strong desire for peace in unique, often misunderstood ways. For their honeymoon, they jetted off to Amsterdam and held a "bed-in" which was basically a news conference from their bed.³⁷ They announced they would stay in bed for a week to "protest against all the suffering and violence in the world" Lennon was quoted explaining. Lennon and Ono wanted to emphasize the non-violent aspect of protest and that a person could protest in many different ways. This event attracted a lot of attention because reporters thought they were going to witness the newlyweds making love but instead they walked in to find them sitting in bed in their pajamas. This was just the beginning of the peace protests Lennon and Ono staged in the coming years.

The couple flew to Vienna to hold a press conference from inside a large white bag. Lennon described this event by saying that the only thing that matters is what they have to say instead of what color your skin is or how long their hair had grown.³⁸ The couple continued to stage events that highlighted the desire for peace. When they returned to England they sent out "acorns for peace" to all the heads of state in the global community. They wanted everyone to plant the acorns as a symbol of peace.

In May 1969 Lennon and Ono tried to bring their peace campaign to the US but the Nixon's immigration officials refused Lennon's request for a visa. This was the first obstacle for Lennon leading up to the immigration battle. Instead of coming to the US, Lennon and Ono

³⁷ Wiener, *Come Together*, 88.

³⁸ Kane, *Gimmie Some Truth*, 40.

decided to go to Montreal to host their second bed-in. This bed-in was more significant than the first because on the last night in the Montreal hotel, Lennon recorded “Give Peace a Chance.” This song was like the emotionally powered song of the Civil Rights Movement “We Shall Overcome.” The song would grab the FBI’s attention once again. On November 15, 1969 a national demonstration was held in Washington, D.C. protesting the war.³⁹ Half a million people broke out into song singing Lennon’s “Give Peace a Chance.” Lennon was inspired and moved by this demonstration.

Once the couple moved to New York City, they became involved with radical movement leaders. Jerry Rubin, who the FBI also kept an eye on, was their closest friend in the radical world. Connections formed through Rubin and new avenues explored by Lennon and Ono, they strengthened their ties to the Left. They agreed to write a regular column for a new political magazine, *SunDance*.⁴⁰ *SunDance* held an auction to raise money and John was one of the first artist auctioneers. The FBI noted Lennon’s participation and column in his file.

The “Free John Sinclair” rally was held in Ann Arbor in December 1971. Sinclair was a political activist who had been in prison for more than two years, serving a ten year sentence for selling two joints of marijuana to an undercover agent. The rally was the culmination of a long political campaign. Their focus was to put maximum pressure on the legislature to change the marijuana laws before the 1971 session ended. Many controversial people were committed to speaking at the rally. Even before Lennon and Ono agreed to be part of it, the FBI took an interest in the rally because of the specific people involved; Jerry Rubin, Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger and Bobby Seale were among those selected to speak and they were all just coming off the Chicago Seven Trial. Phil Ochs was also performing. The rally accomplished their goal

³⁹ Wiener, *Come Together*, 97.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 182.

even before it occurred. The day before the event the legislature voted on the bill and they lowered the penalty for possession of marijuana from four years to one. The penalty for sale was also lowered to four years; it had been twenty to life.

Rubin made a comment that grabbed the attention of the FBI agents in the crowd, “What we are doing here is uniting music and revolutionary politics to build a revolution around the country!...A lot of events like this one will take place between now and San Diego.” He continued calling for “a million of you to turn up at the Republican national convention to humiliate and defeat Richard Nixon.”⁴¹ Lennon and other radicals including the people involved in the Sinclair benefit rally attempted to organize a campaign for a concert in San Diego at the same time of the Republican National Convention where Nixon would be nominated for President. They wanted to mobilize the young vote to come out against Nixon.

Lennon performed his new song entitled “John Sinclair.” The lyrics referred to CIA involvement in heroin trafficking in Asia while Sinclair was sitting in jail for selling two joints.⁴² Ono told *New Yorker* reporter Hendrik Hertzberg that she believed her and Lennon’s immigration troubles began with that rally. If their political activity was missed by the government thus far, the rally definitely brought it to their attention.⁴³ The FBI and Nixon administration had a real concern because people were calling for more political events leading up to the Republican Convention. In the end, the rally had great impact on both the legislation and Sinclair, as he was released fifty-five hours after the concert.

February 1972 was another eventful month for Lennon and Ono. They hosted the *Mike Douglas Show* for an entire week. The Lennons picked half of the guests and Douglas picked the

⁴¹ Wiener, *Come Together*, 191-192.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 192.

⁴³ Hendrik Hertzberg, “A Reporter At Large: Poetic Larks Bid Bald Eagle Welcome Swan of Liverpool,” *New Yorker*, 9 December 1972, 143.

other half. Lennon's guests included Bobby Seale, Jerry Rubin, Ralph Nader and Chuck Berry. Tuesday's show was probably the most controversial. Rubin appeared on the *Mike Douglas Show* much to Douglas' dismay. He did not hide the fact that he did not have positive feelings about Rubin but Lennon wanted him on the show.⁴⁴ Douglas, Lennon and Rubin discussed drugs, politics and race. The conversation became heated when Rubin made comments about removing Nixon from of the White House, "We've got to get Nixon out of the White House. We've got to end the automated warfare in Vietnam. We've got to end the despair—," before he could finish he was cut off abruptly by commercial.⁴⁵ When the commercial ended, Rubin was allowed to finish his statement but he had to avoid using Nixon's name. He finished his comment, "Everyone should register to vote—that's power, if we all vote together. We shouldn't vote for any candidate who doesn't withdraw everything from Vietnam. We ought to go to both conventions, in Miami and San Diego, and nonviolently make our presence felt." Douglas and Rubin went back and forth. Douglas challenged Rubin's every comment and pushed Rubin to back up his statements and challenged what right he had to say those things.

Little did Lennon know, because of the guests that he chose, the FBI was heavily scrutinizing the *Mike Douglas Show* the week he hosted it with Ono and Douglas. The transcript that was distributed to field offices throughout the country emphasized the comment made by Rubin that declared his mission to defeat Nixon. A little less than half of a month after the show, Lennon's visa was revoked on the basis of a 1968 drug conviction in England.

⁴⁴ Wiener, *Come Together*, 202.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 203.

The Dreaded Deportation Hearings

The Lennons' visas were set to expire on February 29, 1972. They hired a lawyer, Mr. Leon Wildes, in January to do what he could to help them stay in the United States. In the beginning, the Lennons only wanted to stay a few more months to look for Ono's daughter, Kyoko. Ono's ex-husband, Tony Cox, had disappeared with their daughter in 1971. Before that Cox would call Ono occasionally asking for money for bills and once she sent money she could then spend a few days with Kyoko. They hired private investigators to look for Kyoko and Cox. Finally, they heard that she was in Texas. On March 3, 1972 the Domestic Relations Court in Houston granted temporary custody of Kyoko to Ono and ordered the mysterious Tony Cox to return the child.⁴⁶ The judge also said that Ono's custody would have to be exercised in the United States. This prompted Lennon and Ono to stay in the country because if they left, Ono's custody would be lost.

Originally the Lennons had been given a fifteen day extension on their visas allowing them to stay in the country until March 15. On March 3, the same day as the custody hearing, Lennon petitioned the Immigration Service to change their status from "nonimmigrant visitors" to "third-preference immigrant" visa applicants. A third preference immigrant is described as "an alien who is a member of the professions, or who because of his exceptional ability in the sciences or arts will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural interests or welfare of the United States."⁴⁷ Usually a visitor whose third-preference petition is approved is able to stay in the US until a visa number becomes available; then he would apply for status as a permanent resident.

⁴⁶ Hertzberg, "A Reporter At Large," 145.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 145.

Here was the catch: immigration law specifically denies permanent status to people convicted of violating any law relating to the illicit possession of or traffic in narcotic drugs or marijuana. In November of 1968, Lennon was convicted of possessing cannabis-resin and this conviction appeared to fall into the category barring his visa acceptance. The government refused to renew or extend Lennon or Ono's visas and they were told to leave the country on or before March 15.

The deportation hearing had been postponed until April 18, 1972. The hearing was brief. Wildes presented a motion to terminate the proceedings but Mr. Fieldsteel, the officer overseeing the hearings, denied the motion and adjourned the hearing until May 2. The Lennons had filed their petitions to become third-preference applicants over a month ago and had heard nothing. Wildes went to investigate. He discovered that the applications had not been touched or even looked at and no one knew anything about them. He looked through their files and the petitions were not there. Eventually, the applications surfaced in their original sealed envelopes. Wildes was furious. He filed a complaint in federal district court on May 1. The next day, Lennon and Ono's applications to be third preference immigrants were granted.

The May 12 hearing focused on deporting the Lennons and their applications to become permanent residents; visa numbers in their new third-preference category had become available. The government's case against Ono was very much a mystery as she had never been convicted of anything. But the government did have a case to present against Lennon. Mr. Schiano, the federal prosecutor, presented as evidence a certificate of Lennon's conviction of possession of cannabis resin and a copy of the British law under which he was convicted.⁴⁸

There were a few things surrounding Lennon's conviction that allowed Wildes to argue his case. In November of 1968 Lennon pleaded guilty to the charge and paid a hundred and fifty

⁴⁸ Hertzberg, "A Reporter At Large," 148.

pound fine. This was a misdemeanor, not a felony and British law was very different from the United States. Under British law, a person could be convicted even if he or she had no idea that they were in possession of an illegal substance. The narcotics laws in the US, Canada and Mexico stated that a person must be proven to have known he possessed a drug before he can be convicted. In other words, Lennon's drug conviction in England, first would never even have gotten him convicted in the US and second, would never hold up here either. A *Rolling Stone* article made the clever comment saying that, "The crime for which John Lennon was convicted in London in 1968 would not even land him in a New York jail."⁴⁹ Also, the wording of the US immigration law was very broad. Wildes argued that the purpose of the law was to keep out traffickers and not punish the occasional pot smoker.

There were also suspicious grounds surrounding how the cannabis resin was found in Lennon's apartment. At the time of the bust, Lennon and Ono were on a specific diet and not ingesting any drugs at all. They were tipped off by a newspaper friend that a raid was planned and gave their apartment a very thorough cleaning. The arresting officer testified he found the drug in Lennon's binocular case but Lennon claimed from the beginning that the drug had been planted. After the arrest, it became well known that the arresting officer had a reputation for "zealousness" in finding drugs in musician's homes. Ironically, and much to the benefit of Lennon's defense, the arresting officer was arrested himself and charged with perjury and conspiracy "to pervert the course of justice."

The last piece of information surrounding Lennon's conviction that allowed Wildes to argue in defense was that cannabis resin was not marijuana. Wildes called Dr. Lester Grinspoon to testify about the drug. He was a professor at Harvard Medical School and wrote a book on

⁴⁹ "John's Legal Case: Few Options Left," *Rolling Stone*, 29 August 1974, 9.

marijuana and knew all there was to know about the drug and the products it derived from.⁵⁰ He simply said that cannabis resin was not marijuana and in fact it was not even a narcotic drug. Because of this testimony, Mr. Wildes argued that the immigration law should be narrowly interpreted mainly because it contained no definition of narcotics or marijuana. Lennon's conviction had nothing to do with marijuana or narcotic and because the immigration law said nothing about hashish or cannabis resin, his conviction did not fall under it.

Lennon, Ono and their lawyers would spend the next four years trying to prove that the Nixon administration and the INS were trying to silence his anti-war, radical political views and with help from the media and public outcries, they eventually succeeded.

⁵⁰ Hertzberg, "A Reporter At Large," 150.

The Media's Significant Influence

John Lennon was a very famous person in the 1970s mainly due to his former membership in the Beatles. Many people admired him and were still star-struck when he was seen in public. When the press reported that the government was trying to deport Lennon and Ono only a few sources were reporting it and it was just the bare basics of the case. Once a few newspapers and magazines began leaking government secrets. Certain publications took a different approach towards investigative journalism and started investigating and reporting the controversial aspects of the hearings. The media was beginning to be very influential around the time of Lennon's deportation hearing as the public was becoming more aware of government overstepping their boundaries.

Media coverage began to change in mid to late 1972. The *Post* was beginning to investigate and report on the Watergate scandal by mid-1972. Lennon's hearings began before Watergate broke and the *Post* began investigating.⁵¹ This could explain why the media coverage of Lennon's case started out slow. As the *Post* publicly pieced together the Watergate scandal on the front page almost daily beginning in October of 1972, other media sources began piecing together the Lennon case with the *New Yorker* printing an article on December 9, 1972 implicating the Nixon administration had some role in the case. The *New York Times* also played a significant role in Lennon's case by reporting the facts but also eventually reporting the political aspects of the case. The *NTY* did not take as an aggressive role in investigating Lennon's case as the *Post* did with Watergate, but the *NYT* did not hesitate to make the political motivation behind Lennon's attempted deportation known once it was discovered. Having a mainstream daily newspaper with a reputation like the *New York Times* so involved in reporting

⁵¹ See Appendix.

on Lennon's case helped to pressure the government as more and more of the public was discovering the scandalous tactics of the Nixon administration.⁵² The *Rolling Stone* took a similarly aggressive stance on the Lennon case as the *Post* did with Watergate. *Rolling Stone* adopted the new investigative journalism trend in publicizing government evidence before anyone could destroy it. Together *Rolling Stone's* and the *Post* formed a new standard for all media and their responsibility to the American public. Thus, as stated in the introduction, the media was a key factor in Lennon's victory over the INS.

Coverage Begins

March 6, 1972 was the day that the INS refused to renew the Lennon's visas. The first hearing followed on March 16. The *New York Times* came out with a "Notes on People" piece on March 17 that basically informed people of the trial and what the government's argument was for not renewing their visas.⁵³ John Lennon, a former Beatle, was featured on page 47 of the *NYT*, one of the most read papers in the country. That publication sent a feeling of non-importance for the deportation announcement. It was good publicity for the case but the article lacked emotion and urgency. The article was three average paragraphs long surrounded by news about other well-known people. It did include a picture of Lennon and Ono after the trial talking to the news. Lennon was quoted as saying by the author, "New York is the center of the earth" in his explanation on why he and his wife were going to fight the deportation.⁵⁴ The main argument for the government was Lennon's drug conviction in 1968 in London. Ono also included information about the search for her daughter and why they were so desperate to stay in

⁵² From 1972 to 1976 the *New York Times* printed nineteen articles.

⁵³ Albin Krebs, "Notes on People: Lennon's Love U.S.," *New York Times*, 17 March 1972, 47.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 47.

the United States but they quickly commented that even if it was not for Kyoko they would want to stay here because they love it so much.⁵⁵

The first piece of news that addressed the issue of the government deporting Lennon because of political differences came on April 29, 1972 in the *NYT* article by David Bird entitled “Lindsay Deplores Action to Deport Lennons as a ‘Grave Injustice’”.⁵⁶ Mayor Lindsay of New York had written a letter to the INS calling the deportation hearings against the Lennons as a “grave injustice.” Lindsay directly addressed the deportation as an “unusual and harsh action.” Lindsay also cites their artist influence on New York City and America as a country and for that alone, they should be allowed to stay. John Hendrix, a friend of the Lennons and also head of the newly formed National Committee for John and Yoko, made very profound statements in this article as well; he said that government was “trying to throw John and Yoko out of this country for more than a 1968 marijuana conviction that John had.”⁵⁷ He continued to say that the real reason for the department was Lennon and Ono’s “antiwar stand, their ability to affect the thinking of youth and their support of unpopular beliefs.”⁵⁸ In a heartwarming comment from Ono the paper quoted her, “I still believe in America, in American justice and the American people...” She did a superb job of trying to win over the American people. Only a person truly in love with a country that was trying to deport her would still say she believed in that country and their justice system even though she was suffering a great injustice.

The *Post* printed an article on the same day that featured much of the same information.⁵⁹ The *Post* cleverly quoted Lennon saying, “The only thing we’ve ever said is just what Mr. Nixon

⁵⁵ Krebs, “Notes on People,”47.

⁵⁶ David Bird, “Lindsay Deplores Action to Deport Lennons as a ‘Grave Injustice,’” *New York Times*, 29 April 1972, 33.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 33

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁵⁹ Tom Zito, “Lennons: Urgency, Frivolity,” *Washington Post*, 29 April 1972, C1.

said on television the other night: ‘Give peace a chance.’”⁶⁰ Similar to the *NYT* article, the Post linked political motivation to the deportation of the Lennons. They went as far to print a quote from Rev. Frederick Douglass Kirkpatrick, a member of the National Committee for John and Yoko, “...The reason they’re trying to run John and Yoko out of the country is because these two people are telling truths that are opening the eyes of the public—particularly regarding the war in Southeast Asia.”⁶¹ Two mainstream newspapers with upstanding reputations had now reported the rumor of political activity behind the attempted ousting of Lennon and Ono.

Curiously, after Mayor Lindsay’s, Hendrix’s and Rev. Kirkpatrick’s statements about the government’s actions against Lennon and Ono, news of the government’s real reasons were not discussed for another month despite hearings being held. Although, during this quiet news month, people began writing in protest of the deportation. “Love It and Leave It” was the title of an article in the *New York Times* on May 2, 1972.⁶² In this article, the author (whose name is not known) compares the Lennon case to that of Charlie Chaplin from two decades ago.⁶³ The author cleverly says that in the years to come the government won’t even remember why they deported Lennon in the first place. Not afraid to discuss the controversy, the author also clearly states doubt as to why the government says they are deporting Lennon, “but there are grounds for suspicion that Mr. Lennon is being considered *persona non grata* because of his unconventional

⁶⁰ Zito, “Lennons: Urgency, Frivolity,” C5.

⁶¹ Ibid, C5.

⁶² “Love It and Leave It,” *New York Times*, 2 May 1972, 42.

⁶³ Charlie Chaplin was a British comedian, producer, writer, director and composer. He toured the United States beginning in 1913 with a performing ensemble. He soon started acting in silent films. Chaplin’s private life caused controversy in the United States. In the early 1950s J. Edgar Hoover’s FBI created a 2,000 page file on Chaplin and his supposed leftist views. Although the FBI found no evidence of his ever being involved with the Communist Party or participating in any other treasonous activity, in 1952, en route to London for the premiere of his last American film, he was notified that the attorney general revoked his re-entry visa. Chaplin came to deplore the United States but in 1972 the animosity between Chaplin and the United States subsided and he was returned to Hollywood to accept a special Academy Award.

views and radical statements.”⁶⁴ This is the second outcry of objection from the public that would soon help Lennon.

“Ballad of John and Yoko: They’ll Hear the News Today” was printed in the *Washington Post* on May 12.⁶⁵ The most fascinating portion of the article was Lennon’s attorney Leon Wildes’ comments on the trial and behavior of the prosecution. Wildes stated that there were a number of irregularities in the way the government chose to remove the Lennons.⁶⁶ He included one example of how three immigration officers served the Lennons with their notice to leave at their apartment; this was very unusual. Wildes said he had never seen a case handled like this, especially how “everything [was] hush-hush secret like [he] was dealing with the mafia.”⁶⁷ He said he contacted Sol Marks, head of the INS office in New York, and Marks said that Wildes was going to get in trouble no matter what he did in the case and when Wildes asked why, Marks responded that he could not go into it and Wildes would not want to press the issue. Wildes’ response to this interaction was quoted in the *Post*, “it was pretty clear to me that the shots were being called in Washington.”⁶⁸

The *Post* had another influential story on May 13.⁶⁹ The article, written by Tom Zito, reports on the May 12 deportation hearing; the hearing was composed of character witnesses attesting to Lennon and Ono’s positive involvement in the community and artistic scene. Probably one of the most important pieces of evidence throughout all the hearings was Dr. Lester Grinspoon’s testimony. A psychiatrist and Harvard professor, Dr. Grinspoon also authored “Marijuana Reconsidered” which confirmed the fact that cannabis resin was neither a narcotic

⁶⁴ “Love It and Leave It,” 42.

⁶⁵ Stephen Isaacs, “Ballad of John and Yoko: They’ll Hear the News Today,” *Washington Post*, 12 May 1972, B1.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, B1.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, B5.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, B1.

⁶⁹ Tom Zito, “Little Green Card Buys Time for the Lennons,” *Washington Post*, 13 May 1972, B1.

nor marijuana.⁷⁰ This piece of information would be repeated in the press and the hearings for the rest of battle.

May 18, 1972 the *New York Times* printed an article describing the desperation in Lennon and Ono's voice and demeanor at the conclusion of the May 17 hearing.⁷¹ The *Chicago Tribune* printed a very similar article that quoted Lennon, as did the *NYT*, saying, "I don't know if there's any mercy to plead for because this isn't a Federal court, but if there is, I'd like it please."⁷² The *New York Times* printed another article that went into depth about other issues other than the specific hearing like the *Chicago Tribune* does on May 21.⁷³ The *NYT* calls attention to the fact that even if the people being deported were not famous people, such as Lennon and Ono that this case still calls for considerable attention as a challenge to the American immigration laws.⁷⁴

The previous two months were full of deportation hearings which presented character witnesses for the couple. Every one of them attested to the "valuable gift to this country" that the Lennons were. The government's lawyer Vincent Schiano claimed that it did not matter whether or not the government liked Lennon and Ono but that they should be deported on the grounds of Lennon's drug conviction. He goes further to say that "the law is not discretionary." But Lennon's supporters begged to differ; they were still saying that he was being persecuted for his nonconformity and antiwar efforts.⁷⁵

Compared to the following months of coverage, the first three months the media did not have a profound impact on public sentiment. The story was made public and it was framed in political motivation but the evidence was not there. Sources were just beginning to come out

⁷⁰ Zito, "Little Green Card Buys Time for the Lennons," B1.

⁷¹ "Lennon Makes Plea at Close of Hearings," *New York Times*, 18 May 1972, 27.

⁷² "Lennons Plead for U.S. Mercy," *Chicago Tribune*, 18 May 1972, A10.

⁷³ Grace Lichtenstein, "John and Yoko: 'If There's Mercy, I'd Like it Please,'" 21 May 1972, E11.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, E11.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, E11.

with the idea that Lennon's political actions were the reason behind the deportation hearings; Nixon did not want Lennon to influence people to at the Republican National Convention so the only solution, in the administration's mind, was to deport the problem. It would later come out to the public that many senators, whom supported Nixon, took a direct action in getting the deportation proceedings rolling. Secrets were beginning to slip out during the hearings and the press took it upon themselves to report these to the public in trend of investigative reporting. The coverage would get more aggressive in the coming months; Watergate was broken into in June 1972 and by October the press was linking the government to the burglars.

In June the press brought more of a demand for the American people to show their support for John Lennon. Ralph Gleason, co-founder of *Rolling Stone*, seriously objected to the lack of support the Lennon's had received thus far in his column.⁷⁶ He took this opportunity to literally rant and rave on paper. Gleason was disgusted, to say the least, with the people's response, both famous and not famous. He begins his article, as did an article in the *NYT*, comparing Lennon's case to that of Chaplin.⁷⁷ Gleason claimed the radio waves were full of people that owed their existence to or the opportunity to do their "thing" to Lennon; he followed his comment with this profound question "And what I want to know is where the hell is everybody?"⁷⁸ He said the telegraph and post office should be full of people writing and responding to the unfortunate actions of the government against Lennon. Gleason makes one of the most outspoken statements made so far and maybe throughout the entire proceedings when he said, "Of course we all know that John Lennon represents considerably less of a threat to the United States than Richard Nixon does...the Establishment is exercising selective enforcement

⁷⁶ Ralph J. Gleason, "Perspectives: Fair Play for John and Yoko," *Rolling Stone*, 22 June, 1972, 34.

⁷⁷ See note 63.

⁷⁸ Gleason, "Perspectives," *Rolling Stone*, 34.

of a special restrictive piece of legislation.”⁷⁹ He continued to discuss how other Beatles were also caught with marijuana but they were not having any trouble with the authorities; they also were not speaking out against the war and organizing anti-Nixon rallies.

Gleason was the first person and one of the only, to come out and say specifically Nixon was behind this and with pressure and letters from some “old buddies” Lennon was now being thrown out of the country. He concludes his article saying that there is not one artist in the Billboard Top 200 albums that should not be picketing the INS or writing letters and campaigning for Lennon’s behalf.

This piece in *Rolling Stone* had huge impact. If a person did not read this issue or this article, they would have seen it referenced in the next *Rolling Stone*⁸⁰ or in *Billboard*⁸¹.

Gleason’s article received much written response. Phil Spector, a well known music producer, agreed completely with Gleason, in his letter to the editor of *Rolling Stone* days after Gleason’s article appeared, saying how sickening it was to see the lack of support especially from fellow artists.⁸² Spector said that if after reading Gleason’s article people still were not motivated or inspired to write and support the Lennons that the United States really was in worse shape than he had imagined, using a quote from Gleason. The *Billboard* article was not as profound but it was still publicity and response to Gleason. It quotes much of what Gleason said but this article reached those people that *Rolling Stone* did not as it had a different target audience; it also gave the information about the committees and organizations that were formed to support the Lennons and how to write to them.

⁷⁹ Gleason, “Perspectives,” *Rolling Stone*, 34.

⁸⁰ Phil Spector, “Editorial,” *Rolling Stone*, 6 July 1972,

⁸¹ “Committies, Gleason Aid Lennons’ Deport Fight,” *Billboard*, 10 June 1972,

⁸² Spector, “Editorial”

The deportation decision was delayed because the government was awaiting a transcript of the May 17 hearing before it submitted its brief and the Special Inquiry Officer overseeing the hearings, Ira Fieldsteel, was going to be away for the month of August. Because of this long delay the media was relatively quiet on the issue.

The coverage of the hearings was spreading by late 1972. December 9, 1972 brought a very informative piece to the press. Hendrik Hertzberg wrote the longest article on John and the hearings yet in the *New Yorker*.⁸³ The *New Yorker* was another mainstream publication that came out in defense of Lennon. For anyone that had somehow missed what was going on and was unaware of the proceedings and what had occurred, it was a fabulous summary of the Lennon's struggle. It started with a basic complete history of Lennon and Ono's life together and their political statements including the bed-ins and John Sinclair benefit concert. It mentioned their friendship with many of the Chicago Seven, including Jerry Rubin. Hertzberg's article described the battle Ono was going through with her ex-husband to gain custody of her daughter and how imperative it was to stay in the US because of that. The article also told of Lennon's drug conviction in London and the very suspicious details that surrounded it. Towards the end of the article Hertzberg divulges into the theories of Lennon's political activism as the reason for deportation. He quotes Mayor Lindsay's powerful statement in a letter read at the May 17 hearing,

The only question which is raised against these people is that they do speak out with strong and critical voices on major issues of the day. If this is the motive underlying the unusual and harsh action taken by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, then it is an attempt to silence Constitutionally protected First Amendment rights.⁸⁴

⁸³ Hertzberg, "A Reporter At Large," 138.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 156.

Hertzberg had the opportunity to talk to Mr. Marks, the New York District director of the Immigration Service, and he said that Ono's application for permanent residence will most likely be approved and in actuality, he is now not so sure it was a good idea to try and deport her in the first place, "We may have acted a bit hastily on that one," Marks had recently told Hertzberg.⁸⁵ He reports that the deportation hearings frightened the Lennons as they chose to refrain from political activity somewhat. Hertzberg also talked to other immigration lawyers that worked with Mr. Marks in the past and they reported that his approach to Lennon's case was uncharacteristic of him and he believed that he had some serious guidance from his superiors in the Department of Justice and Nixon administration.⁸⁶

Hertzberg not only brought all the information on the trial together in one article, he also implicated Nixon as a conspirator just as Gleason did. This article being printed in the *New Yorker* was widely read and distributed so it reached many people. The more information that came out about Nixon's administration pushing for the deportation on Lennon and reasons for it, the more people wrote.

Even though 1972 was a mildly quiet year for the media, in 1973 it would grow dramatically. The year 1973 was a significant year for the Watergate case as well. Previously in October 1972, the *Post* linked the break-in to the White House, now in early 1973 the administration was beginning to crack due to a grand jury probe led by Judge Sirica. A cover-up had been formulated by paying the burglars and others involved "hush money" to keep silent about the depth of White House involvement.⁸⁷ Some of the President's men lost confidence that the cover-up would hold up and began looking for ways to save themselves. Congress had

⁸⁵ Hertzberg, "A Reporter At Large," 158.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 162.

⁸⁷ Jacqueline Jones, et. al. *Created Equal: A Social and Political History of the United States* (New York: Longman, 2003) 908.

initiated their own televised investigation in front of a national audience. In July 1973 it was discovered that the oval office had a built-in tape recorder that had recorded all previous conversations.⁸⁸ These tapes were subpoenaed by Congress and the Special Prosecutor. In response, Nixon fired the Special Prosecutor on October 20, which became known as the “Saturday Night Massacre.” The impeachment investigation began the next day. The media’s support of Lennon grew rapidly when the Watergate connections to the government and their abuses were revealed. The Watergate scandal contributed to a growing and widespread disenchantment with government authority. Americans already felt betrayed by President Johnson and then Nixon as they believed that American soldiers were dying in vain in Vietnam.⁸⁹ With the *Post* deep into the investigation of Watergate, *Rolling Stone* took on an investigation of their own into the Lennon deportation and would soon print devastating evidence. All it took was one or two articles that dug deeper into the case for people to pay attention.

March 23, 1973 the INS ordered Lennon to leave the country within sixty days or face deportation while Ono was granted permanent residency. The *New York Times* printed an article that discussed Lennon’s appeal of the court order.⁹⁰ Lennon called the ruling “strange and not humane.” Lennon and Ono thought it was ironic because the Texas court that was ruled on the custody of Ono’s daughter Kyoko mentioned Lennon as part of what found Ono’s household proper. In the article, Wildes explains their basis for appealing; one reason was that the INS should have found a “humanitarian solution to a human problem” of searching for Kyoko. The second basis was that Lennon was denied due process because the British conviction would not even hold up in American court and that the British arresting officer had been charged with

⁸⁸ Jones, et. al. *Created Equal*, 908.

⁸⁹ Jones, et. al. *Created Equal*, 833.

⁹⁰ Laurie Johnson, “Lennon sees a Wide Impact in Ouster,” *New York Times*, 3 April 1973, 40.

perjury and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice!⁹¹ A third basis was that the law that Lennon was deportable under specifies illicit possession of narcotic drugs or marijuana and does not mention either hashish or cannabis resin. An expert witness testified earlier in the hearings that hashish was not marijuana and that any language used by Congress should be strictly interpreted and any doubt should be resolved in favor of the alien. The article quoted Wildes at a news conference, “The Immigration Service says it must deport Lennon because of a technicality, so let’s get technical about cannabis resin, too—even if Congress forgot about it and left it out of the statute.” He continued to cite another case of his; another client was sworn in yesterday after “another technicality.” His marijuana conviction in Australia was found to be for use, not possession and use is not mentioned in the immigration law.

All three bases for appeal further support the government’s desire to kick Lennon out for his political views. Wildes proved that the INS was getting technical and trying to find a possible reason to kick him out, so that is exactly what they did as well. Wildes’ other case supported this claim; his other client had *used* marijuana so he could clearly not be a trafficker, but how could Lennon be a trafficker if he did not even know it was in his possession?

Appearing in the *NYT* a day later was a brief but very interesting article.⁹² This piece raised two separate issues concerning law and justice within Lennon’s case. The first issue was the basic fairness of the law under which Lennon had been ordered to leave. Strict enforcement of drug trafficking were obviously desirable but the “self-enforcing statutes” which prevent humane judgments reduced the judicial process. The inflexibility of the law did not allow any mercy even if a judge felt mercy was in order. The second issue was whether or not the law was being used to penalize Lennon for his political views. These inflexible laws can easily be turned

⁹¹ Johnson, “Lennon sees a Wide Impact in Ouster,” 40.

⁹² “The Lennon Case,” *New York Times*, 4 April 1973, 42.

into convenient tools of political persecution and it was known that the Nixon administration did not think too fondly on Lennon's antiwar actions. The author clearly states that the laws should not be bent for celebrities but the laws should not be abused into tools of political persecution.

A Change In Support

Rolling Stone reported a change in support for John on April 26, 1973.⁹³ It stated that the couple was now being supported by an ironic new group of people. The idea that the court was in effect forcing the separation of a married couple caused more conservative people to come out in protest. The *Wall Street Journal* called the situation intolerable because they were forcing Ono to choose between abandoning her daughter or live away from her husband. They even went as far to say that Lennon's presence in the US was a danger to no one.⁹⁴ Ironically, the *Wall Street Journal* article begins by acknowledging the fact that they seldom considered themselves apologists for the counterculture. This statement demonstrates how monumental their new support for Lennon's case really was; these conservatives were typically the people that supported Nixon. The article said that people changed their view, which originally looked at their politics, lifestyle and naked album covers to now thinking what a horrible thing it was to split a married couple up.⁹⁵ The conservative crowd also objected because both husband and wife must stay in the country in order to Ono to maintain custody of Kyoko. In the final paragraph of *Rolling Stone* the article it mentions how another long shot for Lennon would be a modification to the immigration laws; and once again the *Wall Street Journal* came out in

⁹³ "Music: John and Yoko Fight Deportation Decision," *Rolling Stone*, 26 April 1973, 10.

⁹⁴ "Re John and Yoko," *Wall Street Journal*, 28 March 1973, 18.

⁹⁵ Referring to the album cover of *Two Virgins* that first got the FBI's attention in 1968.

support of that saying, “if the law does not reflect the human equities, it is the law that needs to be changed.”⁹⁶

The support of the conservative side proved that the media was having an impact on people’s opinions and the case itself. In 1973 the conservatives were very influential; Nixon had just won re-election. The fact that the INS and Nixon administration was being so inhumane, separating a husband and wife, and potentially ruining a chance for a mother to be reunited with her daughter, was enough to get people on all political sides in an uproar. The media was successful and eventually enough would come out to help Lennon stay permanently.

Another Ralph Gleason article appeared in *Rolling Stone* on May 10, 1973.⁹⁷ This Gleason piece emphasized the issue of selective enforcement. He describes it simply, “It is the device by which they bust the guy they are looking for on whatever they can find to bust him on.” That perfectly explains Lennon’s case. Many other people, including famous musicians, including other ex-Beatles had been caught with marijuana but were not politically active and they had no problems whatsoever. Once again, Gleason blamed Nixon for these deportation actions. He said it was the people from “King Richard” on down who set the tone of the administration and of the law in the country at the current time. Despite his emotional outcry in June of 1972 for public support, Gleason claimed that hardly anyone had come out in support still of Lennon and Ono. And especially no rock star had come out publicly in support. It did not matter if he supported him privately; the Lennons needed the publicized support so for once the government would be the pressured one.

John Lennon would come back with a court case of his own against the United States Government in October of ’73. The *NYT* published an article outlining Lennon’s case against the

⁹⁶ “Re John and Yoko,”18.

⁹⁷ Ralph Gleason, “Perspectives: Dealing with Watergate and the Lennon Case,” *Rolling Stone*, 10 May 1973, 7.

government.⁹⁸ Lennon demanded that the government admit or deny whether he and his lawyer had been the victims of illegal wiretaps or surveillance. The papers filed in Federal Court claimed that the alleged wiretaps had been used by the governments and that these acts resulted in the prejudgment of Lennon's application for residency. This case showed the public that Lennon too knew something was not right. He wanted to prove that the government had been watching his political activity and had prejudged his case without hearing testimony.

The Memo

In July 1974, the Board of Immigration Appeals ordered Lennon to leave the country by September 8 or face deportation, again. *Rolling Stone* explained on October 10, Lennon launched a countersuit of his own; his suit was based on three points: illegal government surveillance, prejudice on the part of the INS officials and Lennon's being denied constitutional rights guaranteed under the First, Fourth and Fifth Amendments.⁹⁹ The most significant part of this *Rolling Stone* article was the published evidence of a memo sent to then Attorney General John Mitchell regarding John Lennon's political activity. Through this article, the public became aware that late in February 1972 Republican Senator Strom Thurmond sent a note to Mitchell describing Lennon's plan of a massive peace demonstration at the 1972 Republican convention in San Diego.¹⁰⁰ Ironically, Lennon's immigration problem began the next week.¹⁰¹ This document discussed Lennon's relationships with Jerry Rubin and John Sinclair and their commitments to anti-war movements that were highly political and unfavorable to the present Nixon administration. The memo continued to say that because of the explosive nature of the

⁹⁸ "Lennon Sues Government, Alleging Illegal Wiretaps," *New York Times*, 25 October 1973, 53.

⁹⁹ Joel Siegel, "Lennon: Back in the U.S.S.A.," *Rolling Stone*, 10 October 1974, 11.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

problem it had been handed over to the INS to handle and requested that the office to which it was addressed keep constant surveillance of the subject and report back.¹⁰² Of course, the INS denied any knowledge of the document. Lennon acquired the memo through a former New York City narcotics officer.

This was the first *real* evidence of political persecution and it was huge. After *Rolling Stone* published that article, more articles like it poured out of the media. The political side of the deportation hearings was hard to miss now. Investigative journalism had broken the Watergate case wide open by the time of the evidence of a Thurmond memo was printed in *Rolling Stone*. By the end of July 1974 Congress had passed all three articles of impeachment of President Nixon. In the beginning of August the government released the public three recordings of presidential conversations regarding the cover-up of Watergate. Nixon resigned the Office of President on August 9, 1974. Building off the momentum from Watergate, *Rolling Stone* breaking the Lennon case wide open as well. After Watergate was exposed it was much easier to accuse the government of abuse of powers and convince the American public of the abuses.

Rolling Stone followed up their influential article from October 10 with another on December 5, 1974. The title basically said it all “Justice for a Beatle: The Illegal Plot to Prosecute and Oust John Lennon.”¹⁰³ Treen, author of “Justice for a Beatle” revealed the government’s original intentions to have a big political trial. Schiano, the prosecuting attorney was smart though, he said that would be a disaster and would only produce ill feelings among the American public, especially young people.¹⁰⁴ Schiano said it would be a “snap” to kick Lennon out because either he had a criminal record or he did not. The article conveyed the intense

¹⁰² Siegel, “Lennon: Back in the U.S.S.A.,” 11.

¹⁰³ Joe Treen, “Justice for a Beatle: The Illegal Plot to Prosecute and Oust John Lennon,” *Rolling Stone*, 5 December 1974, 9.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

pressure Marks, New York district director of the INS, was under to kick Lennon out. Marks was actually interviewed for the article and answered questions freely until he was asked if either Farrell or Greene, two men above in the in the INS, called the shots in the Lennon case. Marks answered, “Well, this is something that I will withhold comment on.”¹⁰⁵ Treen explained the intense pressure Marks was under through Lennon’s argument that Marks was not allowed to exercise the discretion of his office and therefore denying Lennon due process of law. In essence, Marks was not allowed to consider the many possibilities that would allow Lennon to stay in the country as an artist, head of a large corporation or under non-priority status for humanitarian reasons; instead he was only allowed to throw Lennon out.¹⁰⁶

December 16, 1974 *Chicago Tribune* printed an article titled “Deportation effort: Politics charged in Lennon case.”¹⁰⁷ This article explicitly said that there were growing indications that the INS responded to political pressure in deciding to push the case against Lennon. Court records showed that there were 118 other offenders with much more serious narcotic backgrounds that had been permitted to stay in the country. How could the government deny this once it was publicized? This article continues on what *Rolling Stone* said that Immigration’s intense interest in Lennon began when it was informed that he was planning to appear at the Republican convention. The *Chicago Tribune* said that Thurmond’s memo made its way through the Justice Department and INS to the director of service’s New York office with stern orders to revoke Lennon’s visitor’s visa immediately.¹⁰⁸

Once this information came out, people began changing their minds including influential Congressman. In the January 30, 1975 edition of *Rolling Stone* it said that Congressman

¹⁰⁵ Treen, “Justice for a Beatle,” 17.

¹⁰⁶ Treen, “Justice for a Beatle,” 17.

¹⁰⁷ “Deportation: Politics charged in Lennon case,” *Chicago Tribune*, 16 December 1974, 8.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

Norman Lent, a Republican from New York, sent a letter to President Ford asking Ford to intervene between Lennon and the INS.¹⁰⁹ Lent suggested “that the president waive deportation and remove the obstacles to his becoming a permanent resident alien.”¹¹⁰ Lent originally became involved because of the urging of a constituent that was disgusted with the government. Lent added that many of the Congressman he “hobnobs” with felt that Lennon had made a very strong case for himself. Another Congressman, Edward Koch, tried to have the law changed to allow the attorney general the privilege of waiving exclusion for people convicted of marijuana possession. This bill ironically seemed to fit Lennon’s case perfectly.

The public support of Congressmen, especially Republican Congressmen, was just what Lennon needed at this point. People in government that supported him and were fighting for him within the system benefited Lennon greatly. Two weeks later, Lennon won the right to question the Department of Justice.

Rolling Stone on February 13, 1975 announced to the American people that Lennon had won the ability to investigate the justice department.¹¹¹ US District Court ruled that Lennon would be able to question federal officials, be permitted to see the immigration files and have a chance to prove the Watergate connection in the Lennon deportation case. The big three officials Lennon was hoping to examine were Schiano, Marks and Greene.¹¹² These were the three men that instructions were given to and they carried out. This was a very significant moment in the case because Lennon and his lawyers could finally find out what actually happened inside those government walls and files.

¹⁰⁹ “Random Notes,” *Rolling Stone*, 30 January 1975, 22.

¹¹⁰ “Ibid., 22.

¹¹¹ Joe Treen, “Lennon Wins Right to Quiz Justice Dept.,” *Rolling Stone*, 13 February 1975, 12.

¹¹² Schiano was the prosecuting attorney, Marks was the New York district director of the Immigration Services and Greene was INS commissioner’s assistant that dealt directly with the case.

On July 31, 1975 *Rolling Stone* went public with Strom Thurmond's memo regarding Lennon and his plans for a peace rally.¹¹³ After Lennon questioned the Justice Department, he filed a suit in Federal Court which charges that the deportation actions directed against him were improper. In the article Wildes agrees that the government had "selectively prosecuted and prejudged" Lennon's case and that the deportation proceedings that been initiated for political rather than immigration reasons.¹¹⁴ As with previous *Rolling Stone* articles, this one continued discussing Thurmond's February 1972 memo; this added it would have been a counter-measure to Lennon's peace plans for the convention to have Lennon's visa terminated.¹¹⁵ Thurmond responded to this with the comment, "This appears to me to be an important matter and I think it would be well for it to be considered at the highest level. As I can see, many headaches might be avoided if appropriate action can be taken in time."¹¹⁶ Further investigation of paper work discovered correspondence between officials wondering if they had any basis to deport him on and that is where the drug conviction came into play. According to this article, the government was breaking down.

Conclusion

On October 7, 1975 a major court decision was given barring the United States immigration officials from deporting Lennon for a marijuana conviction in Britain. After more than three years of fighting that conviction, Lennon finally won. The presiding judge made a profound statement regarding the proceedings, "the courts will not condone selective deportation

¹¹³ Chet Flippo, "Lennon's Lawsuit: Memo From Thurmond," *Rolling Stone*, 31 July 1975, 16.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹¹⁵ *Rolling Stone* printed the exact memo in the article.

¹¹⁶ Flippo, "Lennon's Lawsuit." 16.

based upon secret political grounds,” reported the *New York Times* on October 8 1975.¹¹⁷ The decision mainly came from publicized government documents that indicated the Nixon administration started deportation proceedings against Lennon in fear that he would make appearances in the US promoting opposition to the then President Nixon.

On July 27, 1976 John Lennon was given his green card for permanent residency. By this time, it had become public that the Nixon administration circulated memoranda clearly identifying Lennon as a dangerous political enemy and that it was thought he was financing groups that intended to disrupt the 1972 Republican National Convention.

The press publicized many of the government’s secrets surrounding Lennon’s deportation case. They published the memo that began the whole ordeal, which originated with southern Republican senators, and proceeded to explore the details that did not make sense. The government’s makeshift reasons for deporting Lennon were proven false. The media informed the people of what its government was doing to a fellow New Yorker and appropriately, the people reacted with anger and much support for Lennon.

Investigative journalism was a significant influence over the 1970s; Watergate had been uncovered much due to the *Washington Post* and their innovative journalists just as John Lennon’s deportation proceedings were defeated with the help from the *Rolling Stone* and their initiative to print the Thurmond memo. Watergate and Lennon’s hearings mirrored each other in numerous ways; Nixon’s abuses of power were exercised in both instances, the press took an aggressive stance against the government and they took the initiative to print evidence thus bringing it into public eye. The Nixon period in history resulted in the change from healthy skepticism to unhealthy cynicism on the part of the press. Investigative reporting would become

¹¹⁷ Arnold H. Lubasch, “Deportation of Lennon Barred by Court of Appeals,” *New York Times*, 8 October 1975, 42.

common among journalists and reporters but it was never carried out to the quality or care it was during the early 1970s.¹¹⁸

The significant coverage of Lennon's hearings did not start right away in March 1972. It took a few months for the press to build the story and eventually connect the deportation to political origins but by the end of the hearings in July 1976, the press had built a strong case against the government and even provided solid evidence to prove it.

The Watergate break-in was proven to be only one-step in Nixon's broader campaign of illegal warfare against his political opponents. Vietnam, Watergate and Lennon's deportation combined poisoned American politics by the use of government's powerful executive branch to undermine mainstream opposition and anyone else who challenged his position.¹¹⁹

On January 1, 1976 *Rolling Stone* printed a very powerful piece in their editorial section. This piece proved how powerful the media could be and how it really did have an impact on Lennon's victory over the INS. The author of the submission was John Lennon himself. In brief four or so lines, he thanked *Rolling Stone* and its readers for their unwavering support. He even went as far to say that he could not have done it without them. Even John Lennon realized how important and influential the media could be when it came out to support him.

¹¹⁸ Liebovich, *Richard Nixon, Watergate and the Press*, 71.

¹¹⁹ Jones, et. al. *Created Equal*, 907.

Appendix I: Chronology

Many dates and events came from Wiener's *Come Together* and Woodward and Bernstein's *The Final Days*.

- August 1966: John's "More popular than Jesus" statement and controversy.
- November 5, 1968: Richard Nixon elected President.
- November 11, 1968: John and Yoko's *Two Virgins* cover released.
- March 26, 1969: Lennon's Amsterdam bed event begins.
- May 26-June 3, 1969: Lennon's Montreal bed event and "Give Peace a Chance" is recorded.
- August 1971: John and Yoko leave England and move to New York City.
- December 10, 1971: John and Yoko perform at Free John Sinclair benefit in Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- February 4, 1972: Senator Strom Thurmond suggests in secret memo to Attorney General John Mitchell that Lennon be deported.
- February 14-18, 1972: John and Yoko co-host *Michael Douglas Show*.
- March 6, 1972: INS refuses to renew John's visa
- March 16, 1972: Deportation hearings begin and subsequent hearings are held on April 18, May 12, and May 17.
- April 29, 1972: John claims deportation action based on his antiwar stand and political affiliations.
- June 17, 1972: Five men are arrested in the Democrat's headquarters in Watergate.
- June 20, 1972: Nixon and his campaign manager discuss the arrests. This conversation was not recorded on the automatic taping system. Nixon and his current Chief of Staff also meet to discuss arrests and this conversation has an 18-½ minute gap.
- June 23, 1972: Nixon formulates a plan to have the CIA impede the FBI's investigation of the Watergate break-in.
- September 15, 1972: Five Watergate burglars are indicted on federal charges. Nixon and his counsel meet to discuss.
- November 7, 1972: Nixon re-elected.
- January 8-30, 1973: Trial of Watergate burglars; guilty pleas are entered by all.
- February 27, 1973: Nixon and his counsel meet to discuss the cover-up. This is the first of a series of meetings.

- March 21, 1973: Another meeting between Nixon and his counsel to discuss ways to ensure the continued silence of the burglars and those involved in the cover-up. “Hush money” is introduced.
- March 23, 1973: INS orders John to leave country within sixty days or face deportation; Yoko was granted permanent residency.
- April 2, 1973: Lennon Deportation appeal filed.
- April 15, 1973: Nixon meets with his counsel and asks leading questions which made his counsel think the conversation was being taped. The White House claims no recordings were made and the Dictabelt containing information on the conversation could not be found.
- April 30, 1973: Nixon announces the resignations of Attorney General, Chief of Staff and Assistant to the President for Domestic Staff and the dismissal and White House counsel.
- May 4, 1973: Former White House counsel announces that before leaving the White House he removed certain documents and placed them in a safe-deposit box and he turned the key over to presiding Judge Sirica.
- May 17, 1973: Senate Watergate Committee begins its nationally televised hearings.
- May 22, 1973: Nixon again denies knowledge of the Watergate burglary or cover-up in a 4,000 word statement.
- June 3, 1973: The *New York Times* and *Washington Post* run stories indicating new testimony will accuse the President of participation in the cover-up. Nixon begins listening to taped Oval Office recordings.
- June 29, 1973: John and Yoko attend Watergate hearings.
- July 13, 1973: White House taping system is revealed to Senate Committee.
- July 23, 1973: Special Prosecutor subpoenas recordings of nine presidential conversations and meetings.
- July 25, 1973: President Nixon claims executive privilege and refuses to turn over tapes.
- August 29 1973: Judge rules Nixon must turn over tapes.
- October 17, 1973: John sues INS under Freedom of Information Act seeking evidence of prejudgment and wiretapping.
- October 20, 1973: Nixon fires Special Prosecutor.

October 23, 1973: Forty-four Watergate-related bills are introduced in Congress, 22 call for an impeachment investigation. It is announced that the tapes will be handed over.

October 31, 1973: Lennon's INS appeal hearing held.

November 1973: The missing tapes and 18 ½ minute gap are brought to the courts attention.

March 1, 1974: John moves in US district court for temporary restraining order of INS appeal ruling. Grand jury indicts many former and current government officials and names Nixon an unindicted co-conspirator by grand jury but this information is held secret.

April 29, 1974: Nixon announces he will release edited transcripts of the subpoenaed conversations and make the public. They are released the following day.

May 1, 1974: US district court denies stay of John's INS appeal ruling.

July 17, 1974: INS board denies John's appeal and orders him to leave country within sixty days.

July 24, 1974: Supreme Court rules 8-0 that the President must turn over the 64 tapes sought by the Special Prosecutor.

July 27, 1974: House Judiciary Committee passes first article of impeachment charging the President with obstruction of justice in attempting to cover up Watergate.

July 29, 1974: Second article of impeachment passes.

July 30, 1974: Third and final article of impeachment passes.

August 5, 1974: White House releases transcripts of three conversations with Nixon and his men.

August 8, 1974: Nixon resigns.

November 2, 1974: John sues INS claiming he was victim of political vendetta.

December 5, 1974: *Rolling Stone* prints Thurmond memo and reveals political origins of deportation case.

January 2, 1975: US district court grants John the right to question INS officials and inspect files to seek evidence that he was a victim of political vendetta.

- June 16, 1975: John sues former Attorneys General John Mitchell and Richard Kleindienst and other INS officials claiming their actions against him were improper.
- October 7, 1975: US court of appeals overturns INS deportation order.
- July 27, 1975: INS grants John permanent residency.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anderson, Jack and Les Whitten. "Lennon Affidavit Cites Fear for Ono's Health." *Washington Post*, 4 October 1975.
- Arnonwitz, Al. "Two Questions about Lennon." *Rolling Stone*, 29 August 1974, 9.
- Astrachan, Anthony. "Get Back." *Washington Post*, 24 March 1973.
- Bird, David. "Lindsay Deplores Action to Deport Lennons as a 'Grave Injustice.'" *New York Times*, 29 April 1972, 33.
- Flippo, Chet. "Imagine: John Lennon Legal." *Rolling Stone*, 9 September 1976, 14.
- _____. "Lennon's Lawsuit: Memo for Thurmond." *Rolling Stone*, 31 July 1975, 16.
- Gleason, Ralph J. "Perspectives: Dealing with Watergate and the Lennon Case." *Rolling Stone*, 10 May 1973, 7.
- _____. "Perspectives: Play Fair for John and Yoko." *Rolling Stone*, 22 June 1972, 34.
- Hamill, Pete. "Conversation with John Lennon." *Rolling Stone*, 5 June 1975, 46.
- Hertzberg, Hendrik. "A Reporter At Large: Poetic Larks Bid Bald Eagle Welcome Swan of Liverpool." *New Yorker*, 9 December 1972, 138-162.
- Isaacs, Stephan. "Ballad of John and Yoko: They'll Hear the News Today." *Washington Post*, 12 May 1972, B1.
- Johnston, Laurie. "Lennons Sees a Wide Impact in Ouster." *New York Times*, 3 April 1973, 40.
- Krebs, Albin. "Lennons Love U.S." *New York Times*, 17 March 1972, 47.
- _____. "Lennons' Deportation Hearing is Delayed." *New York Times*, 2 May 1972, 33.
- Lennon, John. "Editorial." *Rolling Stone*, 1 January 1976, 6.
- Lichtenstein, Grace. "John and Yoko: 'If There's Mercy, I'd Like it Please.'" *New York Times*, 21 May 1972, E11.
- Lubasch, Arnold. "Deportation of Lennon Barred by Court of Appeals." *New York Times*, 8 October 1975, 42.

Maitland, Leslie. "John Lennon Wins His Residency in U.S." *New York Times*, 28 July 1976, 16.

Martin, Judith. "Lennon: 'Get Back to Where you...'" *Washington Post*, 18 July 1974, B3.

Siegel, Joel. "Lennon: Back in the U.S.S.A." *Rolling Stone*, 10 October 1974, 11.

Spector, Phil. "Editorial." *Rolling Stone*, 6 July 1972, 6.

Treen, Joe. "Lennon Wins Rights to Quiz Justice Department." *Rolling Stone*, 13 February 1975, 12.

_____. "Lennon Can Stay! Deportation Order Overturned." *Rolling Stone*, 6 November 1975, 10.

_____. "Justice for a Beatle: The Illegal Plot to Prosecute and Oust John Lennon." *Rolling Stone*, 5 December 1974, 9.

Werbin, Stuart. "Music: Lennons Discuss Deportation, Allen Klein, Beatles Reunion." *Rolling Stone*, 10 May 1973, 10.

Zito, Tom. "Lennons: Urgency, Frivolity." *Washington Post*, 29 April 1972, C1.

_____. "Lennon: Now It Looks as Though He's Here to Stay..." *Washington Post*, 28 July 1976, B1.

_____. "Little Green Card Buys Time for Lennons." *Washington Post*, 13 May 1972, B1.

_____. "The Lennon Case." *Washington Post*, 18 May 1972, C1.

"Back Where you Belong." *New York Times*, 8 April 1973, 239.

"Committees, Gleason Aid Lennons' Deport Fight." *Billboard*, 10 June 1972.

"Deportation effort: Politics Charged in Lennon Case." *Chicago Tribune*, 16 December 1974, 8.

Federal Investigation Bureau. John Lennon file.

"Impending Fatherhood Stays Lennon Ouster." *New York Times*, 24 September 1975, 41.

"John's Legal Case: Few Options Left." *Rolling Stone*, 29 August 1974, 9.

"Lennons Win a Skirmish in Battle to Remain in U.S." *New York Times*, 3 May 1972, 14.

"Lennon Makes Plea at Close of Hearing." *New York Times*, 18 May 1972, 27.

"Lennons Plead for U.S. Mercy." *Chicago Tribune*, 18 May 1972, A10.

“Lennons Sues Government, Alleging Illegal Wiretaps.” *New York Times*, 25 October, 1973, 53.

“Love it and Leave it.” *New York Times*, 2 May 1972, 42.

“Music: John and Yoko Fight Deportation Decision; Hardhats join Appeal.” *Rolling Stone*, 26 April 1973, 10

“Random Notes.” *Rolling Stone*, 30 January 1975, 22.

“Random Notes.” *Rolling Stone*, 12 February 1976, 22.

“The Lennon Case.” *New York Times*, 4 April 1973, 42.

Secondary Sources

Anson, Robert Sam. *Gone Crazy and Back Again: The Rise and Fall of the Rolling Stone Generation*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc, 1981.

Bernstein, Carl and Bob Woodward. *All the President's Men*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.

_____. *The Final Days*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.

Coleman, Ray. *Lennon: The Definitive Biography*. New York: Harper Collins, 1985.

Davis, Elmer. *History of the New York Times, 1851-1921*. New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1969.

Draper, Robert. *Rolling Stone Magazine: The Uncensored History*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Giuliano, Geoffrey. *Lennon In America 1971-1980, Based in Part on the Lost Lennon Diaries*. New York: Cooper Square Press, 2000.

Jones, Jacqueline and Peter Wood and Thomas Borstelmann and Elaine Tyler May and Vicki L. Ruiz. *Created Equal: A Social and Political History of the United States*. New York: Longman, 2003.

Kane, Larry. *Lennon Revealed*. Philadelphia: Running Press, 2005.

Kane, Perry. *Gimmie Some Truth: The Story of the John Lennon Deportation Case*. Bloomington, IN: 1st Books Library, 2000.

- Lennon, Cynthia. *John*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2005.
- Liebovich, Louis. *Richard Nixon, Watergate and the Press*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.
- Linsky, Martin. *Impact: How the Press Affects Federal Policymaking*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1986.
- Mollenhoff, Clark R. *Investigative Reporting: from the Courthouse to the White House*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1998.
- Paletz, David L. and Robert M. Entman. *Media, Power, Politics*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. 1981.
- Porter, William E. *Assault on the Media: The Nixon Years*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1976.
- Roberts, Chalmers M. *The Washington Post: The First 100 Years*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977.
- Seaman, Frederic. *The Last Days of John Lennon: A Personal Memoir*. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991.
- Wenner, Jann S. *Lennon Remembers*. London: Verso, 2000.
- Wiener, Jon. *Come Together: John Lennon in his Time*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- _____. *Gimmie Some Truth: The John Lennon FBI Files*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Williams, Paul N. *Investigative Reporting and Editing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1978.
- Wolfson, Lewis W. *The Untapped Power of the Press: Explaining Government to the People*. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1985.