

W W BY JNYI OR C 8575

BC-Hoover-Media, 2 Takes, 460-680

With Kennedy Files

By EVANS WITT

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON AP. — FBI documents released Wednesday show the late FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover was extremely concerned about news coverage of the investigation of the Kennedy assassination.

Hoover's concern was reflected in efforts to sway editorial opinion and efforts to find unnamed sources in news stories.

The FBI documents, which relate to the bureau's investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, revealed Hoover made an effort to persuade the Washington Post not to run an editorial and that the FBI thought its "many friends" in the news media could be used to put the agency in the best light or to attack its enemies.

Many contacts between journalists and the FBI are detailed in the 40,001 pages of documents, from newsmen providing tips to the FBI to the FBI probing for a journalist's sources.

"I thought no one knew this outside of FBI," Hoover wrote on a copy of one news story dated Dec. 3, 1963. "Certainly someone is doing too much talking."

Hoover said in a memo three days after the assassination that President Lyndon B. Johnson was upset by a possible Washington Post editorial calling for a presidential commission to investigate the

ennedy assassination. The memo said Johnson had asked Hoover to try to stop publication of the editorial.

“He asked if I could disssaude the Post from carrying the editorial and I told him frankly, that I seldom read the paper, but would get word as to what is being done,” the Hoover memo said.

Hoover started a memo dated about an hour later that day, Nov. 25, 1963, this way:

“I called Deputy Attorney General Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach and advised him we had killed the editorial in the Post.”

But later in the memo, Hoover says another conversation with Alfred Friendly, vice president and managing editor of the Post, later revealed that Russell Wiggins, editor of the Post, had refused to make a comment that the newspaper would not run such an editorial.

The next day, the Post ran an editorial calling for a full federal inquiry into the assassination, but did not specifically mention a

Warren Commission, an action the Post applauded editorially.

In another case, Hoover demanded an explanation of a leak that revealed that the FBI agent in charge of the Dallas office at the time of the assassination had been forced to resign.

“Did DeLoach find out the source?” Hoover asked in a memo.

“This rumor,” said a reply memo from C. D. DeLoach, an FBI official.

'We have contacted our Good sources at CBS in Washington and Neil Stawser advised that he was familiar with the story. . . . He said that, at first, it came to his attention from Robert Pierpont.

MORE

1759 PHS 12-07

a251

r w by lwyfzvt 2676

BC-Hoover Media, 1st add, 220

WASHIN: Robert Pierpont.

'Pierpont who is friendly and known to my office was contacted on a strictly informal basis and he stated that he had received the rumor from a 'government source' . . . .'

In another memo, DeLoach wrote of an attempt to get stories about erroneous police statements retracted. He said: "We called our sources at both United Press International and the Associated Press and talked with them on a confidential basis."

A Teletype message to the FBI San Francisco office showed that CBS anchorman Walter Cronkite told the FBI of a call he received that suggested the caller had some knowledge about the assassination.

In another memo, DeLoach suggested that a response could be made to an unfavorable column by the late Drew Pearson, which suggested the

FBI should have kept tabs on Oswald during Kennedy's visit.

“Many of our news media friends have called me and the men in this office today concerning Pearson’s unjust and unfounded remarks. These men offered to literally ‘take Pearson apart’ if we will just give them the go-ahead. They have volunteered to start an effective campaign against Pearson for his attack on the FBI,” the memo said. But DeLoach said such an effort would not be productive. Hoover agreed in handwritten remarks:

“Unfortunately we are not in a position to completely contradict Pearson.”

1904 MRS 19-07