3/25/72

Mr. Jack Anderson
1612 K St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Anderson,

If the early edition of this morning's Post and yesterday's radio coverage are a fair representation, there is a rather good story in the release, if there was one, on Hoover's report on your Beard memo and in the report itself.

I tried to alert you to a certainty a week ago, in advance of this, and knew of the probability of what has happened, as carbons of correspondence with reporter friends who papers won't take any initiative will show.

A mythology has germinated and matured in the press, that those who question the investigation of the assassination of JFK (all by Hoover, by the way) are all nuts and have to be. Those reporters who have a decent concern for their society usually can't conceive that the few of us conducting serious researches and investigations have exactly this concern.

In any event, I have, in my work, become a kind of expert on Hoover, the FBI and their special use of language and semantic techniques. I think it would be an ultra-conservative estimate to say that I have 5,000 pages of FBI reports. I know I have more than 2,000 pages I have not yet had a chance to read, leave alone study. From close study of Hoover's method I have learned where to look and for what. I have learned the probability of truth where he hides it, and have in a fair number of cases, including one to be heard on appeal next month, in a freedom of information suit, found the missing answers, the uncongenial truth Hoover hides.

CBS-TV net news last night showed what seemed to be this Hoover report on your Beard memo. Give me a copy and I'll translate it from Hoover into English for you. Kleindienst, by the way, studied at the feet of the old master. I have a fine sample of the same method over his signature. And what that letter also says is, "I Richard Kleindienst, am a big liar."

I hope you do not miss the obvious in this. It has to be a good story. I'll know by the time you get this letter unless you are holding it back.

Hoover is almost as predictable as the tide to those who have not been conditioned. One of the means of conditioning is favoring with "leaks". I am not so conditioned. He won't even give me a press release.

Your Chile story on ITT is not new to ITT. It goes back to before your day, to when it was run by Sosthenes Bene. Good digging and good luck.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. It was impossible for me to mail this letter this morning because some thoughtful soul removed my mailbox alone along the entire road on which we live and threw it into my pond (If this sounds paranoid, phone 703-3101 and ask for Officer McCarthy). So, I'll be driving into town to mail it. Thus, when I stopped work for lunch, I heard the 1:30 p.m. Mutual news on WAVA (I'm now tuned to WTOP to see if they have a different report on the 2 p.m. CBS net radio news). WAVA quotes ITT as saying that chemical testing proves the Beard memo was written much later. Aside from the clear inference that Hoover gave it to them, otherwise how can they have more than xerox chemicals? I think you should know that

a) chemical testing on the ink is inadequate testing of the ink alone;

b) it is not the only chemical testing that should have been done and could be definitive (for example, on the paper);

c) two other tests, neither chemical in nature, would seem to be in order, aside from other lab work, and

one can be positive proof on the negative side and

the other can be pretty positive either way.

Do not underestimate the capability of the FBI to identify the source of paper. Unless they deceived the Warren Commission, they can differentiate between consecutive rolls of a manufacturer's production. Now at a little before 2:10 WTOP, not net source, quotes ITT ~~xxx~~ as saying they can prove the memo was written this year. Unless someone kept some old paper in her desk or used very little, this would seem to suggest that testing of the paper is a need and one Hoover and his boys would not be likely to overlook.

CBS quotes Herb Klein as boasting about the political outcome of this flap, both in Kleindienst's confirmation and what will happen to Democratic senators. This, the leaking of Hoover's report in a special and prejudicial form early yesterday morning, the formulation in today's Post and a number of other things can be indicative of what can yet be expected. If this turns out to be the case, then what has not yet been reported and what I have hinted at and been reluctant to make explicit because there is reasonable presumption you may not enjoy complete privacy in your mail, may be more important.

If one were to conjecture about ITT's specifying this year as the time of the typing, one could then conjecture, among alternatives, that they have your real or an imagined source in mind (they surely have expendables) and were this the case, there could be the filing of sensational charges prior to the hearing of which the nomination might slide through and pending the outcome of which you might be under a cloud. It might also have a depressing effect on your future capabilities.

I do not present myself as a scientific expert on the technical matters I have mentioned. Hoover's dissembling and his hiding and his distorting and misrepresenting, which took Warren and probably some members of the Commission staff in, have forced me to learn something of such matters. I know enough to be without reasonable doubt that what has been reported is far more than entirely inadequate. It does not begin to indicate the performance of what for him and his agency are the normal and obvious examinations.

Based on the reporting to which I have had access, were I Jack Anderson I'd be asking myself if Hoover has made more examinations than reported, and if he has, what they show; and if he has not, why he has not.

You may credit me or not, but it should be obvious there is nothing in the time I am taking for me. The only thing I have ever asked of you is the return of what I loaned Chuck Elliott, and to that I have not even had the courtesy of a response.