

confidential; means samples her personal and her secretary's typewriters; subpoena for HQ records, those in DC only having been destroyed, and what she wrote has to be scattered in their offices and a number of Congressional and other official ones. This would make the DC destruction more culpable. She could be under such pressure this is her only means of retaliation. And Scott had Nazi connections World War II, when he was the darling of other Republicans, the Annonbergs.
1612 K St., NW
Washington, D.C.

R. G. Frederick, III. 21701
3/17/72

Dear Mr. Anderson,

Perjury is, as you said today, a crime. It is not uncommon for a second crime to co-exist with it, subornation of perjury. And it is less common that you are, apparently, willing to learn for government officials to commit perjury, with a more than reasonable presumption that it was suborned by the Department of Justice and in the area of Kleindienst's interest and jurisdiction.

The affidavit Senator Scott read on TV tonight might be the break you are looking for. It should not be difficult to tie the name you quoted to Mrs. Board. I'm surprised you have not already done this by the other means that should be readily available to you.

I do not know the lady, nor do I know anything about the case besides what has been made public. The obvious interpretation is the one you placed on the affidavit, that she is under pressure. But unless she is sick in the head, would this pressure be enough to persuade her to commit a crime like perjury where it is susceptible of proof that would, under the circumstances, be rather difficult not to prosecute? To put this another way, if she is not mentally ill and is under severe pressure, even though it might ruin her future, is it possible she had in mind making independent establishment of truth itself a possibility? And were this to be the case, might she not get the satisfaction of taking others with her?

This matter need not rest on her word against Hune's.

I hope you don't let it.

My experience with Kleindienst persuades me that despite his academic successes of the now-distant past, he has been so corrupted by power that he depends upon it entirely. This leads him into incredible stupidities, some of which I have offered you. Believing he has all the power necessary, he does what he damned well pleases. With me, and it would be difficult to find one with less influence, this has been so raw that even Mitchell had to over-rule him twice.

Your Achilles all have heels. I'm surprised you haven't reached at least one fresh one. With the help of one solid member of the Committee, with what has already transpired, you could now do what Paul Y. Anderson did, if you can remember that far back. And all the wrong things that have been done would provide you with an intellectual judo. By yourself, sharp as you and your staff are, you can do almost as much now.

I'm not being coy in not spelling this out. I think it would be unwise to assume your communications enjoy their constitutional protections. Thus I can only hope that busy and involved as you must be, you can find time to think or overcome your long-standing hangup on the kind of work I have been doing and ask.

If you don't, good luck anyway and sincerest thanks for what you have already done.

By the way, Senator Scott has some interesting connections from before your time. That was long before the day of the tube, but he tried to present himself as pure then, too.

Success to you!

Harold Weisberg