

1/12/74

Dear Mr. Schorr,

There is a reason for this response to your letter of the 10th.

As you say, we can only theorize. But let us take your own formulation, separating the sentences of your second paragraph:

"However, why the FBI would have wanted to harass me in its own interest I cannot imagine."

"I had no problem, as far as I know, with the FBI, but only with the White House."

"And the White House, as far as I can see, had nothing to gain from an overt investigation."

The first sentence assumes you understand the FBI's interest and that it was harassing you in following that interest. But suppose its interest was not in you but in using you - say to get at some White House characters?

You had no problems with it but did with the White House. The FBI knew this as well as you did. It also knew there was no possibility of your being offered a job. And it knew that personnel investigations simply can't be kept secret. So, it made one of you knowing that it would become known.

Of course the White House had nothing to gain from this. Precisely why the FBI handled it as it did - to be sure it hurt the White House. There had been some problems of which you are aware.

I referred to "rough shadowing" as overt surveillance, to intimidate. Perhaps I did not carry this far enough.

It is practised on those who are not likely to be intimidated by it, too.

Their wives may be intimidated, they may fear for their husbands, the husbands may fear for their families.

And it promotes a kind of paranoia.

I don't think that anyone who knew you expected you would be shushed. They should have known you very well. This is to say no more than they know their business.

On tonight's show you said that the amiable and attractive Sam Ervin was for the first time showing signs of pulling in his horns. I think you missed a multitude of cues. Beginning with the organization of the hearings, the sequence of witnesses and including many things you should recall, like what was not gone into, questions not asked, perjury not questioned and witnesses not called. If my memory is correct, the first sign I spotted was the Alch affair. If I'd thought of it earlier, I'd probably have wondered about getting a professor to run the show.

But the performances were attractive and we permitted ourselves to be amused.

It is true in one way or another of all the committees whose work has been touched by these matters as it has been and will be of all the others involved.

When we lack all the facts and there are no certainties, it is as you say, "we are left with theories."

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

CBS NEWS

A Division of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.
2020 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(202) 296-1234

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

January 10, 1974

Since I don't have, and perhaps will never have the ultimate answer, I must concede your theory as a possibility.

However, why the FBI would have wanted to harass me in its own interest I cannot imagine. I had no problem, as far as I know, with the FBI, but only with the White House. And the White House, as far as I can see, had nothing to gain from an overt investigation.

So we are left with theories.

Yours,



Daniel Schorr

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 8,
Frederick, Maryland 21701