

Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
3/5/74

Mr. Joseph Kraft
3021 N St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kraft,

Your appearance on the Today Show yesterday shocked me. Your today's column made me think. Bad vibes.

"There is no cover-up" you pontificated yesterday. Today's column begins with the same opinion, "When the Watergate cover-up was in full swing..."

For all your amply-demonstrated perception and high intelligence, have you any way of knowing? Indeed, have you any way of making a dependable evaluation? How much time have you invested in getting to the point where a responsible journalist dared offer opinion as fact? (Shades of your today's conclusion, "...self-important narcissism...")

Maybe somebody told you and you trust him and his judgement. But suppose his opinion is not valid. Or suppose he is parti pris?

Your account of the grand jury leaks and their to you predictable consequences depends upon these leaks being harmful to those charged in this indictment. Is this a fair representation of the leak of the grand jury going farther than the prosecutor wanted it to go and drafting its own report which, according to what was reported, is addressed not to those charged but to one not charged?

This column is a defense of Nixon and Jaworski, not of the rights of the accused.

It is also quite inconsistent with the high degree of responsibility that has characterized your columns.

How can you possibly know that "The full force of the law is now being mobilized against the guilty parties?" Can you, in fact, know who all the "guilty parties" are? Can you say of this indictment that it includes all the charges that can and should be made? Or all the parties who should be in it?

Unless you have absolutely certain knowledge, not something someone has told you, how can you say of these indictments that "They show not a lack of zeal" which you follow ^{with} by something less than what most of us had conceived to be the purpose of the special prosecution, "a disposition to be extremely tough with balky witnesses."

I don't know who is responsible for this leak. However, among the more obvious possibilities is a disenchanted member of that grand jury. He would know what you have no way of knowing. Another is an informed member of the prosecution staff whose specific knowledge should be superior to yours.

Suppose, just suppose, that the cover-up is not over and you have used your fine reputation to persuade so many, including those in the Congress, that it is ended? Can any other leaking be as mischievous, regardless of your intent?

To keep up with a story of this enormity is beyond the capacity of a reporter who spends all his time on it. Have you really spent any time on this? Can you have any real factual basis for what you have said and written? I have no doubt you believe it, but there was a time when the world's wisest sincerely believed the world to be flat.

Sadly, if you had a good factual basis and restricted yourself only to that which is in the indictments you'd have to be plagued by doubts. My regrets for a piece and a sincere belief you will come to regret. More if you read the report of a similar body in which in the past Jaworski served a similar role. (Ask John Hanrahan.)