

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701  
7/25/75

Mr. Fred Jordan  
Grove Press  
53 E 11th St.,  
New York, N.Y. 10003

Dear Fred,

Thanks to you or Barney for the release on your suit against the CIA and for the attachment to the court papers the first page of which is headed "Jurisdiction."

I have watched the work of lawyers in cases similar to this for years. This is the first time I can honestly say I think they did a great job. Sometimes lawyers will do a fair job on the law and then forget all else. These were an imaginative team whose product impresses me much. So much, in fact, that I'd appreciate a full set of all papers, if possible in duplicate for my lawyer. You may remember I told you both at lunch that I'm going to be suing them when we can get to it.

They stonewalled with me, denying they had any files after I told them I had copies of some. This was before the law was amended and before they started getting pushed around as much as they since have been. Since then I've obtained added copies of added proofs. While my lawyer is busy preparing an appeal in one of my cases against the FBI and in the Ray case I've started exhausting administrative remedies again. We'll file - and against more than the CIA - after these appeals are over.

Copies of this excellent work could be very helpful to my lawyer, who is just starting practise. He's been to the Supreme Court several times - successfully - without being before a jury yet.

It is possible that I can help you. I'm willing to take the time even though I'm pushing to get a book that I think can break the JFK case open ready for the camera. I have gone over the files supplied someone else I know and was able to pinpoint withholdings. I also was able to fill in names that were masked. In my own work I have established full proofs of a CIA front for this kind of intrusions into first-amendment rights. I have not gone public with this hoping to sell a story on it or save it for my own suit but if you need it I'll give it to you. Coming from you it has a chance of getting more attention than from me, too. This front remains unexposed. I can trace it back for a decade. Where I do not have proof but have pretty substantial evidence I think I have the leads necessary to establish another such operation. I have this in a Watergate book that exists in unread rough draft. I had to lay it aside a year ago and have not been able to return to it. If I am right on this it will make a supersensation, as I think the book, well edited, still could. (There is a vast and still unexposed CIA/Watergate story.)

If your lawyers move for discovery, whether by interrogatories or depositions, perhaps I can help there, too. As if you decide to carry #37 on other publishers forward. There may be other publishers, I have reason to believe there were, and there was at least one you did not name who shared offices of CIA "assets" and "proprietaries." I have reason to believe there was a domestic operation on publishing, this reason extending to its downtown Washington offices. I think it is possible to supply more names for joining in the suit if you'd like. And agencies. I'm sure the Army was in on this surveillance. My files will probably supply the names of willing witnesses.

My hunch is that these papers were prepared from what you got from the CIA and

shrewd guesses. However, the CIA itself did not monitor the overseas calls. That was done at Ft. Meade, Md., I think by NSA. I mention this in the event Barney and/or the lawyers decide to amend the suit by including other spook agencies. It might not increase what you could win in the suit but it might strengthen it and might make more sensations. Think of some of the books, including The Diary of Che.

At the time you were bombed I phoned but found no interest. I do not recall now what proofs I then had and don't know if I could not retrieve them. I think the person to whom I spoke was in your public relations. Whether or not I can get what prompted me to phone, I think I can help in other ways on this aspect. I have other cases of bombings by people trained by the CIA and using materials they got from the CIA. A court case, where there was prosecution.

I mentioned to Barney the possibility of a separate FOIA action to get from the FBI their tests on the explosives, if they made tests, as they should have. They would probably invoke the law-enforcement exemption but I think one of the amendments to the law for which one of my cases was responsible, one dealing with scientific tests, would obtain. Your lawyers might regard this as a no-lose deal if they <sup>FBI</sup> refuses to give the information and it might help much before a jury. (If they decide to ask, the FOIA officer is Thomas Bresson.)

If the government provides affidavits in response to anything or in an effort to prove what it may want to prove you can expect sometimes subtle semantics and up to and including perjury. In these cases, where they are caught, they do cross the line into perjury. I have many cases of this, including against me. In fact, ~~in~~ in the many times I've charged it there has yet to be a pro forma denial. Here it depends on the judge. In the case we are about to appeal the judge would take anything. He is the guy just overruled when he held the FBI could wiretap indiscriminately. Before a jury and with press coverage I believe it would be different.

While my lawyer, who is also my friend, is just starting practice, you may want to remember that he has done much work on the FOIA act and has good connections with others who have specialized in it. (If you can spare a set of papers for him he is Jim Lesar, 1231 4 St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.)

If any of these things seem to be of interest and if you can come here for a couple of days as we discussed about literary matters, we can go into details.

Thanks and best to you all,

Harold Weisberg