

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701

9/1/75

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

Dear Fred,

The name I had in mind is that of Richard Ober. I'll go into this briefly.

Ed de Grazia has not sent the rest of the court papers. If when he can he does I think it can help us both because I want to sue them not exactly the same way you are but in ways that I think can help you. I want to be able to depose those I have reason to I think you do not. Unless you have reason I don't think you can. What I should be able to develop in interrogatories or better depositions will, I think, be of considerable value to you.

There is no rush on our getting these papers you have filed. My lawyer is just starting practise, even though he has been to the Supreme Court four times and has established a new rights principle. He is his entire staff, including typist. He is now deep into a long appeal in the Ray case, or the King assassination. As soon as he finishes that he has to file ~~what with the press~~ an appeal for me in my current Freedom of Information suit, what will be precedent under the amended law. And I have just finished the draft of an addition to a book dealing with this suit and the sensational evidence it yielded while I was losing it. I'm going into debt to print this overlong book myself despite serious literary liabilities because it can have significant political consequences right now.

I was impressed with ~~de~~ Grazia's thoroughness and, of course, all the work he has done is work my lawyer need not repeat if he can use it.

Richard Ober happens to be the name of one of the sons of Harold Ober, who established the literary agency. Whether or not he is that son I do not know. I've had to use students when I could in checking. They have come up with no listings in standard sources. Richard Ober seems to have been in charge of some parts of these domestic operations under Angleton. He also appears to have been transferred to as I now recall NSA. (One of the reasons I suggested that if it did not violate <sup>Barney's</sup> privacy my going over the papers you got is because I know others were transferred who had worked in domestic operations because I've spotted their names in the papers others received.)

If and when I get copies of the file on me they'll let me have I may learn more along this line. I started long ago but they know me and my limitation well and exploit them. I don't think they've stonewalled anyone as much. I first applied under the old law, in early 1971. This January General Counsel Warner told my lawyer and me to our faces that they had no files on me when I told him I have copies of some. They are still stalling but I'm letting them. Their answer to my appeal was to say they will now make the initial check. The one to which they have already responded negatively and also in writing. I go into this because it seems to indicate that they have some problems and that they have to do mainly with publishing and me but not entirely from the papers I have that they did not give me.

I think you know by now that this is the kind of thing I abominate and on which I want to help as much as I can. I did an enormous amount of work on the McDonald thing without pay simply because of the possibility these people were setting Barney up. I have files from inside some of the agencies proving they even do this to each other on that subject, so I know they do it. But there may be some conflicts of interest of which I'll give you an indication.

I have already developed solid information on CIA and publishing and have part of it in a book that exists in a very rough draft I had to lay aside a year ago this month for my work on the Ray case. I've never been able to read it. Parts may be incomprehensible to others because of the conditions under which I wrote it but the content is largely new and I think quite sensational. It will not be easy for me to throw that work away. As soon as the book I'm about to print is in manufacture I intend to cut and edit this one. If I can find the time. My wife is my only typist and she has our only regular work from January 1 to April 16. I'll have to try to get it ready for retyping before she starts this work. And nobody else can read my writing.

I have established fairly certainly where this publishing operation was officed, not at Langley. I have established the existence of and have proofs about an unexposed front through which CIA handled a seemingly innocent kind of publishing surveillance to which they would give another name. I have proofs of CIA people being involved in both publishing and ~~XXXXXX~~ "assets" or "proprieties" at the same time and of working domestically in seemingly innocent commercial operations while working for CIA. Aside from this I have what I regard as substantial reason to believe there was and I can trace and do have several links to a New York publishing or anti-publishing operation that to my knowledge goes back to 1965.

It is a fantastic story but what I have written is absolutely solid. It involves many people very much in recent news I think spectacularly. It is in both areas, where I have proof and where I have these reasons to believe that I will also want to take depositions.

I was aware that the judge had turned you down. Since then a federal judge in Washington has ruled otherwise in the Rosenberg case, I think for the first time. These judges begin mostly pro-government and especially pro-spook. From their pasts even the more decent ones equate this and "national security." They are finks. I confront them regularly with proofs of perjury and they avoid it because they will do nothing about federal wrongdoing. In the recent case when I did this four times and each time with the most solid possible proofs, all the judge did was threaten us. Until my lawyer accepted his challenge. Then the judge just dropped it and ruled against us. You have means I do not but I think you ought to expect pretty much the same attitude and assume you will need both overwhelming proof and the prospect of public attention to it to overcome this prejudice.

I hope this is helpful to you. I have taken the time in the hope it can be. I'm sorry for the haste in which I do it but I have to do things like this early in the morning, when I first get up, so I can then get into being a one-man publisher with an extraordinarily complex book.

Best,

Harold Weisberg



Grove Press, Inc./53 East 11th Street/New York, New York 10003/Telephone: 212 677-2400

August 22, 1975

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Route 8  
Old Receiver Rd.  
Frederick Md. 21701


Dear Harold:

I don't know whether you saw the story of the Court's decision about our request to compel the CIA to hand our files over to the Court. The judge turned us down flat. Evidently, he trusts the CIA.

We received a copy of the Colby report already, and, if you have not already sent it, please don't bother.

Which is the name you think would interest de Grazia?

Best,

  
Fred Jordan

FJ:cm

Route 8  
Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Md. 21701

August 11, 1975

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

Dear Fred:

Unfortunately, my shoestring is short. I've obtained a copy of the Colby report. I do not know whether you have or want it, but on the chance that you and/or Barney might want to read the censored version or that de Grazia could use it, I'm having a copy sent you. The way I do this is to get students I help to use xeroxing facilities they can tap.

It is an enormous understatement. In fact, deception. However, I can't imagine the White House not knowing this. Ford has to be up to his muffing in this.

There is one name in it that may interest de Grazia. It says much less than can be said about him.

As recently as Friday's and Saturday's mail these characters were still denying having any files on me and I have copies from more than one. They've got to be pretty uptight to be lying so openly.

I've gone over the papers obtained by another. From them I can pinpoint some omissions and I can trace personnel shifts. These may or may not apply in your case.

If I can help de Grazia, of course I will and I'll want to.

Best regards,

Harold Weisberg



Grove Press, Inc./53 East 11th Street/New York, New York 10003/Telephone: 212 677-2400

August 8, 1975

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Route 8  
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Harold:

Thank you so much for your letter of July 25. I'm so glad you like the complaint by the attorneys.

I've sent a copy of your letter to Ed de Grazia, who will be the attorney handling the case from now on, and I am sure he will be delighted to keep you informed with copies of all his papers.

I'm sure he will also be very happy to have whatever help you can give, and I am asking him to contact you directly.

Again, thank you so much for everything.

Sincerely,

Fred Jordan

FJ:cm