Dear Mr. Ober,

Under date of 1/22/74 you returned some pages I had sent you out of order, pages you had not returned with what I had by then written more or less consecutively. I was tempted to write you then and say "you will soon be reading about some of this in the papers." I felt you might take it as smart-alecky and I didn't want to risk offending you. However, if you read the papers, this was ahead of them and, although as I recalled you described it as tendentieus where it was critical of the Ervin committee, it was exactly correct and the committee was forced, when it was too late, to attempt to retrace and recover. Instead it pooped out. It had suppressed and it was ruined by it.

This is not all it suppressed. Some of the otherpages I sent you, roughs not then and not now read and made largely as notes because of the problem of encompassing material of such enormity, address what you may also be reading about. Again the unprecedented: CIA indictments. I now have more than enough evidence against the three top men, some of it what was suppressed by more than the Ervin committee among committees.

I am by no means certain that this will happen. I am certain that it was considered. The charges of which I have enough to use in court include perjury and obstruction of

You may recall that I open the book by attributing a deliberate covering up to the prosecution. Then it was not ever mentioned and nobody, including the great liberals, would consider it. But were it not true, would there now be these new indictments and those yet to come? This is not to suggest what I do not believe, that these new indict-

ments are of different character or intent.

You may remember I had a long chapter or a short book on L. Patrick Gray. What was entirely ignored. Indicting him may not be avoidable. I predict that if he is indicted, the charges will be less than is in that chapter written so long ago.

If you have been reading the papers, then you know I was in a advance on the Howard ughes/Rebozo/Nixon stuff for recently it has been all over, from the Jack Anderson column to the front pages, but with less than you read long before this began to happen.

I am reminded of this and much more with which I will not burden you by a combination of two things: going over the extensive notes I made before I became convinced that there would be no contemporaneous, definitive work on this unprecedented subject and all it necessarily entails for all of us and began to write; and coming to your January letter in catching up on filing. My review of the notes is to retrieve mislaid material from the enermity. Despitems a considerable self-confidence in my investigations and analyses, I am quite pleased at the regularity with which I accurately anticipated events in writing and that with these notes all prior to the Ervin hearings there is no error in them and they go into much of significance that has not yet come to light. What is depressing, aside from the fact that there appears to be no publisher interested in a definitive work and would say what he wanted, the only way this can be enclosed within single covers, is the magnitude of the material refused by those who have won respect for their reporting, including but by no means restricted to those who won the Fulitzer.

It is not merely that this kind of work is unpublishable, which is bad enough. It is also that nobody in all of society gives enough of a dman to be willing to do anything. Including, of course, government, which is responsible for all of it.

Your discouraging did not stop my work. It merely convinced me that I had to attend to other matters, not neglect then as I had been doing. I am continuing my work, should you ever learn of any potential interest. When I have completed it, it will be a series of books, not one. My only alternative is quitting. And as of now I have every reason to believe it will include what all official proceedings will have ignored. Everybody is afraid, which is how there came to be a Hitler.

Sincerely,