

Dear Bud,

1/30/75

What you told Jim, who spoke to you yesterday after I spoke to him, is somewhat helpful in what I'm trying to figure out about the Goulden/Washingtonian hatcherty in the current Washingtonian.

However, if you will take the time, I'd still like the annotations of a copy indicating

What you told him or he could have located after speaking to you;

What he indicated knowing about prior to talking to you;

What sources you think he had on the indicated parts other than you or me (nothing in it directly from me);

What if anything is opposite what you told him;

What if anything you told him that is relevant and omitted;

In general, did he tell you whether he had talked to anyone else, or did he without so saying indicate he had spoken to any others?

I have the tapes of our conversation, with the label under which he mailed them back. He made and identified the tapes and I fixed them as he used them so they could not be erased by accident.

You have probably noticed that there is not a single direct quotation of me and that the views he attributes to me are diametrically opposite those I have always held. This and having me on the wrong side on the dispute over conspiracies interest me much. Why, then, did he spend a day here?

Some of these errors can't be accidental. There is the possibility he had this written before he came. What he says of me and Garrison on Shaw is exactly opposite fact and what I told him and I can't imagine him writing that after he was here without making him out worse than I do.

Some of what he says he got from me means nothing to me. I have no idea what he is talking about in the business about the clipping, for example. This also makes me wonder, particularly because I see nothing in the piece of this nature I can attribute to you, even in an unguarded moment. What could his sources have been then?

This in particular might be a fruitful matter to pursue. Whether or not there is a direct connection, he is serving the interests of others and you and I presently have reason to give this a second thought. While at the time none of this was in my mind and I had no reason to believe he was going to ax us, some of my preconditions turn out to have been worthwhile. There is this tape and he says the opposite of what I said and the defamation thus can't be accidental. If we ever get together and talk, there is more that I think is relevant and I am suggesting that the effort to do something when we both have more to do than we can may nonetheless be a worthwhile way of spending some time. I am saying that it is not unreasonable to ask whether the complete interest was in an article that might interest readers only. I believe the answer is negative. I have done a little preliminary checking. It entirely supports the seat-of-the-pants reaction. So you can do a little of this on your own and fast, check the index to Superlawyers for what, given the names he uses, is not there. If you do not understand what I mean, ask Jim to do this with the ~~index~~ index as I did with him Tuesday. He may not have thought of this when he spoke to you or there may not have been time.

And I am suggesting that there may be a connection with a letter you wrote a month ago and as of the last time I asked Jim if you had gotten a response he said you had not.

This and what a suit makes possible is one of the reasons I suggested that one might be considered.

Sincerely,