

Dear Js,

5/7/74

After I wrote Lesar yesterday, the letter with the strange Nader crack about me, it occurred to me that I hadn't used this man's language. Lesar had just used it to me so for the letter it wasn't needed. As a matter of your comprehension and for any other record at and what can help time the origin of what it reflects is.

I had not known of Larry Ellsworth's existence until Lesar mentioned his name as not the senior lawyer in one of Nader's groups. He had warned Lesar in advance that he sees a clear record of pre-existing prejudice by Gessell on Exemption 7 cases, that is, where the government alleges a file to be investigatory and for law-enforcement purposes.

Lesar had permitted himself the luxury in which I sometimes indulge, that the case based on law and justice should win. He discounted this warning. I added to it that this had been my experience in a case before Gessell in which I had represented myself.

What Ellsworth said is, "Next time get yourself a different client." One of the possible meanings is for nay case. Another is is you expect to win, perhaps before Gessell.

In a Nader FOI Exemption 7 case there had been an in-chambers conference with Gessell. Ellsworth was there.

What should be considered in connection with this is the interest all such groups had in my spectro suit. It was, without doubt, the strongest, soundest one available on this exemption and involving the FBI.

Without my asking it of anyone, Nader, ACLU and Consumers' Union said they would file amicus curiae before the Supreme Court. If any one of them did, it is unknown to me.

I have had a runin with the ACLU. It can be said that I picked it. In actuality, they changed their minds without telling me after suggesting they would take an entirely different and typically ACLU case for me.

As of a year ago, when I was in the ACLU national office, there was great excitement over this spectro case. The lawyer with whom I dealt saw to it that as I left I was introduced to the boss. I can anticipate that said boss put the hex on the case and the lawyer who was excited by it was too embarrassed to tell me. But this also I do not know.

If all of this sounds paranoid, and I mean to include what is in the letter, too, as I see it, avoiding the seemingly paranoid inyerpretations is not easy.

You may have nothing to add. But if you see what I have not indicated by way of explanation, I would like to hear it.

On the letter to Dorland, the Bud CTIA people consider him paranoid. Bud told me hopelessly. Coming from those I consider paranoid on this subject, that can be a severe charge. But then I find most of these people paranoid at least on this subject. With Dorland, I avoid this, having no real basis for knowing, by asking myself a simple question, how does what he says that is within my knowledge stack? The answer is well. If I had spoken to him a year ago I would have saved myself I can't guess how many hours of work figuring out and then getting confirmation of the location of the CIA's Washington "station." He was right. He was right on the cover used, too. And if Tad Szulc is to be believed, what Dorland told me in 1966 about the planned 1965 replay of the Bay of Pigs is confirmed by Szulc. Only in 1974.

Howard is coming today.

Best,