

JAN 30 1975

Dear Jim,

1/28/75

Getting a 4 a.m. start to keep from getting farther behind from having to go to dentist today. Thanks for your 1/24 and the enclosed goodies I've not yet had a chance to look at. And I did get the NYTimes 1/27.

Before I forget, WxPost cut the Anderson column 1/27 but not significantly. It weakened but did not change part and eliminated where it said this was the first of a series, as I was certain from knowledge of the story. I'd given it to Whitten in early November, then without success. I rather think that the use was not connected with me but with someone else I know, not known to you. The story stacks from the pre-Anderson investigation of which I know and depositions of which I have copies. I have had parts for a couple of years. No interest anywhere then.

Yesterday I got word from Memphis on the judge's anticipated decision schedule and his intent to accommodate the major media. I suggested to JL that he tell Valentine. When Jim spoke to me later he told me he had, that the Post will probably fly Paul down to do their own story, and that Paul had noted JL had been checking some we-thing CIA incorporation records in the District government files. How come? The Post got a tip from a woman claiming to have been part of the operations and PV was checking it out. We'll see if the Post uses the story. Pacific Engineering & Architecture Co., a proprietary, we think, from some earlier checking beginning with Continental News and Hunt (the other). We got into quite a nest of these from what I take to be CIA carelessness, using the same address and phone for them all... Seems that Continental was twice adjacent to my friend Dave Pollard, first in Munsey Bldg, then when both moved to National Press Bldg. Jim thinks it may be innocent. I've done no personal checking, but my friend has not been very diligent in representing my interest with Freed et al.

As you will gather, Goulden did an ax job on all of us. I haven't seen the piece. I'm a bit surprised but it is conducive to some arithmetic. Some of what he says of me that comes from neither the interview nor my writing of speaking is what Bud says, but Bud denied to having said it and Jim believes him. He also claims that on part Goulden broke confidence. Some of the worst of what Goulden quotes him as saying he did not deny. Goulden didn't even speak to Lesar, of whom he says other than I did and not what I did. The question remains "why?" The timing is interesting: why did he and The Washingtonian go for such an ax job at this time? The concept seems to have come after the Ray hearing and after I was pushing JL to get to some of my suits, the latter often by phone.

Your reasoning is sound on the parts of the chicken. We'll have to wait and see. I can confirm from other things, too many, the ego need of which you speak. And it is quite difficult for me to be satisfied with completely innocent explanations of some of the things not done to which I've often enough made reference in the past. They were serious errors. I do know of previous connections but they are not necessarily of the kind imputed. Nor are they necessarily not that kind. They can be.

Lesar has no recollection of the article we both do not have. I think another possible explanation is a typo in the ~~XXXXXX~~ letter we saw. Or perhaps a late edition use only. As I think back, this guy's writing does fit with the current campaign which I've thought served the interest of what I regard as his faction. It could be considered the earliest chords of the orchestration, especially his going after Superman. Some source provided him for it what is not readily available. All of this followed his unloading on Der K. And Der K had been after the non-spooks of that faction, had eliminated part of their work. Wrongfully, I think.

I'll make an overall note separately on the overall story.

After I knew we had won in the Supreme Court on the discovery precedent (to me a foregone conclusion because it was the worst case the government(s) could have taken there) I made a couple of efforts to attract interest to what I believe is a natural feature story: young lawyer, first real case, sets precedent. One of these was to Eason. He did air me briefly on this. Our communication was not too good, perhaps my fault. Perhaps I assumed too much knowledge. He did use the occasion to recall that they had been mentioning WW IV and how was it that people could get it and at what price? I said. The way he did it led me to believe that he and Spann are under wraps. Not hearing from either on that content is inconsistent with the records and interests of both.