

Dear Jim,

11/8/76

For a day on which the cold wind cut too much for extended walking I feel pretty good. In part because I'm all packed early and there is no last-minute rush and in part because of the perhaps temporary but certainly significant turning around of the House committee. I feel particularly good for having figured that one out instinctively, immediately and as it appears correctly.

I'd be less than honest if I suggested taking too much from this.

Even with the unsolicited promise to Jim and me of unsolicited letters and the aborting of the Foreman project at least into the far and indefinite future.

It was hours after the calls that I heard from Jim. He has some of the same impressions I do. One is that Ozer would really have to be insane to launch such a project on his own. Crazier to bulldoze and threaten as he did.

I am left with the belief that if you'd known one Garrison you glimpsed them all.

As I suspected Jim did not tell Sprague all he should have. I'm glad I did. There is not only the chance he may be innocent - he should also have inspiration to end this kind of most serious misconduct and unprofessionalism by lawyers.

He did ~~not~~ not, he says, know his people had made and not kept appointments with Jim. Would I tell him? I didn't know. So he asked me to find out and let him know through his secretary today or tomorrow. Too late for today. We'll know tomorrow.

How much relationship and if any of what kind I'll have with this committee I do not know. I am fairly confident it will now be on an entirely different basis.

The phone conversations were all polite on both sides. Only not this time with Jim. He did blow, exceptional for him. This did not prevent my being quite pointed, if the ~~big~~ points were not real sharp.

It also provided me with several opportunities I'm glad to have had.

When I first met Sprague I told him I want him to succeed, want to help all I can, am willing to run any personal risk to do this but will not save with public records without a real showing of both good faith and his ability to control the committee, members and staff. He said he agreed with this position. I think that it would be his.

So I've now had the chance to tell him and his first assistant that based on this experience to expect nothing more from me except these kinds of records that they could duplicate. I did not say pending display of dependability and good faith. Instead I said neither Jim nor I were about to compromise on any issue of principle.

I went farther and asked that he tell his hotshots not to try threats or intimidation on either of us and that by now he should know enough not to have to be told why. Besides, after the vigor of this reaction and the untenable position in which it left him he needs no citation of record.

He also learned some of the other costs to them of this adventure. Now Jim alone can't get Jimmy's okay. Jimmy feels he also has to consult his Tennessee lawyer, one in whom we have no reason for confidence. They created the situation even though the other guy is connected with civil litigation only.

One of Sprague's explanations is that they were going to Memphis anyway, so they thought they'd do it at the same time. Besides, they have such things as court records to copy. This is what they have not gotten from us, I told him. He stuttered a bit. Easier and cheaper at home, I added. Court charges are high. And they could have had clerical people do all the work, not waste professional road time. Can you imagine them believing that when I loaned them 14 volumes of transcript only we had nothing else? I can't.

That it happened is not good. Once it happened it turned out as good as possible, I think. What was so bad will not now come off. We'll have a chance to evaluate better now that he does know. Meaning us more than what his guy did. I still have difficulty imagining this kind of autonomous behavior by a lawyer.

~~Some~~ Some start, huh?

Best,