

Dear Jim,      Code-Name Toro

4/12/77

Last evening I had a phone call which means that beginning some time this a.m. I'll be tied up the rest of the week. But at the least it will mean I'll be able to pay the court-reporting bill without thinning of thin reserves.

But with the Saturday night call that Lane's book is on sale I felt I had to finish reading the ~~script~~ proofs. Last night and early this morning I did. However, I made no further notes. I marked the proofs up. If it becomes necessary later I can dictate notes.

The stuff on you and Bud is particularly vicious. There is much that bears on intent. I am without doubt that there is basis for suit and for action by the always-reluctant bar.

This account of his relations with Ray is still another one, one that should be sent to the New York bar as a basis for consideration. His accounts, whichever is compared, disagree with Jimmy's. And, of course, each other!

The book, which claims to be an investigation of the crime, has nothing on the crime except what he lifted from my work.

There is no reference to "ay that does not have him guilty, whether or not as the shooter.

There are future problems for Ray if he ever testifies because Lane did tape the interviews unless he lied and he quotes Jimmy as saying other than he had earlier.

In addition to some changes that are visible one entire pages is missing. This is not an error in pulling proofs. There is a blank page on the proof sheets for it. I suspect what he had said about himself and the committee and perhaps Sprague had to be changed. I think in the proofs it is 275.

I believe there was earlier editing about him and Sprague, before these proofs.

Too bad he did not become committee chief counsel and staff director.

Tracing the thievery will be child's play. I can even show where he made efforts to hide it and forgot to make changes elsewhere for consistency.

In his credits to the irrelevant he forgets Jeff Cohen. This may provoke Cohen even more. I don't know if Freed has quieted him down since that broadcast the tape of which has not yet come. I've written rather strongly about this.

But there exists other proof of intent and I'll have it.

He has provided the missing proof on NBC and made liars of the NBC counsel.

If I can even get any help and then find some free time for it I'll collect and copy what you and Bud may want. I have a fair collection of his earlier statements and Mann's, in print and on programs.

What they did in Memphis will blow minds.

More crooked is not possible.

An element that should be pursued and I now can't is the story floated in Memphis that bar action was pending against you.

My belief is that Bud should get and read the book as soon as he can so he can be prepared to answer questions. Not only from the press. I think Mark was also aiming at him on the Hill. I think it is quite possible that at the last time mentioned in the proofs, 3/77, Mark could have had his eye on the counsel's job. Unless he feels like I do not think Bud should sue. I think you should on one basis and I, separately, on several others.

I have not seen the dust-jacket but Dan says it is something else.

The maximum claim for this definitive Memphis investigation is three days! How definitive can you get?      Hastily,