

Mr. Jerry Ray
Box 147
Lake Zurich, Ill. 60047

10/15/76

Dear Jerry,

The enclosed review of McMillan's book from today's Post tells you what you can expect. In this case, as you'll see, I had explained that you were playing games with George. ~~and~~ had gotten a contract to ~~hire~~ Valentine through Jim. If you were to talk to him he'd tell you more than he wrote about that contract. This also represents what you can expect: on the central fact the reporters will write what they think the papers want. And so once again you have demonstrated your mastery of public relations of which you have boasted so often.

In order to be able to quote it in writing Bradless, who will not love me because of my letter, I dug out the story you earlier said you want for Jimmy. I enclose it, too.

I saw Jim briefly yesterday. He had a letter from Jimmy that gets to the strange notions Jimmy makes up without any basis for it. He sent Jim what he should have sent months earlier, a copy of a letter from another Tennessee lawyer to Livingston having to do with further commercializing of Jimmy of the Huie-Frank type. Jimmy said that I might know something about it. How? Because Jimmy and Bob never mentioned it?

That lawyer, Lloyd Tatum, represented the late Buford Pusser, about whom a movie was made. Great. There is fraud in the accounting and that matter is now in court.

I discussed Livingston and all related matters with Jimmy often, honestly and frankly, especially after his Cliff nonsense, his taking Cjastain in to see Jimmy by representing him as Jimmy's investigator and just before the evidentiary hearing and the first time I ~~was~~ saw Jimmy after it. There is just nothing that could lead Jimmy to believe that Bob ever discussed anything like a movie about Jimmy with me and even less than nothing to lead Jimmy to believe that I think he should take Bob's line of appealing to the governor based on some kind of confession. This is what Bob says Jimmy should do - in the papers, of course - Jimmy having been afraid to fire him when he should have. You'll remember that instead Jimmy praised him to the sixth circuit.

Jimmy also mentioned something about the Congressional investigation in a sense of expecting a reading on it in the near future. Unless it shows itself to be bad in the days ahead no reading will be possible until long after the first of the year. I'll have my own before then. My present information is sketch and sometimes not first-hand. However, I do know that the man in overall charge is prosecution-minded and that the lawyers he'll have in charge of each part of their work is also a former prosecutor. This is certain. What is not certain is that the man to be in charge of the ~~ing~~ part is formerly of the Department of Justice crime task-force.

You'll all do well to shut up on this and George and to stay that way.

The man in charge has asked me to spend a day next week with him and the staff he has gathered by then. Before this I was consulted on two different levels. I am saying nothing about any of this and don't want you to. However, I am telling you that I do not expect them to jump for joy over what I'll say. It will be tough and straight. It will not be easier because of Jimmy's stupidity in seeing Lane without checking with Jim or me. If he had he would not have seen him. Lane has already done what is very, very hurtful to Jimmy. That part, if I have time, ought not present any serious problem to me next week. However, the Members of the committee, not just the staff, are already hung up on it, so it will be a real problem. I begin with what I do not regard as a problem for me. This man Sprague comes from Philadelphia, where he was the first assistant DA. When a Phila. paper asked me about him I asked if he does not have a conflict of interest because he was the first assistant to the Warren Commission's chief whitewasher. Hastily,