

B: T or Br act themselves up as judges of  
T's honesty. T: No - Br. Can't say that,  
J: Did Br. have any business giving dir. to Cl?  
Br: ~~Have same int. as Ch. J.~~  
~~On that day John Br. has arrived, but soon~~  
H: Go in peace & sin no more.

Br.: Proper inquiry to make. Went to N.O. told  
Ed - would not be at Ed's app. Close relationship. Spike to  
Gilbert.

Memorandum  
Spike  
1. Asbill v. Alfred - Ruppenthal - Criticized Ed  
for altering  $\phi$  in Montgomery. Would do it again,  
no matter what rule provided.

2. Br denies statement in E.W. letter 9/8/14  
33 ds & n.c.y. B. m 22. B: [Singularly;  
meaning to as in ominously]. B: ~~had~~ had  
heard it was going on; T ~~ad~~ told B  
it was not going on. Had heard as long ago as July,  
it after Lynd. B: hard to keep calm - fight  
this. H: you be calm, I'll fight for you.  
Br: distant, but positively deny it. During yr. 61-62  
did do it, but not in 62-63. had nothing to  
do with Ed on assignments. B: guardianship.

3. Houston  $\phi$  was <sup>hairy</sup> a problem with ct. reporters  
in Houston. W. th. cl. = 5ct adopted our rule with  
Harris, had nothing to do with advancing  $\phi$ .

4. Civil Rts ds in Montgomery. Reason: only 1 wk  
in Montg. this yr. instead of 2. thinking of R.;  
These ds. Cameron usually manages to swap around  
so as to go to Montg. or New Orleans.