

pagel

2309 North Glebe Road
Arlington, Virginia 22207

28 January 1984

Dear Mr. O'Donnell:

No, you are not "one of the attack dogs." You are the attack dog, and the threatening, vicious tone of your letter only reinforces my outrage at the tactics you have used since coming onto this case.

At the outset, let me say that I sincerely hope you did not bill VVMF for the letter you wrote to me. It would be a shame to see the public's money spent for a response to Jan Scruggs' personal request that I be interviewed for his book, particularly since Jan's original letter was mailed from his home, and my response was also sent to his home. Are you authorized to represent Mr. Scruggs and Mr. Wheeler in every aspect of their lives, so long as there is some mention of VVMF? If so, I would imagine you can anticipate a relationship, paid out of VVMF funds, that is open-ended.

Let me also say that the sort of threat contained in your last paragraph is typical of the modus operandi you have demonstrated throughout this case. I once saw a movie where a lawyer threatened a man by saying, "I can make Mother Teresa look like a whore and not tell a single lie." Your mention of my "excess" in calling you an attack dog is ludicrous when compared to the hyperbolic descriptions of Mr. Sherwood and others contained in all of your dealings on this matter. Are you now intimating that I must begin seeing this thing your way, or you will take appropriate vengeance? I have no apologies to make regarding the statement I sent Mr. Scruggs, or the elaboration which I mailed him yesterday in response to his latest letter. If you believe the mention of your law firm, and the "deep pockets" relationship it has with VVMF, can intimidate me away from my honestly-held convictions, you are not only wrong, you are odious, and the person who needs to "develop a new resolve" is yourself.

I am curious about your latest attacks, now directed on my so-called "misstatements." Putting aside for the moment the question of the amount of money spent for your services by VVMF, certainly you cannot quibble with my observation that you are a high-powered lawyer, and that you have taken VVMF (meaning the public's) money in fee in order to keep the public from seeing the disbursement ledgers. Allowing public scrutiny would mean allowing everyone, including Mr. Perot, to see just how and where the money was spent, and you have put in enormous time and effort toward the goal of keeping everyone, including Mr.

page2

Perot, from such examination. Even your claim that all records are now available to the GAO does not alter this observation. The GAO is not the public. Does this, to use your words, "honor the public's need to know" how its money was spent? Or is it you, and VVMF, who determine the public's "need to know"?

You mention that you extended to Mr. Perot, and others, the offer to have the "Independent Audit Committee" investigate and report on any specific charge of financial misconduct. First of all, as you know, the chairman of this Committee has himself recently been charged with financial misconduct. Second, it is difficult, is it not, to make such a "specific" charge when VVMF has built a tent around its records? When I worked in the Congress, every penny I spent, and every penny I received in salary, was open to public scrutiny. I am informed that the American Legion will send any member a dollar-by-dollar breakdown of any spending program questioned. I know that even Coors brewery, a for-profit corporation, will allow anyone off the street to come in and examine its financial records. What is so sacred about the funds which the officers of VVMF hold in trust for the public that they should not voluntarily expose themselves to similar scrutiny? And what are you, other than an attack dog, when you attempt to browbeat anyone who makes such an observation?

This brings us to the question of how much you have received from VVMF in fee for defending them against such scrutiny. Jan Scruggs recently mentioned on the Joel Spivak show on WRC, in response to a question by Mr. Spivak, that Ross Perot had cost the Fund "six or seven times" the amount he had given it, for "that flag, that statue, and lawyers to keep him off our backs." Ross Perot reportedly gave VVMF 170,000 dollars. Seven times this figure is nearly 1.2 million dollars. Mr. Scruggs, who has a very loose tongue, may have erred in his calculations. But since only you and VVMF know how much VVMF has spent, it is prudent for the average listener to take Mr. Scruggs at his word. The sculpture cost \$330,000. The flag was reportedly provided by the American Legion. This leaves \$870,000. Is it unreasonable to believe Mr. Scruggs and assume that a good portion of this went to attorney's fees? I think not. I invite you to clarify this matter for me, and give me a more specific figure, and I assure you I will use it should I ever write about it for publication. Your accusation on this point is typical of your whole approach, when you accuse me of misstatements and falsehoods for making an estimate using the best data available.

No one involved in this matter, and particularly those of us who were branded "enemies" for stating our beliefs, has come out of it without a feeling of having been wrongly attacked. For my part, I will find it very difficult to forget that VVMF has repeatedly tried to label me a McCarthyite after I brought information privately to Mr. Wheeler,

page3

and never once mentioned it publicly. I would think that, given your own record of government service in a pretty controversial White House, you would have been keenly sensitive to such innuendo, and counseled against its continuance. Instead, you seem from your letter to have developed a style that is ass-deep in intimidation and harrassment. To borrow your phrase, I would like to see those "ugly attacks" cease. If you are prepared to join in that effort, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



James Webb

cc: Ethics Committee, D.C. Bar
GAO