

Dear George, *Lardner*

1/4/77

There was some kind of conspiracy conference at the University of Southern California at LA some months ago. It was taped (not clandestinely) and tapes are available. A friend who has the entire tape dubbed off a few for me.

Over a period of time I've been listening to them. When on the bus, on the exercycle, etc. Yesterday to and from the dentist. It is clear that the CIA people were led to expect other than what they found. It is clear to me that the excesses of those who criticized the CIA built sympathy among reasonable people. I believe most of the legitimate criticism gets lost this way.

Prior to what this tape holds, part of the Lane/Phillips confrontation, Colby and Ray Kline were there.

This is the essential Lane, never satisfied with a true lily. You will probably know that some of his representations are false. He has to know they are false. But Phillips did not. The audience, of course, also did not. Example- the CIA released records showing it had a long and continuing relationship with Clay Shaw. While I have no way of knowing what the truth may be what it released showed only a brief domestic-contact relationship. Similarly he says that the Clinton witnesses testified to the same thing. I was never in the courtroom but I know their story - saw both once.

This is not the reason I'm sending you the tape. I think you may want to hear what he says about you and the Post and the Times. As I got it, you did the work of the CIA for the CIA because you are CIA. And me, too. (So I want it back, please.)

Lane claimed he would sue Phillips if Phillips would waive the public person part as making Lane libel-proof. I doubt he would. But his only basis was Phillips' reading of Post and Times stories Lane claimed are defamatory.

Odd he never made the same request of the Post and Times, so he could sue them. In this case he assuredly would not sue because there was no defamation- no error, either.

On the matter of the story on my request for a temporary injunction, exactly what I told you would happen has happened. I'm got sick. He called Pratt's office to ask for an extension of time in that case and was greeted with what amounts to what the hell are you doing suing in my court to get records if you are also suing to prevent others from getting records.

This is precisely the interpretation I told you would be put on the story the way it was angled and headed and because of the omission of the word "temporary."

The flaw is in the paper, not in the interpretation of readers.

You were off so I wrote Milius. He has not answered. I told him that the first reaction was from a magazine writer who actually believed I was trying to block the release. He thought that was a great idea and the only way to forestall another media event.

If you want a dub of the tape feel free to make it. No hurry on the return, just so I get it back.

Sincerely,