

Dear Phil,

4/16/77

Harriet Van Horne's NYPost column of 4/13/77 illustrates what a consciencless crook can do with a combination of distorted open thievery, simplification and outright lies is he has a major publisher behind him and an uncritical media audience that is pricked by a slowly-disturbed conscience.

This review selects both the fabrications and the thefts as its base. The thefts are bad not because they are thefts, which they are and a New Yorker should know they are, but because they have been given a twisted meaning, one they cannot and do not sustain.

All that is true, even though distorted, was published earlier and totally ignored by this same reviewer and this same paper. The difference is changed times and the publisher's name.

The cleverness with which Lane succeeded in his sick quest for vengeance and personal if unearned fame is illustrated by the error Van Horne adds to his. Holloman, for example, was not in Hoover's office for 25 years. Nor was he during the time Lane places him there. (After lying about it in earlier appearances he fuzzed it over in the book, probably by just editing all these references to time out.)

Of such, alas, the kingdom of the major media.

I was away the 14th when there was a call from Globe news in Canada. It was to have called back yesterday. It did not. I do not know if this is the same as your reference to National Examiner and the James Hepburn book, a fake signed with that name.

I did see the Anderson/Liberto column and give it no more credibility after it is leaked by the committee than I did from obtaining these papers for myself. It is the Mc Ferren story.

Cliff Andrews, by any of his names, is a con man. I did not have to know of his long professional career to know his story was b.s. In any of the versions from Bob.

I do not have the AP and other quotes you use in your 4/13. They were aired but not printed hereabouts. If you examine them carefully you will, I am certain, see that they really say nothing at all. And they ll be the Sprague interpretation of what he says Jimmy said. I do not know what Jimmy said. I do know what he can say. It is not what is attributed to him by Sprague.

If you have the quotes I'd appreciate them.

I think also that the years of confinement, the kind of confinement and the repeated questionings, not uncommonly angled questionings, can turn what is in Jimmy's mind around, particularly because I think it likely he is trying to hold some back, if not that which he is quoted about.

Hope the two more weeks away from home do not get too heavy.

I'll enclose what I'd intended sending to your home when your absence was to have been shorter.

Thanks and best,