Dear Jim, attached letter to the phoney mark 12/19/76

As you will see, I deal with myself only except for the one truthful reference to you, that I had nothing to do with your filing chargges against him with the bar.

Of course I deal with Mark, in a way that puts Prentice, Hall on further notice.

Mark has to be completely out of control or desparate beyond description to file an suit against me.

He may yet get that desparate.

If he does I'l stabb pro se and do my own deposing.

For this would I enjoy going into debt again!

He duplicated Foreman completely in getting to see Ray. If my memos on this are not specific enough it is the Cigna show on KDKA, Pittsburgh, and my source is Karen. She is also the source on the Mann stories. That is, the home-town boy story.

She is this good, dependable a person: just out of college she has a sort of legal-apprentice job with Westinghouse, which is being sued and has to produce some 35,000 records. Her performance on this job has been so outstanding that in a very short time she has been promoted and they are talking to her about helping her get a legal education. She made my JFK sculpture. Lil and I are fond of her.

It is on this tape that he discloses other than he has recently written you about how he got to see Ray, the time the warden was not there.

You have the tape of his own account of how he got to see Holloman, Coretta and others. Please preserve and return it to me. If you want a dub I'll make it for you. It holds what many people will not want known. Helpful to truth and decency.

I'm so glad that his insane inability to respond to you drobe him to bring me in.

Please be open-minded about what smells like the ripest Lane: I am told that. He may want to give the impression that this is Jimmy. Maybe it is.But I think it at least as likely that it was the Freed crew.

Also, do not lose sight of the fact that he makes no reference to my writing the American Program Bureau, in Mass., which has not responded since I put them on notice.

The time has come not to ignowe his disinformation operations and thefts. He has set the stage with an abundance of people who will not want to be soiled and can be called and can avoid being soiled by truth.

If I force him.

We8ll see soon enough.

Best,

Citizens Commission of Inquiry

105 2nd Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-7500

December 16, 1976

Mr. James H. Lesar
Attorney at Law
1231 Fourth Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

Dear Mr. Lesar:

Thank you for your unusual letter of December 12, 1976.

One - You wrote to the wrong bar association. Does Harold Weisberg do all of your research for you?

Two - It is not clear to me that you any longer represent Mr. Ray, since I am informed that his effort to fire you was impeded only because a case was pending. Now that you have lost that case, as well as the rest, your status may be in doubt.

Three - As I tried to explain to you so carefully in my last letter, the Canons of professional conduct prohibit my sharing with you confidential communications between Mr. Ray and myself. Should you secure a letter from Mr. Ray authorizing me to share that information with you, I would examine your request in a different light.

Four - Your associate, Harold Weisberg, in an effort to interfere with an existing contract, wrote to my publishers stating that you and he had met with Mr. Sprague and that Mr. Sprague "confirmed" that the Select Committee had been led "into difficulties" by a combination of my

"thefts and dishonesties." Mr. Weisberg made it quite clear that I had stolen material from his unfinished book, a partial book that until Mr. Weisberg's odd letter was forwarded to me I had heard nothing about, and a partial book which does not interest me in the slightest, since I work with a logical development of facts, not with quantum leaps and hysteria. Since your close associate contends that all of my material is both stolen from him, and inaccurate, I cannot understand why you now request the material. If Mr. Weisberg is accurate on this occasion then:

A. You are familiar with the material because you discussed it with Mr. Sprague and Mr. Weisberg and

B. It is all inaccurate and might lead you also "into difficulties" and

C. It is all available to you from the source--namely, Mr. Weisberg.

It appears to me that your letter refutes all of these false charges made by Mr. Weisberg. In any event, as you must know I am under no duty to share any of that information with someone who may no longer represent Mr. Ray and who, in fact, may be doing considerable damage to Mr. Ray's important cause. Should Mr. Ray urge me to take a different position on this question I would, of course, give very serious consideration to that request.

Very truly yours,

Mark Lane
Director

December 12, 1976

Mr. Mark Lane, Director
Citizens Commission of Inquiry
105 2nd Street, N. E.
Washington, D.CC. 20002

Dear Mr. Lane:

In reply to your letter of November 29, let me make it quite clear that I did not "threaten" that disciplinary action may be taken against you. I wrote the New York State Bar Association the same day I wrote you.

You state that Ray has asked you to represent him in "a specific matter," which you don't specify, and that he retained you in writing. If you have been retained by Ray, I feel I should be kept advised of your efforts on his behalf. What, specifically, did he retain you to do? What steps, if any, have you taken towards that end?

The December 6, 1976, issue of Midnight states that you interviewed Charles Q. Stephens within a few days after Dr. King's assassination. The Midnight article contains the following passage:

> "The despription that Stephens gave me precluded the possibility that he had seen Ray," Lane said. "And after I spoke with him, Stephens was jailed as a material witness."

Are the quotes attributed to you in this paragraph accurate? If not, how do they differ from what you actually told Midnight?

On what date did you interview Stephens?

Did you tape record or make any notes on your interview of Stephens. If so, why were such records not made available to Ray's attorneys? Because it is directly relevant to the matter in which I represent Ray, I request that you send me any records you have pertaining to your interview of Stephens. If you do not have any such records, then I would appreciate an immediate statement from you as to what description Stephens gave you and why it preclued the possibility that he had seen Ray.

Did you mean to imply that there was a causal connection between your interview of Stephens and his being jailed as a material

witness. If you did, what precisely is the connection?

Did you interview any other witnesses in Memphis shortly after the assassination? If you did, I would appreciate you identifying them and providing me with any records you have of what they told you, or, if you did not make records of any kind, then I would ask that you state to me what you recall their having said.

I understand that the Select Committee on Assassinations recently formed by the House of Representatives in large part owes its existence to "new evidence" about Dr. King's assassination which you made available to members of the Black Caucus and Mrs. Coretta King. I ask that you make all such "new evidence" available to me as soon as possible, so that I may determine whether it can be of benefit to my client.

Sincerely yours,

James H. Lesar

Route 12 - Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

December 19, 1976

Mark Lane
105 Second St. NE
Washington, D.C. 20002

Counterfeit Mark;

I saw Jim Lesar the day he received your letter of the 15th. He did not consider it worth wasting time on, so I do not know what he thinks about it. Except that he laughed. Instead, he gave me a copy of it and his of the 12th to you. I find no reference to me in his letter and no basis for intruding me into this. Your resort to the traditional device of the totally bankrupt lawyer is obvious, even for you. The total nonresponsiveness of your shysterism is apparent.

Although I had nothing to do with Jim's filing a complaint against you with the bar, I consider what he did a public service. If he had not, in time I probably would have.

As some of your formerly deceived and since then defected associates have told you, you are sick. You are galled by a long career that is, from your own effort, singularly without any distinction except as a thief and a skilled propagandist. A lack of either principle or scruple assists you in both. You therefore have no choice but to take from others and to trade on others.

Why don't you try to be honest for a change? The world will not end. No hole will swallow you up, public benefit that this would be.

Your representation of what I told Prentice-Hall is unfaithful, the norm with you. My purpose is and was explicit: I put them on notice. If you or they think I did not mean it, well, we'll just have to await the working of time, won't we? I look forward to what is long overdue!

Only a twisted mind that in its innermost recesses knows it is without decent, reputable accomplishment would twist this into the sick misrepresentation of "an effort to interfere with an existing contract." Your tortured ego will do you in yet.

I went much further with Prentice-Hall than you indicate. I invited a confrontation with you, to be taped and without restrictions. Neither they nor you accepted. But we have been through that before, haven't we? Like the time I exposed you as a thief on the air and in a TV studio, with the studio tape showing you defending thievery as right and proper, the air tape holding your claim that it was all a "printer's error" that would be corrected in a reprint, in which it was not "corrected."

Like the juvenile delinquent that you are emotionally, you talk brave talk when you have no one to face. Face to face, a rarity, the coward in you is meek. Twice when I was ill and weak. Even then you were yellow.

If Prentice-Hall wants to believe what you say, they will learn, as has everyone who ever had anything to do with you, from the inevitable pain. They have yet to learn what all who know you recognize as you at your best and most dependable, the quotation of your words from Midnight - which is where you belong - in Jim's letter:

> "And after I spoke with him (Charles Stephens) he was jailed as a material witness."

After he took a crap has as much relevance. After he slugged a woman while the cops were "protecting" him. And after he was filmed denying Ray is the man he saw. You had less to do with this than a sealed garlic waved over a simmering stew.

I have raised many dogs, knew still more, and a few pigs, but never have I seen or heard of a cur who from his deep immersion in manure sought to bite the succoring hand - except you. You disgrace the canine, the bovine - and excrement.

You were once less careful than you have since learned to be in your deceptions as you acquire a synthetic fame by thefts and other dishonesties. So in 1966 you announced that you were suing Wesley Liebeler for libel for calling you a liar. How he and his enjoyed it! How they needled you and your friends! How total a defense - truth - Liebeler had! While your tail remained between your legs, your friends asked me to take after Liebeler, you being unable to in your own defense. I did, he ran, and you were free to resume the same crooked career, next with Garrison. (I skip your books, not because they are not melodorously overripe.)

Sick with self-importance and no personal accomplishment as you are, naturally you resented my saving your self-soiled ass.

And, of course, you don't hate yourself, so you hate others.

When it has been reported to me that you said you were going to sue me, I have seen to it that you had ample grounds, in personal, return-receipt correspondence. You have not sued. I do not think you can get desperate enough for that. While you do not know what I have, you have a pretty fair idea of what is available to those who have any knowledge of you at all and of the potential, not only of the thievery and deliberate dishonesty of your writing, but what there is on tape as you go around in your juvenile ersatz heroics.

If your advance was for $10,000 or more, you now have now and ample grounds for going into federal court.

But you know I am not Liebeler, don't you?

And you know that, in addition to what I know and have, I can produce others who will establish not only that you have a career of thievery but are a walking and loud-talking encyclopaedia of misinformation.

You will want that aired in court when shrimps whistle Yankee Doodle from the backs of cows jumping over a greancheese moon.

But I would taunt the vampire to whom truth, decency and honesty are like holy water. So I send copies to others and inform you that I do.

Meanwhile, do keep those tapes that impress people. I know of them what Prentice-Hall does not.

Sue me, yellow dog - and risk a countersuit.

Good people - authentic experts - will stand in line to testify!

Now, on Jim's complaint to the bar, with which I really had nothing to do, what you do have to look forward to is what I can testify to and what my sources who have taped and clipped you and your associated literary Fagins from coast to coast can and would testify to. I could not follow you if I considered that a worthwhile endeavor, which I do not. So on what is relavant with Prentice-Hall, what I have is copies. Plus those who are my sources, who have the originals.

I strain to hear the whistling of shrimps, of which in human qualities you are one.

Truly,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. Are you man enough to send me a copy of your response to Prentice-Hall? You have read my letter. Do you dare risk my writing them further after reading yours?

Mr. Peter Grenquist, President
Trade Book Division
Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632

12/20/76

Dear Mr. Grenquist,

In the month since I told you to feel free to give a copy of our correspondence to Mark Lane he has not addressed me.

It is typical of him that he seeks to engaget in diversions and digressions. He has attempted this with Jim Lesar, who gave me copies of their exchange to show that while Mr. Lesar made no reference to me in that matter, in which I am not involved, Lane sought to use this and his customary fabrications to avoid addressing anything else. I have therefore written Lane. I enclose a carbon. Lane can provide you with copies of his correspondence with Mr. Lesar if you want it.

I wrote Mr. Lesar further about this. I also enclose a copy of that letter.

Your Wayne Carson did phone Mr. Lesar, who told me about their conversation. I wrote Mr. Carson 12/10. I have had no response.

I told him as I have told you, if you want to inform yourself that is possible. If you do not you are on notice.

Mr. Carson did not accept my offer to go to your Washington office on this.

If there is other correspondence of which you should know I will send copies.

Otherwise I feel I have done all that can be expected of me under the circumstances.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Dear Jim, My yesterday's letter to Mark Lane 12/20/76

I got up earlier than usual for work I was not able to complete last night and my eye was taken by the letter to Lane Bill had retyped for me.

Let me add a few things.

Do you for a minute think that he would have been silent going on eight years if Stephens had told him the man he "saw" was not Ray?

This is typical Lane. Who is going to deny it? Stephens is a drunk nobody believes, even asks.

But it did not happen anyway. Mark cares nothing about truth and nobody ever has any interest in keeping him honest.

I have no doubt that he was in Memphis. He was on the Garrison teat then and Memphis is close to New Orleans. But he never came up with anything. Any place he went. Except the garbage he put on film and couldn't use. He did a long bit with Dago Garner in which Garner boasted of homosexual relations with both Oswald and Ruby. Terrible stuff like that, what he thought could get attention. Same with Roger Craig. In these and in other cases he followed up after others. He steals without discrimination.

If Mark really knew the fact of the King assassination it probably would have made no difference. He does and says anything and people who do not know him or the realities generally are impressed.. But the give-away is that he was in Memphis before Ray was identified so he could not have asked Stephens to "identify" Ray. After Ray was identified by the FBI CBS was there with a picture. They did not then use their footage but they did film Stephens, I think 4/19/68. This was the week after Mark was then and left empty-handed.

His m.o. then was to go around and say he was the "representative" of the New Orleans District Attorney. With the college kids that went over big. In Memphis, a town you now know well enough, it just scared the hell out of most people, especially some of the blacks. So they turn to those they feared, which is how I know about some of it. From the local cops to FBI Inspectors. I have records on this. I've made an extra copy of one that will amuse you.

Mark's problem comes from all he has, what he makes out on - his mouth. I know when he was in Memphis also from him. He sees an open mike and the most incredible stuff pours out. He makes it up as he goes and then believes it. So one of the ways I know he was in Memphis laying eggs before Ray was identified/ is from a tape of one of his broadcasts an outraged student sent me. Probably more than one but I remember one.

You should have asked him why he did not give that hot evidence to defense counsel if he had it. There was to have been a trial. And here he is the champion of the oppressed.

Before he put together the fairy-tale he told you about how he got to see Ray he once told the truth. It also was sent to me. I think the bar will be interested if they ask you any more about your complaint. Of course Mark will probably be going around flashing the paper he got Ray to sign but not Ray's withdrawl of it. He did not get to see Jimmy because Jimmy wrote and asked him to be Jimmy's lawyer. He may have slick-talked Jimmy into something like a meaningless FOIA deal but not to be his lawyer, I'm sure. He falls short of saying this in his letter to you. He only implies it. He flashes that kind of paper to impress those who know nothing. I'd be surprised if he is not doing this with his non-response to you. He has often enough in the past.

Thanks for the letters. It is entertaining. Especially when taken with his virtuoso display of worse than ignorance. Those parts are going to kick back hard. And it won't be long, either. I can see it happening when it is too late and the book is wrecked. I'll love it. I've never asked for fairness doctrine time on these things but then I will!

Best,