Dear Phil, 1/3/78

Relet 12/31, for which thanks, I'd thought that those people were Renfro's work (and subject to the limitations of all of his work, some of which is fine) and that Lane had merely cribbed it.

Once he is out of Tennessee Lane goes around boasting this is all the result of his investigation. He may well have duplicated Renfro's work, with a tape recorder. He did tape an interview with Gracie, he says. Naturally that also is original, even if I turned it over to Paul Valentine of the Wx Post years ago and he did a fine story on it.

McCraw also is not Lane's work. I interviewed him years ago on a Sunday. (If I get there again and we get together remind me to tell you that story - as indicative or what reaction there was from ordinary Memphians, all of whom were good to me.) I then produced him as a witness at the 1974 evidentiary hearing. Now Lane has this great new lead. The real probalem will be that between natural confabulation with the passing of time and Lane's effort to foist off his own point of view McCraw may have in fact or by inference said other than identically what he swore to. This is the classic illustration of the lawyer asking one question too many, in this case gilding the lily for personal reasons, when all he needs is under oath in an existing transcript. No point was served. No decent lawyer would be exploiting it and running any risk. Existing record more than adequate & sworn.

Lane's new Gracis Walden/Stephens version is that Charlie was not even in the bldg.

Re NY clips on JFK releases: thanks much. I have the Times single story of 12/8/77, APs. What is interesting to me here is that a Times reporter who had been assigned to that told a friend of mine that he was merely one of a crew who would be pawing over those records. Only to have the Times use a single AP story? Wild!

Angus was bound to move upward.

On FBI releases: I've asked for a temporary injunctions for a number of reasons. One is to effect compliance with my requests for this material going back to 1968. Another is to have it in hand to be able to read any records and be able to respond to press inquiries from the record, not a reporter's hasty impression of it. Still another is to support my request under the Act for the remission of costs. So any clipping can have a line that can be of real value. We have a bad judge, for me(not a perjurer)-the one who praised Kleindinest for perjuring himself- and then turned him loose to get wealthy. No response yet, from judge or government.

Do you know anything about Dean Cowden or Thomas I. Wilson? Is either dependable?

I'm troubled that both were silent for so long, especially with all the local attention the 1974 evidentiary hearing got. And I remember only too well Renfros joyous boast of running the police ass off with fabrications. He manufactured them to get even with the cops for giving him a rought time, as I'm sure they did. Renfro was very honest with me about those kinds of things. And with an appreciative audience he can be a very entertaining story teller.

The latest poop is that the House assassins committee will issue some kind of report. I know no more, except that there have been contrary reports. I can add that as of now I know of no "critic" who was for them, meaning almost everyone besides me, who now is without the most serious doubts. Most are more unhappy than mere doubters.

Goo year to you all and many thanks.

L Lane

PO Box 4803
Memphis TN 38104

Dec 31/77

Dear Harold,

As to the ENQUIRER story of Oct 11/77 by Charles Cobb:
Renfro Hays led ENQ to Dean [redacted] Cowden, a commodities broker, and Thomas I. Wilson, a retired car salesman, both of whom say they saw Ray at the service station. Whereas Mrs. Grace Walden is quoted as saying the Glophouse bathroom door was locked "for about 45 minutes" before she heard "a loud shot." If it was Ray, he couldn't have been in the bathroom & at the service station at the same time, the story notes. You are quoted re Grace going to Bolivar: "I think she was put there because her story contradicted the story Charlie Stevens told." (pr perhaps yours?)
ENQ also uses Mark Lane/material without crediting him, re Gabbie finding Charlie drunk.

McEachran is now top editor at Birmingham Post-Herald.
Your implication is probably right re FBI & Blanton, with vengeful FBI getting the goods on Blanton & giving it to CA.

FBI's JFK records--I have all the clips from the NY dailies & will try to get up copies for you.

Happy New Year!

Phil.

Phil Moss

Dear Ted,

1/3/78

When my wife uses the copying machine again I'll be copying part of a personal letter for you. Because I have to protect my source I'll be eliminating some of it. My purpose in sending this to you is not to argue or to run Lane down but to let you know what he does all the time and people have no way of understanding. He is that skilled in his perpetual dishonesties.

You may remember that when you first told me of Lane's newest boasting about his personal investigations in the King assassination and you repeated what he had said I told you that I'd heard the same thing appeared in the National Enquirer. The writer was named Cobb. His source, as this letter says, was Penfron Hays. So naturally Clark is James Bond.

Note also - and I want you to please say nothing about this - that the stories contradict each other. If I mean Gracie's do.

I will also be enclosing, for your information, papers on the settling of John Henry Faulk's suit against Clark and others for $5,000. Settlement for $4,000 out of court is a rather high percentage.

Today I had to go to Washington for a molar extraction. Because of the medication I'm on the dentist did not want me to go by bus so I had a ride. I was able to listen to tapes both ways. I don't know what happened to the LA conspiracy symposium tapes but they are incomplete and repeat. Instead of the speeches by Lane and Phillips there was a repeat of the ACLU woman - the same thing twice. I do have the question period of Lane and Phillips. I have not finished hearing that. Quite worthwhile.

Some of what Clark said was quite fair and in point. Much was false. There was also a great amount of distortion. If Phillips knew the subject he'd have hurt Lane. The situation was very hurtful to Phillips, aside from his won record. If Lane really knew the material he could have done ever so much more. However, I also want you to know what Phillips did not know, that Hoover did not tell Rowley that FBI agents had heard the tape and said it was not Oswald's voice. I know this is what Lane has been saying. it is not what Hoover's letter says. It is typical Lane distortion and misrepresentation. That kind of thing can be used with great effectiveness in private, as on the Hill, with the Members.

I'd like very much to have their opening remarks. Phillips did spill a little but Lane did not take up on it. He went for a trick, saying he did not know that the records on critics or the memos had been sent abroad. Actually, they say so in the copies I have. Those records were for overseaes CIA stations, not those in the US, anyway. And as of that time what Lane was saying was grossly wrong, as Phillips did not know. not knowing the subject, the available material or what Lane was saying. Mark did get carried away a bit when he said his name is mentioned in the records, maybe the FBI's or the Commission's, more than Oswald's or JFK's or Ruby's. Nonsense. But he did say it - and got away with it.

In the earlier tapes there were similar duplications and omissions so you may have gotten confuaged when you were dubbing and done the same things with others. Makes no difference to me because I'm sure that Colby and Kline said little or dropped little. Don't bother trying to dig out a set of their remarks.

Nothing new here. Hope you had a nice holiday.

Best,