

CHAPTER 25

The Holy Man and His Other Holy Cause

As counsel for Carto the Hitler-lover and his establishment of anti-Semites Lane was effective. He won for it the lawsuit filed by former CIA spook and Watergate villain E. Howard Hunt over an article in The Spotlight of August 14, 1978, written by Lane's associate on Carto's anti-Semitic pro-Arab publication referred to above, Victor Marchetti.

Before quitting the CIA, Marchetti had been an office assistant in the higher levels at CIA headquarters.

His article, which Lane reprints in Plausible Denial (page 139ff) is false and it is very defamatory. It accuses Hunt of being a JFK assassin, along with others, and says that the CIA is going to admit it — throw Hunt to the wolves, so to speak. Hunt sued for libel. In 1981, he won an earlier lawsuit over it. When it was remanded for retrial is when Carto got Lane to handle it.

It was perfectly safe for Lane to reprint that false and defamatory article in his book because it has already been held not to be libellous, such is the state of our libel laws today. Here are some excerpts from the Marchetti article as reprinted by Lane:

CIA To Admit Hunt Involved in Kennedy Slaying

The Spotlight, August 14, 1978

(Victor Marchetti has been in U.S. Intelligence activities for almost 20 years, 14 of that being with the CIA, the last three years of which he was a staff assistant to Richard Helms. He is the author of *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* and *The Rope Dancer*.)

by Victor Marchetti

A few months ago, in March, there was a meeting at CIA headquarters in Langley, VA, the plush home of America's super spooks overlooking the Potomac River. It was attended by several high-level clandestine officers and some former top officials of the agency.

The topic of discussion was: What to do about recent revelations associating President Kennedy's accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, with the spy game played between the U.S. and the USSR? (*Spotlight*, May 8, 1978.) A decision was made and a course of action determined.

...during the next two months, according to sensitive sources in the CIA and on HSCA, we are going to learn much more about the crime. The new disclosures will be sensational, but only superficially so. A few of the lesser villains involved in the conspiracy and its subsequent coverup

will be identified for the first time - and allowed to twist slowly in the wind on live network TV. Most of the others to be fingered are already dead. ...

They'll Hang Hunt

Chief among those to be exposed by the new investigation will be E. Howard Hunt, of Watergate fame. His luck has run out, and the CIA has decided to sacrifice him to protect its clandestine services. The agency is furious with Hunt for having dragged it publicly into the Nixon mess and for having blackmailed it after he was arrested....

In the public hearings, the CIA will 'admit' that Hunt was involved in the conspiracy to kill Kennedy. The CIA may go as far to 'admit' that there were three gunmen shooting at Kennedy. The FBI, while publicly embracing the Warren Commission's 'one man acting alone' conclusion, has already privately known that there were three gunmen. The conspiracy involved many more people than the ones who actually fired at Kennedy, both agencies may now admit.

Posing As Bum

A.J. Weberman and Michael Canfield, authors of *Coup d'Etat in America*, published pictures of three apparent bums who were arrested at Dealey Plaza just after President Kennedy's murder, but who were strangely released without any record of the arrest having been made by the Dallas police. One of the tramps the authors identified as Hunt. Another was Frank Sturgis, a long time agent of Hunt's....

Now, the CIA moved to finger Hunt and tie him to the JFK assassination. HSCA unexpectedly received an internal CIA memorandum a few weeks ago that the agency just happened to stumble across in its old files. It was dated 1966 and said in essence: Some day we will have to explain Hunt's presence in Dallas on November 22, 1963 - the day President Kennedy was killed. Hunt is going to be hard put to explain this memo, and other things, before the TV cameras at the HSCA hearings. ... E. Howard Hunt will be implicated in the conspiracy and he will not dare to speak out - the CIA will see to that. In addition to Hunt and Sturgis, another former CIA agent marked for exposure is Gerry Patrick Hemming, a hulk of a man - six feet eight inches tall and weighing 260 pounds. Like Sturgis, Hemming once worked for Castro as a CIA double agent, then later surfaced with the anti-Castro Cubans in various attempts to rid Cuba of the communist dictator. But there are two things in Hemming's past that the CIA, manipulation HSCA, will be able to use to tie him to the JFK assassination.

"First, Castro's former mistress, Marita Lorenz (now an anti-Castroite herself), has identified Hemming, along with Oswald and others as being part of the secret squad assigned to kill President Kennedy. And secondly, Hemming was Oswald's Marine sergeant when he was stationed at CIA's U-2 base in Atsugi, Japan - where Oswald supposedly was recruited as a spy by the Soviets, or was being trained to be a double agent by the CIA."

For Marchetti, The Spotlight, the Carto-minded gang of anti-Semites and Hitler lovers and for Lane, the self-described pre-eminent authority on the JFK assassination, this is pretty good. One sentence is true, part of another sentence is also true, and a third sentence is, while accurate, quite false.

True in a manner of speaking only. True in its references to what is referred to. But what is referred to is false.

With the passing of time it is obvious that the entire thrust of this Spotlight defamation is entirely

false. None of it happened.

There was never any reason to credit any of it. Like, "the CIA will 'admit' that Hunt was involved in the conspiracy to kill Kennedy." Or that it knew there were three gunman. Or that the FBI also believes that there were three gunman. Or that the CIA had ever "moved to finger Hunt."

The totality of falsehood is rather impressive.

Even what is true is also false.

Weberman and Canfield did publish that crazy book and did include those oft-printed pictures that never had any assassination relevance. But after those three tramps were arrested, they were not "strangely released without any record of the arrest being made by the Dallas police." The police did disclose those records and the correct identifications of those three winos, which is what they were. Neither Hunt nor Sturgis was one of them.

Lane has boasted, falsely, as usual, of backing trucks up to the FBI and hauling off loads of its records. If he had and if he had looked at those records, all then being available having been disclosed to me as compelled by the courts in those FBI lawsuits, he would have learned that in the May of 1968 I had forced an FBI investigation of those pictures and the results of that investigation, in my files and in the FBI's public reading room if not in Lane's imaginary truckloads proves no assassination connection of any kind of those men. They were picked up an hour and a half after the investigation, a block to the west of it and two blocks to the south. Actually they were photographed near the Book Depository building as the police marched them off the tracks, from the parked boxcar in which they had been drinking behind the Dallas Central Annex Post Office. That was the only way the police could walk them away.

Lane had pioneered in making up "identifications" for those innocent winos then down on their luck a bit. He and others had other "identifications" for them, many of them. For example, although all were photographed while walking, the tallest was referred to for years as "the walking man." Lane first "identified" him as one Edgar Eugene Bradley, then the west-coast representative of the ultra-right Cape May, New Jersey radio preacher, the Reverend Carl McIntire. (It is McIntire to whom for a short period of time we had the

intended broadcasting fairness of "the fairness doctrine" from the Federal Communications Commission.

Lane even published his account of his account of his "investigation" to "confirm" that the tallest of these men means Bradley- which he was not. The "underground" papers went for that big.

Another was given the name "Frenchy" by one of Lane's then pals. Why "Frenchy?"

Because of the imagined French out of that hobo's well-worn and rumpled suit coat.

When I pointed out that not even the CIA had invented rifles that could be sighted around corners, the alleged role of these poor tramps was converted from assassins into their being "paymasters" lingering, in those many theories, near the scene of the crime, risking being caught, just to be sure that the job had been done to and to pay those who did it!

Because there was never even reason to suspect that those men had any connection of any kind with the assassination, there is no point in recalling all the many other "identifications" made of them by that part of the JFK assassination industry. But it was the Lane who began proclaiming that the tallest of those men was as he was not, Edgar Eugene Bradley, also falsely "identifies" him as E. Howard Hunt in his fraud of a book.

(Of the series of readily available reports on the investigation for which I was responsible the one from Dallas that gives the results of its investigation disclosing where those men were when picked up and who did that is a Memphis MURKIN of main King assassination file, where it is in that file's "Sub-E," dated 8/21/68. In Dallas it was placed in three different files, in its King assassination, 44-2649, in its Oswald file, 105-815, and in its main JFK assassination file, 89-43.

Thus the result of that investigation are available to the public in at least four files that by my lawsuits I forced from their official hiding places and were available to Lane.

For the publisher part of the JFK assassination industry these are the finest of credentials: the more grossly wrong the more publishable.

The book-publishing part of this industry is satisfied to have the readers it suckers provide their own explanations of how Hunt and his imagined fellow assassins sighted and fired with such deadly accuracy around a corner that was more than two city blocks away.

What a sight that required!

Lane's way of lying while not literally lying in basing his phony book on the false allegation that the jury held that the CIA had killed JFK is summarized on the book's dust-jacket. It says that "the forewoman of the jury, Leslie Armstrong, stated that, 'Mr. Lane was asking us to do something very difficult. He was asking us to believe that John Kennedy had been killed by our own government. Yet when we examined the evidence we were forced to conclude that the CIA had indeed killed President Kennedy.'"

This is what Lane says in his books. But the question of who killed the President was never before that jury and it never deliberated on it. Regardless of what the Lane-befuddled lady juror said.

As the Associated Press reported the outcome of that trial for the next day's morning paper, here quoted from our local Frederick Post of Thursday, February 7, 1985, the jury held 1) that Hunt was not libeled and 2) because "malice" was not proven.

Federal jury says Hunt not libeled

Miami (AP) - A federal jury denied Watergate burglar E. Howard Hunt \$1 million in damages Wednesday, deciding that he was not libelled in an article by an ex-CIA agent suggesting Hunt was part of a conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy.

In a trial four years ago, Hunt was awarded \$650,000 in damages. That verdict was overturned because of a flawed instruction to the jury.

This time a six-member jury found in favor of Liberty Lobby, a right-wing Washington group that publishes *The Spotlight* tabloid, where the article appeared in 1978.

One juror, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said the panel felt that no evidence was presented showing malice toward Hunt by the publication. The judge had instructed the jury before it began deliberating Tuesday that evidence of malice was necessary to find for Hunt."

The case is reported in the Federal Reporter (720, second series, pages 631 ff). Of seven numbered summary paragraphs, with citation to earlier decisions, six are headed, "Libel and Slander" and one, headed "Federal Courts," says that "in libel action by public official or public figure, whether plaintiff has established 'reckless disregard' of 'actual malice.'" (page 632)

Nothing about the JFK assassination. Or the CIA!

Hunt did not prove "malice" and Marchetti did have sources, hence, no matter how crazy his sources were, there was no "reckless disregard" for truth, and that is the entire thing.

Nothing about the assassination at all.

Of course Lane knew this. But if he had limited himself to the truth he would not have had his book. And all the money and fame from that cheapie, that fraud.

He makes this clear in his own chronology in his book:

"Second Hunt v. Liberty Lobby trial. On February 6, the jury finds Liberty Lobby not guilty of libel."
(page X)

In complaining to the Washington Post over its review of his book, Lane steered away from this and made no mention of the knowingly false thrust of the book that would not have existed without that knowingly false thrust. The Post printed two other letters in its February 2, 1992 issue. The first complained, not without justification, about the subject-matter ignorance of the reviewer. The second was from me. Here are four paragraphs from my letter about which Lane then and since then has been silent:

This was a libel suit and nothing else. There was no other question before the court. The decision of the jury was that [E. Howard] Hunt 'was not libelled' [in an article by an ex-CIA agent suggesting Hunt was part of a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy]. The case was decided on absence of proof of 'malice' by Hunt and his lawyers.

Lane also pretends that it is he who brought to light those originally withheld government records. He refers to hauling 'truckloads' of them away from the FBI building. Any lawyer at all familiar with Freedom of Information Act litigation knows this is a very big lie.

Any perceptive reviewer, having read these repeated claims to have acquired all those records, should have wondered why in so long and detailed a book not a single statement is cited to any identifiable record.

Here you have Lane boasting, Horatio at the bridge as he always is, along with Dick Daring, of having alone and unassisted gotten 'truckloads' of FBI records; and what does he have in his appendix? Only dated self-promotion, all previously published. Why did he not publish a single one of the hundreds of pages he claims to have rescued from official oblivion.

Book publishers have to know what is and what is not libel and they do. On the most casual reading Lane's book is based on a palpable fraud, one not involved in any libel decision. But then, in common with most of the so-called assassination books of the past two and a half decades, Lane's is trash. And trash in assassination books is what has little trouble getting published - and advertised and promoted. The publisher knows that Big Brother does not get angry over trash and frauds. In fact, the agencies love that because it confuses the people even more and makes the official mythology seem more credible.

As we have seen, fraud represents no problem to Lane when he sees self-promotion or other publicity for himself, or when he sees money in return for fraudulent writing. What gives him trouble is the

truth. He has trouble telling it even by accident.

He is an accomplished liar, a knowing, deliberate, well-practiced liar.

It has paid him well, too.

He knows much less than he pretends to know about the fact of the assassination and its investigations than he represents while presenting himself as the pre-eminent critic of the official story.

As a few spot checks of his implausible Plausible Denial shows.

For example, in his Prologue, he lies knowing it is a lie:

"Rush to Judgement was the first analysis of the report of the Warren Commission." (page 4)

He knows it was not the first, and he knows it was not the second. Of those printed in this country only. Others were printed abroad. In fact he cribbed from the first two, my Whitewash and Epstein's Inquest in his first book's first edition.

On the very next page, apparently referring to Hunt but not naming him, Lane says of his Libery Lobby lawsuit, "For the first time, a suspect in the killing voluntarily entered a courtroom and thus exposed himself to questions that he was required to answer." (And Lane does not have in his book.)

Suspect as he uses it refers to a police suspect, not any of the myriads imagined in the assassination nutturies. Hunt was never a "suspect" in the assassination.

Except to the nuts and the commercializers.

Lane's last paragraph in his Prologue is also a lie:

"There is no legal precedent for Hunt v. Liberty Lobby." That case was decided only on precedent, as indicated above. Lane's cockamamie reason for this self-promoting lie is that in it "the case against [JFK's] killers was finally tried in a civil action suit brought in the federal courthouse in Miami."

That did not happen - not in any way.

But without this lie Lane would not have had his fraudulent book and the dishonest fame and dirty money he got from it.

(His successful fraud was reprinted in 1993 to exploit the thirtieth assassination anniversary.)

Lane says at this point about the silly concoctions he pretends are assassination evidence and aren't even good fiction that "this testimony was offered reluctantly and in fear by a person who had been involved in the action and who had travelled with the assassins from Miami to Dallas just before the murder."

That is a good line, that business about fearing to talk and fearing getting killed. Like in a murder mystery. But it is not in fact, not even in Lane's fiction.

He did not like that line, though. And he used it over and over again, despite the fact that it was in all respects false.

He was talking about that phony Marita Lorenz who boasted of whoring for two country rulers at least. Including bearing Castro an illegitimate child. Lane says of her story "The information was startling and impressive, but I was unable to locate anyone who would publish her account." (page 291)

Lane got onto this particular gravy wagon after the first Hunt suit against Liberty Lobby, remember, and in Lane's own chronology (page X) that did not end until 1981.

If Lane was not able to find anyone who, after 1981, "who would publish her story" the most obvious of the many possible explanations is that although even the supermarket tabloids would not touch it and didn't the New York Daily News do a series on it in 1977!

I do not know how many parts there were but I was sent copies of two, both by Paul Meskill.

Each has a different picture of Lorenz, both when she was younger.

The headline on the first is:

**Ex-Spy Says She Drove
To Dallas with Oswald &
Kennedy's Assassin Squad.**

The carryover headline is:

She Tells of 'Assassin Squad.'

The second story is headed, "Tells of FBI Warning on JFK Plot."

As is not uncommon, these sensational fabrications were picked up by the wire services and re-published widely. I have a Reuter's version from the Toronto Star of September 20, 1977. It credits the

Daily News as its source and that was three days before Meskill's last I have that the Daily News published.

Lorenz feared for her life if she spoke to Lane or in public? Everyone feared to publish her story?

Both are Lane's shameless concoction to make something of that nothing and to sucker-bait the book-buying public.

Besides this Daily News series and other publication in 1977 she had already testified to the House assassins committee, and that was public. And having made up so attractive a story, she also - in 1977 - seven years earlier - gave the names of those she said she travelled with and she said were the actual assassins!

Even Lane's chum A.J. Weberman published her preposterous fabrications in his Yispter Times, with Gabrielle Schang as coauthor of it. That headline is, "Yes, We Have No Havanas," with the second deck reading, "Marita Lorenz Tells Why She Did It."

The interviewed her. So far was it from true it that what she could not be published or that she was in fear.

In her publications of her concoction even included the names of those she says were the assassins. Those she feared naming to Lane.

Lane's version is that she said these things for the first time in that lawsuit:

"It was clear that Lorenz was about to reveal the names of the paymaster and control [Hunt] for [Frank] Sturgis' secret operation. The courtroom was hushed." Or at least so Lane says of his 1985 regurgitation of that so well publicized cock-and-bull story of seven years earlier. (page 294)

Lane leads her into saying that she saw "Mr. Hunt actually deliver money" to Frank Sturgis, in an envelope. Obviously she could not know what was in a sealed envelope so Lane asked her, "Was the cash visible as he had it in the envelope?" To this naturally, she responded, "Yes."

If that had been the case Hunt would have flunked Spooking 101!

In all respects, from having a witness to using an envelope with the loot spilling out of it. (page 296)

For Lane she added a new invention, that she saw Jack Ruby with those two carloads of assassins

with whom she claims to have travelled. Liking that little touch, Lane re-emphasized it, "Is it your testimony that the man who killed Lee Harvey Oswald is ... the person you saw in the motel room in Dallas the night before the president was killed?"

What else? Marita, of course, said, "Yes." (page 299)

In Lane's account, when he interviewed her "I had asked for the names of the other persons in the two-car caravan from Miami to Dallas. She was very reluctant to answer the question. "'They killed Kennedy. I don't want to be the one to give their names, it's too dangerous.'" Sir Walter reincarnated, Lane then says, "I told her that I would neither pursue the matter nor inquire of her about their identities." (page 300)

It gets riper - and more preposterous. Lane quotes some of Hunt's lawyer's questioning of Lorenz. He asked if she saw the weapons her alleged companero assassins carried from Miami to Dallas. She said she did. So he asked her what kinds of weapons, and she said "handguns and automatics." That is real expertise, as benefits the trained spook Lorenz said she was, including in weapons training. Some "handguns" are "automatics."

She was asked to identify "specifically" what kind of guns they were. She said, for all the world as though rather than killing a single man they were going to storm the city of Dallas, "Rifles, there were cases of machine guns, rifles, thirty-eights, forty-fives." (page 300) Here she added that she was "trained in firearms."

That is not all she was trained in!

Despite her amateur performance at it.

But that was good enough for Lane anyway.

In the version Lane published, Hunt's lawyer did not ask Lorenz why they needed or how they were going to use "cases of machine guns" in addition to all those rifles and handguns in shooting a single man.

Lane does exaggerate his knowledge of the established fact of the assassination, and most of what he has said and written over the years, like this book, is anything but factual, with nothing too preposterous or

impossible for him to exploit it. But it is without question that he knew in adducing it and in presenting all this to the federal court that he was producing what without question was perjury.

To most of us that is a serious offense.

Lorenz's sworn-to fabrication includes that Oswald was in Miami and that he was with her and the others she identified as assassins on their trip from Miami to Dallas, ending the night before the assassination.

Lane knew without any question at all that Oswald was not and could not have been in Miami or to have made that trip because he was without any question at all in Dallas all that time.

And rather than being in that fictional motel room the night before the assassination, it is likewise without question in the sworn-to statements before the Warren Commission that after work the day before the assassination was driven directly to the Paine residence in Irving, Texas, where his wife Marina and their child were living with Ruth Paine. (Irving is a Dallas suburb.) Lane knew without question that Oswald spent the night there, too.

Although he exaggerates his appearance before the Commission making vague references to his testimony before it, in fact he was there on behalf of Oswald's mother, Marguerite. She wanted him to represent her son. When the Commission did not agree to that, Lane appeared as Marguerite's lawyer.

So, Lane knew very well where Oswald was all that week, including the night before the assassination and that it was without possibility of any question at all.

Yet he presented the sworn-to lies by Lorenz to the federal court knowing full well that it was all lies.

Suborning perjury is also a serious offense.

Is there any wonder Hunt lost when his lawyers were so ignorant of the fact of the case?

Could they have clobbered Lane!

But he and the Carto cabal got away with it.

How holy can you get?

And how lucky can the deliberately dishonest be?

This, obviously, is worse than mere trash. With the generous assistance of a publisher who is not a

bit concerned about how he makes money, not a bit more than Lane is, giving the people and the country a fake "solution" to that most subversive of crimes, the assassination of a president - a crime that has the effect of a coup d'etat.

Knowing that without question it was false in all particulars.

Not merely false - it was to Lane's certain knowledge impossible.

Lane knew.

And if the publisher, Thunder's Mouth Press, did not know it is only because it did not want to know.

They all had to know.

But what the hell, there was profit in it, so what if the money is a bit soiled?

And our precious history is a bit more corrupted?

And the sorrowing people deceived, mislead and still again lied to.

There was money in it and that is all that matters.

Inside the JFK Assassination Industry.