- 148 Says Foreman and Canale worked out the deal.
- 149 Quote from Kyles testimony those I used in F-U and taken from my transcripts given him by committee in violation of agreement, pretty certainly. Illustrative is that nobody else referred to his voluntering about the tie being blown off.
- 150 Eskridge and right ear also from me.
- 151 Omissions in Francisco's testimony also from F-U.Only.

 While he quotes what I did of Zachary he does not point out the falsity of it.

 That Zachary "foubd" the bundle.
- Strains to belabor the FBI for not putting up a roadblock on the ground that when there is danger of a known state border being crossed "no local police roadblock was likely to prove effective." He knew there was no all-points, which is not federal but local, from F.U.

 Having been able to steal the transcript only, not the exhibits, have claims the date of the Rebel registration is not in the record. tis.
- 153 He says the state said the shot came from the direction of both a clump of bushes and after rearof a rooming house." t said the rooming house only.
 - I call it peasley's "narration," so does hane.
- 156 I say no fingerprint from ay in room, transcript does not address, Lane repeats me.
- 157 Days case again Ray presented "thoroughly". t was not. It was lied about.
- Ch 23, The efense
- 158 Despite Foreman he says that in a trial the facts would have come out, "tested at the trial."
 - "anatomy of guilty plea"to test truth./
- Says "uie agreed to pay Ray. It was to pay Hanes as used here.

 Says "anes investigation was diligent and he went through their files.

 He pretends it is original with him that the jury would not have convicted, his conclusion, not that to his knowledge the case had been tested in court before him.

 The attributes an "affirmative defense" to the Haneses. I do not recall it.
- 161 He gives himself away on the absence of a case from anes' files in referring to the pathologist. He is not in the hanes files. They were out before this testimony.
- He uses my stuff on Frazier's story as presented by Beasley.

 He has no source on his "expert who saw it but was not allowed to examine it under microscope" But I suspect this is his carelss theievery. This is my work and I did arrange for and McDonnell did use a mircoscope. The testimony was not the bullet was "sufficiently undamaged" but that sufficient marks of identification existed, He says that the State failed " to prove the 'death slug' was fired from the "Ray rifle but this was neither in nor necessary in the guilty plea. It is in the evidentiary hearing and the habeas corpus petition, again my work, "e says there was Frazier's "refusal to inform the State." There is no basis for beleiving the State ever asked and have every reason to believe it did not. But in context this is mark phoneying up a case of his own expertise about the ridiculous, a statement of his elemental ignorance of the case.
- He keeps talking about the misleading of the jurors, which indicates he has not even taken time to read that transcript. All had agree to a finding guilty prior to any representation of evidence.

 The great man has an opinion, the State could prove that "ay bought the rifle. With plenty of witnesses and a recipt and fingerprints, what else. But "I bleieve."

 Yet he says the State could not link Ray with the rifle, in the same paragraph. He says that "uie's writing of the finding of Ray's prints in the rooming house "inclined "ay to believe his defense would be more difficult than he had conceived."

 As proof Mark cites the book which was not written at the time of the plea!

- 164-5His proof that Hrs. Brewer never identified May is attributed "years later" to questining of Cabale by two of his assistants. He does not say that he read this to Krame-Up. I think it is in the evid. hrg., too.
- Rooming house was Stephens. It alleged Anschutz

 Fiere Mark puffs himself and his alleged investigation a week after the assassination and quotes Stephens as giving a description Stephens never did give. And that Stephens told him he was the source of the atrist s sketch. Now if ark is so dedicated to justice why did he not give his vital information to the ay defense in 1968?

He pretends that the statement of reason for confining Stephens, to protect him, was obtained by his two women. t is in F-U.

- 167 The most virtuoso display of ighorance is at the bootom, "Howver, Canale did not tell the court in 1969 that Stephens was an alcoholic who should be imprisoned for his own protection." Here he can rip off only what is my work in the evid hearing, not footnoted by source. The same jusge was in on all the deals in 1968.
- All this is uncredited from my work.

 He gives no source for the McCraw interview, worth noting in what he says about the later defense, which adduced this evidence. He did not.

 He thus pretends it is his work. That it is not his is indicated by his statement that esaley ignored it. Beasley did not have it.
- 167 Be interesting to get the source of his Jowers statement to two cops. I suspect this also is out hearing work. not footnoted.

 But with it he says the State's case had "crumbled."
- 168-9 I only suspect it but it seems that what he has on grazie, ahrdly from any investigation, because she also was a source and was then ill, coems from the stuff we turnedover to faul Vale minre. He is credited at the end, making it seem that all except the fact that Paul wrote a story is "ark's original work. It is my recollection that contradictory stories are attributed to "racie save that there seems to be agreement that she had been in bed when it happened.

Ch 24 The Affirmative ase

- 171 begins
- 172 Says the "overblown promises made by Beasley" would have been the evidence presented in court
- "interview reports" or sayin whose or how he obtained them he dies not say "anes'the concludes the State could not prove way was in the rooming house. "ere he also
 claims to have read "the entire defense and prosecution cases." He does not say
 Canale showed them, he cannot have read Breman's because they do not exist, so
 if this is not complete fabiraction it can refer to the evidentiary hearing only.
 Besides, with no trial there was no such thing.
 He quotes "ay as saying the registration book is lost because it was not entered
 into evidence. The FBI had it and I have the copy of the recport on it.
 Says it was the only evidence to prove "ay was there." e never heard of the \$20 bills
 in his enormous investigation.

 "ere he wuotes "ay in the incompetent and irrelevant but makes it look sensational.
 Having gotten nothing from ray and wanting to pretend that he did all the work and
 having claimed that he alone saw Ray, this is no more than a trick. I have the registrations and so did the prosecution and the FBI.
- He says the other crimes ay committed could have kept him in jail for the rest of his life. His great investigation and legal expertise do not include the extradition treaty and its probisions. he could not be tried on any other crime.

 The pretends further that the account he gives from ray of may's movements and acts is from ray to him. With the intro he does not have to state it and in fact he

- doesnot say it. here merely deceives. No, he actualy says "to me." ay told him ntohing not already public domain and much less than he told me. None of it is new. It first appeared in Huie's magazine articles.
- 174 "to me" repeated fairly regularly on what was printed earlier.
- "March 20, less that two months before King was killed." Great investigator.

 Two week is less than two months.

 Nonsenscial account of .243 being a "large bore" rifle" and that Raoul showed Ray the "right" one in the catalogue. The pictures of the two are identical. The difference not only does not show in a catalogue—it cannot.
- fered in a courtroom under oath." All false. I arranged the formula and jim did it.

 It was cross-examined, without shaking it at all.

Some of the firect quote is blacked out.

However, the "ay story here is what he testified to and what "old man "anes" also did, in the evidentiary hearing I understand Lane later deprecates.

The account he attributes to ray of all the errands he went on that day is obviously false. It is, from "ane's earlier account, entirely impossible.

Where it is not it is not new. "ay testified to all or almost all of it and told methe rest in much greater detail.

- 177 "ane says he estanlished that ray was at all the motels and restaurants of which he spoke, without saying which. All is impossible. One of the main and the closest ones was torn down and replaced.
- He says the FBI was not able to prove that Ray was "financed...in any fashion toher than "apul." InRays's story even this is not true. But it is not possible to prove, either way. All robberies are not solves. All are not reported.

 Lane pretends there were no allegations relating to the package at canipes. Our new expert describes a identical rifles differing only in caliber with the larger caliber "much more powerful and accurate." There is no difference in the "power" of the rifles. The larger bullet can be propelled by a weaker charge. And the smaller the caliber the flatter the trajectory. Or the first rifle was "much more...accurate."

The "ocd story, ingerentially arkss, is the same one oft told. He then goes into what he represents as his own definitive study of the hanes records and their "affirmative case."

180 His laying of a false philosophical base for an attack on the Bud-Jim-me defense is explicit here. It is guised as the quest for truth, historical truth. not being the right way to defend a client in court.

That is is phonet and knowingly irrelevent is clear in the next graf where he says that among the questions the jury would have had to decide in a trial are "whether there was a deliberate police effort to let Ray escape from the scene" (which also says he was at the scene); "if the FBI/allowed Ray to escape from the country

before advertising their interest with him (sic)"Wwhy Ray's rpints were not found in the bathroom(!!!)" and ab; listics questions the naswers to which he knows from my work.

He then follows with an exaggeration of the importance of the flophouse because King

had not stayed there. This is virtuouso ignorance, even for Lane, because king always stayed there, and

it does not address the prosecution contention that king was known to be there before Ray rented that room.

To t is he adds other falsehood, that the rear of the flophouse is hidden from the Lorraine balcont by "trees and bushes." False, including then. Pix. "From the Lorraine one cannot even know that the Lorraine exists." (And he calims to have investigated the weel after the crime.)

181 Than a sil y play intended to suggest local conspiracy by the claim that by entering

flophouse entrance ""one will be able to see the Lorraine" from 422 1/2. This is pointless. There is but one entrance to the two halves of the building and in fact the view of the Lorraine would have been better from the other half. 422 1/2 is immaterial. Anyone walking around the block would know that this particular entrance was to both halves either one of which suited. he extends this to what amounts to saying that may was part of a conspiracy. None of these factors defend may. All incriminate. et he is winding up for an assault on Jim in particular, obviously-all falsely. No greater ignorance of the most elemental fact of the crime than in to say that by examination of "the autopsy documents ...with eyewitness testimony...feconstruct the exact position posture of Drk "ing" when hit, which "will (emph added) establish the angle of entry andthus the origin of the shot." 18W he then pontificates in a vacuum that the defense should have explored the possibility of the s or coming from the bushes behind the flophpuse. n the Solomon jones story he goes for the "spmething white" accross his face. He follows this with the falsehood "yet the police did not interview Jones until ten months had passed." Then using Hays from Hanes' files without checking at all in his great investigation. This is a story Hays invented to has le the police with details that on the face are impossible, the detachment of the stock and the stepping down onto an absent barrel with all the people at the Lorraine looking on-and not being seen. 184 Hays described as Ray's "one investigator." Ulaims Hanes told him the police radio tapes show the white Mustang broadcast began at 622 6:10. This is in direct quotes and is false. The claim is that there was nobeby who made this statement. The reports show several. The fake broadcast did not begin unti, after 6:30. What ane does here is pick up from Waldron's story what he read in "-U. 185 He has Ray driving Raoul away, out of town, ""according to Ray he drove out of town in the opposite direction with the ubiquituous Raoul huddled in the back seat." Ray couldm not have said this and it is hurtful to "ay and any possibility of trial.

in the opposite direction with the ubiquituous Raoul huddled in the back seat."

Ray couldn not have said this and it is hurtful to "ay and any possibility of trial.

"To this date no adequate official explanation of the police radio broadcast has been offered." He then follows this with questions I asked in "rame-Up. But he calls it a police radio broadcast and of that the truth is an adequate explanation and it is the "official explanation." A policeman rebroadcast a CB broadcast. He then says that the "anes defense would have been exploring conspiracy with this broadcast as evidence. Conspiracy with Jimmy= Jimmy guilty.

Here he quotes from police broadcasts in a way indicating he obtained this from the committee. I do not recall it from hanes' files. He then makes a deliberately false interpretation, that homicide had completed its on-the-scene investigation, to eman # the police had finished their work." without knowing the content of official files he says "the unexamined clues the unfollowed leads,..today remain unexamined."

He uses sources quoted from "rame-Up as his original work, as on the A; ron bank robbery He carries this further, again attributed to Waldron with the four aliases. All this

is attributed to Mo's 7/13/67 story.

"The prosecution failed to address this intriguing question." It had no need to with a guilty, plea, as the lawyer hane knew. It was not parg of "the case against Ray."

187 he account of the deal is that Foreman "offered no resistance to an arrangement."

Followed bywhat is in F-W on this, no death sentence in many years.

Ch 25 The Plea

- 188"when closely examined, the plea itself, in fact, support the other evidence...conspiracy."

 Says "ay said then and always said there was a conspiracy. Not exculpatory and not factual. "ae explained the details of the conspiracy to his lawyers", false.

 This whole section should be examined to see if it holds anything not in F-U, if twisted a little, as above.
- 189 His two gals are quoted as asking anale what he read in F-U, on the cell and conditions. No more than what I used.

- 190-1 In quoting from Jerry what we had said in court, I in the book, about the effects of the conditions of confiement Lane says that the consequences "should have been quite clear to counsel," for all the world as though counsel had not pursued Jim y's rights before all available judges. It is part of a vicious attack based on inuendos that are baseless and made to seem reasonable by the most deliberately dishonest writing. He quotes from Terry in 12/75 what he does not say havery heard us put on as evidence in 1974.
- ne pays the manes back and prepares, I think, for further attacks by saying the Hanses "were adequately prepared to represent Ray at trial." Without test-firing the rifle, for example? Lane doesn't know enough about the case to have an opinion. The certainly knows nothing not in the guilty-plea. "Adequately prepared" with the Cornbread Carter garbage as part of their defense? Lane got it from them.

 Trom Frame-Up, not from Foreman's record: "Once Foreman entered the case the inexorable march toward a deal... "Also from guilty-plea hearing but not from any other sources."
- 192 Says Ray himself prepared 8/31/70 affidavit filed in court to avoid counsel who did. Not only did "ane kno. this, he knew the language, typing and spelling are not 'immy's, no matter what the form in which he saw the affidavit.
- Here he avoids the appearance of duplicating my work by use of a device, hid personal interview with Jerry in which he repeats the tes impossy I prepared for the evidentiary hearing. There is no way the reader would know that all of this that is not false or fabricated is in my writing, my work or 'im's or in the evidentiary hearing. (His Cohen was there and he got transcripts from the committee, mine)
- 195 He knows so little of the fact: "Whexplained by that testimony is how Foreman was able to secure the contracts among Hanes, Huie and Ray before meeting any of them. Ray did not have the contracts. Jerry has some, not all. He gave them to Foreman, as F-U reports. This was when Foreman reached emphis first time, at airport.
- Dates "this writing" at "February 25,1977." Probably additions byt a date at which at the least he could have made changes. Others are indicated, others needed. This rel tes to calability of correcting error.
 - he even claims that "ay charged in 1969 that Foreman coerced him into remaining silent about the principals...Ray went to jail, remained silent, and the rpincipals were not revealed." Tjis says that "ay could name them or is guilty of a Murder One charge.
- and earlier, unnoted: Lane is up to his old tricks going back to Rish to Judgement, alter transcripts he pretends to be quoting werbatim, here in bold face. He uses Foreman's name instead of A and uses Q to avoid identify Ray's counsel. The transcripts are never this way. Those of court are Q and A, without Foreman's name.

 The contracts Lane cites are in facsimile in uncredited F-U. The quotes from Luie's book in Jim's court work, uncredited.
- 199 "I believe" Foreman was not rwady to go to trial. He did not read this in Jim's court papers? How can he know otherwise, Foreman not having told him anything about his preparations or lack of it. This, however, can be an important citation in terms os motive and malice in hid attack on Jim.
 - The quotes from Huie are from Jim's work only, of the entire book.

 Ref to "ayos criminal past also from F-U: not this kind of criminal. Lane doesnot cite the rap sheet, does not even claim to have seen it and then says"A thorough examination of his record by the FEI revealed one fist-fight." This is faise, whether or the criminal record alone or of the overall record, including in jails. He lists what Foreman had to do, says he did not do it and cites no source. There ate two pnly, F-U and the record "im and I made in court.
- 200 To hide this he attributes it, as though for the first time, to flanes telling him. There is nothing here directly attributed to personal interview with the manses that is not in F-U, the trial record we made or both.

 He said "renfro mays said he was never asked by Foreman" for his work, implying he spoke to ays, o indication to here than he did although there is aearlier pretense of it.

In saying that "Foreman's description of his investigation was made under oath" ane does not say where; when or how thus avoiding saying that jim deposed him on this and used his earlier deposition in the evidentiary hearing and court pleadings. Lane can't say jim did all he says Jim should have and didn't unless he masks as he does here.

(How opposite all this is of his earlier texhniques, repetitious footnotes and they caliming his arithmetic on the footnotes means solid, original work. In R to J the first 10 footnotes are a single one. Liebeter claims his inquiry into them shows Lane lied. He did in Citizens's Dissent, even inventing sources.)

"Ray told me that Foreman never askedhim if he had fired the short." This is in F-U, from Foreman, and in the evid. hearing, in day's testimony. It is not, as in all prior cases not of invention, uniquely what ay told Lane.

e again infers guilt in criticizing Foreman for not asking Ray "if he had been in a conspiracy to with others to kill Dr. King."

"It appears x texms is apparent to me that the most significant aspects of the case are: Was there a conspiracy to murder Dr. King? And did Ray pull the trigger?" Again the presumption of guilt. In any concept of a defense is not the "most significant aspect" Whether or not the client is guilty? It he did not have proof of a conspiracy, as Ray did not, and if he had not pulled the trigger, as all available evidence indicates "ay did not, he could still be guilty of murder first first without regard knowledge as proof of conspiracy and he could be innegent guilty if hr did not "pull the trigger."

202 The usual "Ryy told me again" about my work and the court record Jim made over Life and the pix. Jim also deposed Foreman on this but Lane pretends it is his original work.

Whether Kay lied or Eane put words in Lane's mind and mouth his use of the so-called Frenchy sketch and picture with "I remember," "I have seen" and other such claims to original work is a direct steal from F-W, where I use the wto side by side. As proof of his own ignorance and the impossibility of this being his work "ane says, my emphasis, "the artist's sketch ... used by the local and federal police in a search for the murdered. It was created by an artist employed by a memphis newspaper." de does not even use herrington's name. But each and every allegation of fact in the quoted section is false.

Here wane says the opposite of what im says the warden told him, that Warden Stoney "ay "ane "met me at the gate and had driven me to the maximum security section of the prison hwere "ay was confined." (Aside from this different representation, the warden having told Jim that if he'd been there he'd not have let pane in, that it was late and he'd gone, is not the entire establishment "the maximum security section?") Is this the warden or an assistant. Again the ray told me bit with the court record.

e has Jimmy saying that all the money he got was from Raoul: "He paid me for various jobs I did." This is not immy's earlier story. The same with Foreman's effort to exculpate Huie and look-allfrom sources other than "Ray told me," and hidden by Lane to pretend originality. He follows with a reference to Foreman's testimony in WUnited States District Court in Tennessee," without saying which or citing the name of the case. He then follows with quotes that have to come from F-U, the court record we made or both. The conclusion of the quote makes it seem like from Jimes work.

204 At the bottom of the page he again has his gals duplicating the courtroom work we did while pretending it is their work. It is only part of what we did but we did do it, "ane and his CCI did not, despite the pxp representation here.

205 Is not this story of Foremen's thinking the Stephenses were the owners of the flophouse also from F-U? He persists in not naming "Foreman's successor" as "ay's counsel. To here there is no mention of Stoner, Hill or Ryan. Here it is with Foreman's knowledge of the McCraw real story, Stephens drunk, also in the evid hearing for ripping off with pretenses.

201 210

Lane's offense is the more grevous beginning with the bold-face here because knowing better and being critical of esar he here attributes to Ray's telling him what Lesar developed and put in evidence. Tjis in fact began with mg and my work on the habeas corpus. But it is bet ween Jim and me and is independent of Ray, who did not really understand it. Knowing of the e id. hearing and the habeas corpus petition Lane knows this while representing g also as uniwely his original work. 206f This continues with more of the "May told me" for what is my work, jim's or twicetold tales pretendedly original with wane except for Lane's original error never original or new. One such is about "ooker, "his candidacy play ed an important part in ultimately convincing Ray to plead guilty." Entirely false. No basis, either. 207 Confusion between police 40mile statements and allegation that police said Ray was "not within four miles" when ling was killed. his is another sign of ignorance of tje case and unoriginal work. esides, on the face it is unreasonable. The rest is false because Foreman did make an effort to get those 4-mile statements. "Ray was unable to sleep" because of the lights. With the most cursory knowledge of the case he'd know the opposite is true, Ray averaged a lonk night sleep. The question is no related to length of sleep. 208 He canSt even get the law straight. Foreman was not arguing the "concept of felony murder." #e was explaining Murder One. This was not dependant on his purchase of the rifle and was not a felony-murder extension. "e did not persuade "ay that "ay as guilty, even of a non-existent gun-smuggling conspiracy. "e again has "ay filing affidavits, as though he had been his own counsel and had even written the affidavits himself, maither true, as Lane should have known.

209 The fear that Foreman would destory "ay in the courtroom comes from Jim and the But this one has no date. It may be Ray's own. But the content is Jim's of earlier date. records in courts. 209 marked ? not helpful to Jimmy and the argument here. That the use of Foreman's letters is from Frame-Up and not from knowledge is clear from the language with which Lane introduces one of the Farch 9 letters, "On March 9, 1969, Foreman sent a letter to "ay which had the effect..." (emph added.) Of "ay's interruption he quotes only what F-U does 211 After quoting what I use in F-U hane adds his unique capability for twisting and delibe ately misinterprets what may said, "Ray had remained loyal to the only concept which he said might legally establish his guilt. There was a conspiracy and becausethere was he was legally guilty." In fact what ay did is the one thing he could that said he was not guilty. If there was no conspiracy, which is what Foreman extended the argument to be, day had to be guilty, there being no other. 211 he manages to restrict himself to the same quote from battle I used. 213 So uninformed is he that when he uses my quotations from Gavzer he identifies Gavzer as "of the Washington Post" (F-U,90) He can8t give the date because I do not. I say it was for papers of a certain date. However, it was not as hane improvises to hide his cribbing, "Just one week after" the sentencing. The story was in the Washington Post and other AP papers 11/17, the date I use. (Above I mean I do not use a date for the interview, as Dane does.) The interview was before the Monday papers of the 17 went to press the evening of the 16th. 213 The interview with Roge Aldi of 10/10/76 refers to "the book...by somebody with a Jewish name" as the origin of the evidence on ballistics. So on this added ground

216 Ch 26: They/He Slew the Droamer"

Naturally to Lane the two most important books on the case are Hume's and Mc illan's. Of books of this nature far and mway the most important is rank's. And then there is the one, the only one, that provided the defense. That is not important? Mc is when it has not on the case or the evidence? The says that without doubt Jimmy knew Huie had prejudged from the first. Not helpful and not true.

218 In his haste in stealing Lane did not check and says the contracts with Huie are of

Lane knew four months before he was writing the end of his book.

214 Instead Lane pretends the book is not known, top page here

rather "entered into during "uly 1968." The were signed in August. Ray was not in the United States when they were drafted and agreed between huie and Hanes, in a side deal. 219 On the title, that is first from F-U, then jim's court work, neither credited.

- Here he really goes bananas to make himself Perry Hercule Spade "olmes. He says that "prior" to the publication of the WR "almost every major publisher in the United States declined" one is led to believe his book alone. Well, Rush to Judge, ent was far from the first book after the WR. He did have a contractfor a different book prior to the Report and he did not deliver it and he did not return the advance, as I recall \$1800. Below, here, he says his is a 1964 book by deliberate mixing of all of this with an alleged lack of publisher interest in 1964. He also says he was offered an advance of \$5,000. He does not say by whom or if he took it. He goes farthur and says it is only after he made a success of his book that "other manuscripts on the subject were more easily able to find publication. (There were at least 7 before his, so he lies.)
- 222 He can libel even a Huie through his ignorance and disinterest in readilyOavailable fact. He says Huie was paid more because he turned around and said there was no conspiracy.
- 225 Of the entire content of the third huie piece hane just jappens to fix on what I did, th t "little conspiracy."
- 226 FBI in "grand conspiracy" "ane says Ray "found to be directed against the nited States." (Ref could be to Uie but literally and contextually to Ray.)

Dear Les.

When you did not call mo as you said you would after the Redditt re-interview I assumed that whether or not with something from him to follow up you might have gone to Memphis for the observance. You still were not home tonight.

You know I had some questions of fact with regard to Redditt but attributed them to the normal workings of the mind, normal even for police intelligence officers.

I have had access to Lane's account of what one is led to be his-alone interview with Redditt. No matter how much I distrust Lane there are omissions and errors in it that I cannot attribute to the frailty of human recall.

There are substantive differences. As I recall "edditt told you he was introduced to this Secret Service agent from Washington. In Lane's account he is not. In Lane's your checking with Secret Service is assigned to "editt's personal investigation.

Whatever he told you have says that Redditt told have Richmond was there only to spy on Reditt. Not like if not impossible. The heroics are showing. With an impossible exaggeration of Redditt as the lone protector from the distance and his plan not including what you said, the perimeter plan.

Lane makes a single reference to you, where he uses your Invader story. He uses this to attack yours credibility and to say you are in error about the infiltration. He does do some stretheing, even for Lane. He quotes ohn Smith and the Tri-State one, mix selectively and in a way that inspires belief there were among the finks.

When he gets back to the "edditt story there is no mention of you, no indication of the Newsday piece on it, all pretense that it is exclusive and original with the most intrepid of investigators, "ark Lane.

Naturally nobody had ever spoken to Holloman beforem either. It says.

Pretty dirty. Prentice_Hall knew. I sent mercaes of your pieces and have their letter of thanks. Also Frief's letter to Hew Times.

To the point I've reached, p. 148, in this book about the ming murder there is no description of the murder. I meant nothing.

If there is more "edditt-related I'll let you know if it is significant.

I have been reading and marking the proofs and annotating. I made thenotes on the irrelevant parts in habd. This actually is most of the book. To 185 in his account of the murder Lane has no account of the murder.

I interrupt this because it has been growing on me that if "ane is called as a witness in any proceeding and cannot claim an immunity, as he cannot, he'al have to lie in a way that will be ruonous to immy.

This is clear at the top of 185 where he has a different version of what he claims immy told him. He is not concerned about consistency and it appears not to have been a Prentice-Hall editorial consideration.

Here he makes Jimmy a conscious conspirator calmly driving Racul away from the murder.

His plugging of this being a personal book when it is not and of his contact with immy make this much worse, if not actionable.

My hunch is that after his February interview with immy he made some changes in the manuscript but not enough to make them consistent, that this part was written earlier.

If you think you should I think you should ask immy if Lane taped their interviews. Except for indicating hurt to him from Lane do not say why. Not under any corcumstances.

Even for Lane the display of ignorance is virtuouse.

Beautiful with the pontifications about law, the practise of law and evidence.

The part that I like best in his lecture is how he could have established the point of origin in the bushes with the autopsy-mateerials and eye-witnesses.

Next to that how the one entrance to the double flophouse would not let anyone know he could see the Lorraine from there. Here he forget he had already said that trees and bushes hid it, a getting carried away in embellishing on false representations attributed to Kay. These include that ing never stayed at the Lorraine!

With a fine judicial attitude he takes the Hays fakery from Hapes files, on Combread ater, at face value, without looking Hays up. I got Renfro to admit that he invented the whole thing to annoy the police. Lane says carter was registered at 422 1/2. I think not.

I could be tempted to write a book called the investigator!

But there is great danger here to Jimmy and to the establishing of truth. ane draws a flistinction between the two, you should note, just before the cited page, part of his beginning of an attack on us.

Hastily,