

Dear Dick,

11/18/91

I'm both glad and sorry you sent me Lane's Plausible Denial and I thank you very much for both, I'm sorry in a way that it distracted me from what I wrote Lies of Our Times, Sheridan Square, re Oliver Stone, which with luck I might have read and corrected today, and glad because the book should be annotated if only for the historical record.

You told me that Graf is a friend of the publisher. I see that it is distributed by Publishers West, with which I believe you are in some way associated. So, in part for that reason and in part for a general comment <sup>I did</sup> not note on the book itself and because I've already had too heavy a dose for one day, I've laid it aside and write.

I know nothing about the laws relating to defamation, if any, and very little about libel, other than it involves intent and malice, and I am inclined to believe that very few people who know him will sue Lane because he is so vicious and clever, but I am without doubt that he is intendedly and with knowing dishonesty/malicious in his references to Priscilla Johnson McMillan (former husband George dead) in his representation that she was working for the CIA.

All the others about whom he is malicious and factually incorrect are to the best of my knowledge, as of the first 200 that I've read, dead.

I recall few as completely and deliberately dishonest as Lane is in his books, not just this one. I'm sure that as the able lawyer he is he knows how far he can safely go. But his ego that he does not always <sup>control</sup> sometimes gets out of hand and it might lead him into what might be too much. As dishonesty, his in particular, this book is hard to exceed, from beginning to end so far as I've read. He is a nonstop liar, not always hedging and evading to avoid overt and unquestionable lying. If someone were to be sued an expert reading this book could make a real case of widespread intended malice.

I presume that Thinder's Mouth had it read to determine whether or not it is actionable and for its possible value as a book. On the latter, assuming that it was read by a competent and perceptive reader, I also assume that Thinder's Mouth knows that it is unsourced, with no notes at all, is deliberately evasive when it intends to be and I think is defamatory - in short, that it is not a good book - but sees the possibility of commercial success with the subject, which is selling. (My <sup>own</sup> ~~own~~ large mailbox was stuffed with outgoing books every day this week and the end of last week.)

Here you have a man that knowing full well the magnitude of his lie claims to have been the one who foisted the FBI to disgorge truckloads of once-secret documents to him and yet with a 50-page appendix has not a single one but instead has in it only what was published earlier, as far back as 1965. This should raise questions with and on behalf of any publisher, especially given the character of what he writes about others. In fact I know of nothing except perhaps for a few pages relating to him that Lane got by FOIA/PA litigation and some of that had already been disclosed. My point here is not that he claims to have done what I did but that if there is any litigation what it says about him and his

book and his intent in his book.

It is not at all easy to be unfair or even malicious about the CIA but in this Lane succeeds from the beginning and he goes about it with knowing dishonesty and unhidden intent. My point here is not that I expect it to happen but to indicate that it can happen that, as the FBI once considered with me, the CIA might get someone to sue even if there is little prospect of success just to inflict damage on Lane and on his publisher, with a byproduct intimidating other publishers. The cost of defending a spurious suit can be great, even ruinous.

As far as I've read I remember nobody other than this woman, who comes of a fine and respected family and has been a very successful and respected writer, could be used for suing Lane and his publisher and distributor. But with 80% of the book yet to go and with my intending as soon as I get some continuous time to get back to "Tone and Lies of Our Times", I write this now.

Were a competent and prepared lawyer to have me as a witness, which I'd resist only because of my weakness and health, I could as of now be on the stand for days without repeating myself and on recollection alone testify to deliberate error and malice and intent to use these and other dirty tricks for vengeance and in self-promotion at the cost of the reputations of others.

The phony case he builds against the CIA is as wretchedly dishonest and anything I can recall, when it is not also inaccurate, distorted, misrepresented and plain invented.

He has lost control of himself with regard to this book in at least one public appearance, at the gathering of the nuts in Dallas a week ago. He then had to be restrained when he at least pretended to be about to attack the man who wrote the Stone expose for Esquire. If again provoked to this extent in public he might make other mistakes, like interpreting some of the content of this book. I am confident that through private agencies, as it did with me, the CIA is getting tapes and transcripts, as it may also by its own efforts. (On this, remember Peter Sheppard and the Ober agency, founded by Harold Ober? It was a younger Harold Ober who in my day was in charge of <sup>domestic int. affairs</sup> that for the CIA. During Watergate the CIA had to get rid of him and his "Public Affairs Staff Staff". They were transferred to the National Security Agency, and even bigger spy outfit about which less is known. Sheppard abandoned me as soon as I alleged a CIA involvement in The Watergate. What I sent him was 100% accurate, too. And then he got Lifton to join Lane in claiming to have discovered sex and invented the wheel.) The public agency it used with me of which I know is "Radio & TV Reports. There are other such agencies and they may well cover the entire country if only because advertisers have a use for them.

Because this is a thoroughly detestable book by as rotten a man as I know I am getting a kind of satisfaction from reading and annotating it because for the historical record alone it is worth the time. I've also concluded that any publisher who has anything at all to do with Lane is asking for real trouble and should balance this against possible profits.

Again thanks, *Harold*