

Lane, the House assassins and their report

HW 12/4/77

Lane phoned Ted Gandolfo to ask a favor. In the course of the conversation Lane said he is completely disenchanted with the committee and in the near future will come out against it. I take it this is if he gets nowhere with Stokes and Fauntroy, both of whom he said he intends seeing.

What brought this to a head for Lane is what followed the committee's last session with Ray, I believe on Friday, 12/2/77. Lane said all the questions were nasty and angled.

After it Lehner started to lean on Lane, telling Lane his credibility would be ruined if he persisted in maintaining that Ray was innocent, the dupe of others.

The committee's report-if there is one- will have Ray the assassin, perhaps with help. Lane told Gandolfo the whole committee is this way with the possible exception of Evans. Evans is a black former NYC detective. He is chief investigator of the King side.

The possibility of there being no report was explained to Gandolfo by Richard E. Sprague, who had just lunched with Robert Tannenbaum, formerly chief JFK counsel of the assassins committee. Tannenbaum explained that the committee has enough money to last it at least through April and therefore will not have to go back to the House at the beginning of the session and thus need file no report at the beginning of the session. However, only a couple of weeks ago Stokes assured Gandolfo there would be a report and it would be available about now.

There is a new internal critics row. This one is over Sylvia Meagher's praise of Tom Bethell for what he did when he worked for Garrison. Penn Jones printed it in his newsletter. Sylvia and Ted had a row when he phoned her. Penn departed from his past unquestioning support of Garrison in doing this.

Lane said there is more. He told Ted something in confidence and Ted did not tell me what it is. He also claimed to have sensational new material in the King case. The more about relates to the committee.

In an earlier conversation he told Gandolfo that I was in factual error in saying that the rifle would not fit in the space permitted by the official story. He also said that I made many factual errors.

It happens that I did not say this, that Herb McDennell volunteered it in his evidentiary hearing testimony. It is testimony I also did not ask of him. However, despite the bad handling at the evid. hearing, McDennell was factually correct - there is not space for the rifle between the mark on the window sill and the bathroom wall if the rifle is pointed at where King was standing.

Then, of course, a shooter supposedly was behind the rifle and this supposed shooter also had to have a footing. It is all impossible. McDennell was right, Lane wrong. As usual.

In Frame-Up I went into the impossibility of a shooter having a footing in the position the official account requires.