

Dear Phil,

4/16/77

Harriet Van Horne's NYPosy column of 4/13/77 illustrates what a conscientless crook can do with a combination of distorted open thievery, simplification and outright lies is he has a major publisher behind him and an uncritical media audience that is pricked by a slowly-disturbed conscience.

This review selects both the fabrications and the thefts as its base. The thefts are bad not because they are thefts, which they are and a New Yorker should know they are, but because they have been given a twisted meaning, one they cannot and do not sustain.

All that is true, even though distorted, was published earlier and totally ignored by this same reviewer and this same paper. The difference is changed times and the publisher's name.

The cleverness with which Lane succeeded in his sick quest for vengeance and personal if unearned fame is illustrated by the error Van Horne adds to his. Holloman, for example, was not in Hoover's office for 25 years. Nor was he during the time Lane places him there. (After lying about it in earlier appearances he fuzzed it over in the book, probably by just editing all these references to time out.)

Of such, aslas, the kingdom of the major media.

I was away the 14th when there was a call from Globe news in Canada. It was to have called back yesterday. It did not. I do not know if this is the same as your reference to National Examiner and the James Hepburn book, a fake signed with that name.

I did see the Anderson/Liberto column and give it no more credibility after it is leaked by the committee than I did from obtaining these papers for myself. It is the Mc Ferren story.

Cliff Andrews, by any of his names, is a con man. I did not have to know of his long professional career to know his story was b.s. In any of the verions from Bob.

I do not have the AP and other quotes you use in your 4/13. They were aired but not printed hereabouts. If you examine them carefully you will, I am certain, see that they really say nothing at all. And they ll be the Sprague interpretation of what he says Jimmy said. I do not know what Jimmy said. I do know what he can say. It is not what is attributed to him by Sprague.

If you have the quotes I'd appreciate them.

I think also that the years of confinement, the kind of confinement and the repeated questionings, not uncommonly angled questionings, can turn what is in Jimmy's mind around, particularly because I think it likely he is trying to hold some back, if not that which he is quoted about.

Hope the two more weeks away from home do not get too heavy.

I'll enclose what I'd intended sending to your home when your absence was to have been shorter.

Thanks and best,

Hotel Lancaster
22 E 38
NY NY 10016 (WILL BE
HERE FOR AT
LEAST 2 MORE
WEEKS)
4/13/77

Dear Harold,

I will try to enclose a copy of Harriet Van Horne's column in NY Post today referring to Mark Lane book.

You may already have been called ~~booker~~ by Natl Examiner from Montreal re "John Hepburn" book. Certainly I don't expect ~~you~~ you to vouch for its authenticity (its facts), but you could per haps Confirm the book exists and did make some splash.

Did you see Jack Anderson col. in which he openly mentions Frank Liberto as an accused conspirator (tho he doesn't same he's Memphian, nor does he mention McFerren, maker of the accusation)?

I am scuffling along on this portable typewriter.

Hope things have gone well for you.

When I last talked to Bob Livingston in Memphis about 2wks ago, he told me how he first encountered Cliff Andrews. He seems to think the guy knows something. No agree?

Any contact lately with Jimmy? Re Sprague, AP siad: "Sprague quoted James Earl Ray as saying he had outside help in a conspiracy in which King was assassinated--but that there was no 'Raoul' as previously claimed by Ray." (My underline.) Times, if you saw it, said, "Mr. Sprague said that Mr. Ray had admitted to him that 'Raoul' was a fictitious name." Times quoted Sprague as saying Ray told him that he had "received aid from others" than members of his family or 'Raoul. "The 'aid' was in the form of obtaining for My. Ray 'certain weapons & certain money," Mr. Sprague said, "both before and after the King shooting..." What think?

Best,

Phil