

4/28/77

Dear Phil,

Your /23 came today only. Thanks for the clips.

On Lane: I cannot separate what <sup>1</sup> hwar him say when people send me tapes from what is in the potboiler. I know he has alleged, on radio if not in the book, that Holloman retired from Hoover's office and then went down to Memphis where he - close to explicit in Lane's radio versions - arranged the deal on "ing for Hoover.

I have no personal knowledge of Holloman or his career. I do believe Lane maligned him if in fact he did not libel him. And without any basis. I know about this what I'm not saying now because I'm going to be writing another book. But I do assure you that whether you take him literally, in any version, or in the clear import, Lane is a no-good liar, and what he alleges is without basis. He has, in fact, twisted what he has stolen.

After all these years I cannot recall where what appears in frame-Up. But I do know what I wrote and I do know that it is true.

<sup>1</sup>y source of the red squad at the firehouse and on the taped interviews I have was a Newsweek photographer who was a friend. I know blacks who still refer to Redditt as Reddick. People who know him well. I credit this source, Matt Herron, in Frame-Up. I am explicit in saying there that he provided me with more I dared not use for fear of endangering his sources.

You have to read the slimy Lane with care. You will find that he claims to have made an "investigation" in Memphis the week after the crime. He goes into this under Stephens if you are past it. You'll find it by the index, under S.

But he does not say that he, then interviewed Redditt or Richmond. He didn't.

The situation was that blacks there would not trust strange whites. Billy Kyles ignored three of four letters from me and then phone calls. I could never get to speak to Redditt, that is for prior use, until April of last year. Kay is the one who told me how to reach him. He would not talk to me. I spoke to his wife and he would not see me. The last effort I made was in 1974. This was before it was all opened by my friend Les Payne, who is black. Lane stole his stories. The credit, partial and inadequate, is because he got caught pretending it was all his own work and was clobbered by Les' editor in a printed letter in New Times.

Lane is a miserable bastard, no less miserable if as I believe he has a sick head.

In law and in fact all he says about Cesar is false. We sure as hell did go into "new evidence," although it is not listed in law books as proper under habeas ~~corpus~~ corpus. The formula was mine, the investigation was mine and I'm sure Kay will tell you we did it extensively, say after day in the evidentiary hearing. She and I discussed it over many cups of coffee, as Wayne and I also did to a lesser degree then. 1974. But regardless of Lane's wretchedness and his law degree the basic questions were voluntariness of the plea and subordinate to this others, like conflict of interest and effectiveness of counsel. Jim handled the preparations on the former, I on the latter, and can you imagine questioning the effectiveness of the world's most successful criminal lawyer? I did it in terms of his not having investigated the case. Jim and Bud both handled the witnesses in court. All of this was "new evidence." And 100% of it stacked. If you read McRae you'll see that he held guilt or innocence to be immaterial. He ruled on voluntariness.

Now there is no possible relevance in the Lane horsehit. Not to habeas corpus, not to guilt or innocence. Even if it were true. I tell you that it is not true. He is a spoiler and wrecker turned whore. He knows nothing about the case yet. The Murder is in the subtitle. Write me when you find his account of it. Hastily,