14 "The interservice rivalry between the FBI and Secret Service was very much in evidence in the hours following the President's death. FBI agents, in an effort to trace the alleged assassination weapon, arrived at Klein's Sporting Goods in Chocago, conducted their interviews and left before the Secret Service agents located the store. When the special agents of the Secret Service called upon Klein's, they were at first unable to secure any information, for the relevant witness informed them that he had been instructed by the FBI agents not to talk to anyone." Here footnote 19. That appears on p.268 and reads: "See Index to Basic Source Materials in possession of Commission, National Archives." (See also p.97) There is no such document, there is no such source. This is a direct and poorly disguised plagiarism from Chapter 4 of WHITEWASH II, pp.36,39. This is a six-page report, only small parts of which I used. Lane uses only those parts. My source was the Commission's 87th file. The description of this in the List of Basic Source Materials establishes the futility and transparency of any citation to that enormous jumble, broken into five large parts. The general title is, "Five volumes, submitted by letter of 1/3/64 Re: Oswald." Identified by letters, the five are identically titled, save for the "control numbers", "Secret Service", which is abbreviated, "Control Numbers". "A" begins with 40 and ends with 759. This particular report was 108. There is no reference to Klein's or anything else. Anyone with the slightest first-hand knowledge of the Commission's materials knows that the greatest single impediment to its use is the total lack of any index. Here Mark has just been a little more open - or careless - with his thievery, a little more than usually contemptuous of his readers and truth, and only a little more dishonest than usual.

A CITIZEN"S DISSENT - Notes

20 "The Commission evidently agreed with me that the matter should not be divulged, since it classified that portion of my testimony that had been taken in executive session "Top Secret"."

This is a complete fabrication. Part of Mark's "testimony" was, at his request, taken not behind closed doors. 100% of the rest, including his, was taken with no outsiders present, but not in the Commission's "executive session". Not just this portion of Mark's, but 100% of the testimony of whatever character and source was then marked "Top Secret". However, a printed version said to be verbatim, has been issued, including Mark's. As Mark well knows, had the Commission departed from its practice and made the statement he then made about Jack Ruby public, it could have caused a mistrial if any member of the jury saw or heard it or it could have laid the basis for appeals by defense counsel. Of course, there remains the possibility that Mark's formulation is simple error, but I leave it to him to plead that abysmal ignorance of the most elemental knowledge of the Commission's workings and evidence.

However, had Mark wanted to use another source that he appears to have forgotten, he could have used a different version to which he testified, that is less complete. This is in his own testimony of March 4, 1964 (2H49).

Description of this normal session as "executive session" was for the sole purpose of distinguishing it from the part that was open to the public. That artificial designation, here deliberately distorted by Mark, serves no other purpose and makes that part of his testimony exactly the same as 100% of the remaining testimony.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

27 After all the exposure he had on radio and TV, from his own account, more extensive than anyone else, even though his book was far from the first and contained virtually nothing not previously published, he actually complains that he did not get 100% of the time. Here he says that WOR had a ban on him. His evidence?

"During 1967, WOR presented what was widely advertised as 'The Warren Report'. It was to be a two-hour uninterrupted discussion with the four leading critics and defenders of the Report. I was not invited to participate."

Possibly it is true that there are those, including WOR, who do not regard Mark as possessed of a monopoly on criticism of the official assassination accounting. I have personal knowledge of the program, because Leo Sauvage and I were asked by the station to appear. Mr. Jenner, who has on several occasions debated Mark, has on at least four agreed to debate until he found I was his opponent, here was consistent. He was replaced by Charles Roberts, author of a then-unpublished defense of the Report, whose partner with the eminent Louis Nizer. That show, after the debate between Nizer and me, ran for four, not two, hours, and despite Mark's snide insistence that the station was suppressing the subject and him, it presented the show for a total of 16 hours on prime time, preempting all commercials for this extensive period, a rather exceptional performance in commercial radio, the exact opposite of Mark's representation.

If he complains that WOR has a less exalted opinion of him and his work and knowledge than he would like, he may rest assured that WOR is not alone.

A CITIZEN"S DISSENT - Notes

28 A long complaint against David Susskind, which could better be made by any other critic.

"David would invite me to appear on his 'Open End' program ...but that invitation has not been forthcoming."

If this is true it in no way distinguishes him, which is true of the burden of his complaint, and certainly is less true of him, his book to the contrary notwithstanding, than anyone else. However, what this passage ignores is the fact that he did appear, in October 1964, on what appear to have been the same facilities, with Susskind replaced by Harrison Salisbury and with a number of other panelists. In Washington it had the same spot, and I have a tape of it.

What it all adds up to is a book-length complaint about a media conspiracy against Mark Lane - again, "alone". On the cover this comes out as "Mark Lane replies...to the press and communications industry...and tells the often grim story of how his dissent was almost silenced."

This and more in the cover ad in Publishers' Weekly: "The thrilling story of a lone man determined who stood up to 'The Establishment' - and won! ... story of how the U.S. government and the communications industry attempted to suppress his investigation of the Kennedy assassination - and failed."

Inside this printed "Hearts and Flowers" we learn of the total conspiracy of all the networks - against Mark, alone.

Now if this is true, and could Mark possibly lie? we require an explanation for this language, part of the (for him) modest three-page account of how, Dutch boy with 10 fingers and 20 holes in the dike, he - alone - turned the tables. It is what the cover of his paperback calls "Important New Material Added". Less than 10 pages in all, less than seven being his retailing of the work of others, from these three pages this language is worthy of special consideration. These are Mark Lane's own words:

"I appeared as a guest on 185 television and radio pr ograms originating from almost every major city in the United States. Many of these were important network or syndicated programs, some were specially produced documentaries, two and even three hours long. I' think the new response of the media and the fact that a genuine dialogue is now under way in America regarding the events in Dallas is an indication of the resiliency of the American society."

Question: Can both Mark Lanes be honest, honorable men and writers?

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

38 His accounting of the cancellation of his contract by Grove Press, he sais, "and no substantive reason was offered". His agent gave me one: He failed to deliver the manuscript by the contracted time. By the content of this book, it was not even really begun by the advertised publication date, March 15, 1964, which coincides with the contracted date of WHITEWASH, which was delivered on time and, without reasonm- even without returning the manuscript - the publisher broke the contract. Collier also told me that as of his last knowledge, Mark had not returned the advance, either.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

39 Without specifying the time, but continuing to poor-mouth, Mark says, "I had but one copy of the manuscript ... and I was possessed of neither the time nor the funds to have other copies made." What happened to all that volunteer help he had? Or to the copies he mimeographed at close to that very time?

Norton: As he knows, publishers frequently give lies instead of reasons. I also had my experience with Norton, with the President and with the executive vice-president, who is also editor-in-chief. They volunteered that they just did not like Mark's book. They did not like the approach or the writing. Rather than suppressing the subject because it was too hot, they offered me a contract if I would agree to make WHITEWASH even hotter. They paid my expenses for a trip to New York to consult with them about this, which I belive is unique in my dealings with ten times the publishers against whom Mark complains, and I rejected their offer because I believe it required of me that I charge the government was part of a conspiracy to kill its head. Agains the opposite of Mark's version.

However, as Mark knows, for it is his book, there is more than reasonable ground for objecting to the conclusion of his book. This cannot in any way honestly be described by his words, "I agreed that the facts could not be altered to provide a nicer book." This is plain deception. What is lacking in the ending of Rush to Judgment is facts. It is a bitter, biased, distorted and deliberately incomplete presentation of Mark's own hatred of the chairman and general counsel and carefully eliminates what he wants ignored, particularly about the rules of evidence. It is so undisguised that priot to the appearance of a long article on it in Newsweek, one of his closest associates was quoted to me by a trade editor, who is also a close friend of his publisher, that the intent of this ending was to convince Earl Warren and everyone else that there was nothing left for the chief justice but suicide. The book is so totally aimed at the chairman and general counsel that Mark has edited even what he presents as verbatim reproduction of the questionings to eliminate the lawyers' names, which in every case appear in the printed transcripts he "quotes".

40 For this discussion of the presentation of this book to The Boadley-Head, which he pretends was entirely his arrangement and idea, what is missing is any account of how this came to pass. It was entirely other than his idea, entirely other than his initiative, from what the person who told me she arranged it did tell me. Telling this, however, would be inconsistent with the pretense of the book and the explicit claim of the publisher that everything that anybody did and everything that has not yet been done, Mard did, alone and unassisted. Lacking from any of his writing or any of his speaking that I have heard is any expression of gratitude to Sally Belfrage, who sent him to her friends in England who made all the arrangements for him. The editor he acknowledges, Sonnenberg, even he is her former boy friend. She also told me that prior to Sonnenberg's attentions, the book was gone over by three eminent historians, not only Trevor-Roper, whom he mentions here in a different context. That, however, is consistent with his failure to credit The National Guardian with publication of his "brief" in all thouse thousands of footnotes (mostly duplications) to make footnotes a selling point). See p.376. One possible reason is that prior to his financial success Mark was afraid of left-wing taint, even from his greatest benefactors. Miss Belfrage's father, one of the early victims of the McCarthy era, had been editor of The National Guardian, had been deported, and was then editor-in-exile.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

46 Chapter 8 has a curious omission of dates, consistent only with misrepresentation of the reality of the book as drafted and an effort to pretend it brought forth what was previously unknown. He says he and his wife moved into a small flat "to await publication. Viking rushed through Epstein's boo, ..." As though there were no others. There were, then, both WHITEWASH and the second book, that Lane never mentions, Sylvan Fox's. The delay in appearance of Lane's book is not exactly what might be expected of the man who here writes disparagingly of "Weisberg's ... rather unique style" (p.162), for it is attributable to the literary attentions his own work required to make it publishable.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT _ Notes

(Goes with correspondence)

48 Read the chapter on Burke and get him to tell truth - or tell it. Rather than "one of the critics had declined a similar invitation", much earlier, I had done it, facing his representatives in the first more than two-hour one-man "special" that established new ratings. Rather than requiring heroism to appear with Burke in criticism of the Commission, as Mark says, after the show I did with Burke and Mark's surrogates, it required heroism to appear in support. And the special program about which he says "they approached me" was before his Burke show and after mine and then only in response to the reaction to it. Even his representation of Epstein's refusing to appear is false, for until the last minute efforts continued and the night before it was expected he would. Nor is that a "Commission defender was added". All the members and most of the senior staff were invited, and before the bit about Epstein. There were two "defenders" on that show. Likewise, as one would expect, the story of the subsequent Nizer show is false. Tell it. Nizer wouldn't face me and I was tossed off my own show.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

48-9 While Salandria deserves credit for his excellent work, in Philadelphia, WCAU, the McKinney show, it is I who prepared the audience more than any other, with a total of not less than 24 hours before Mark was there.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

50 Difficult as it is to be unfair to Joe Pyne, Mark here succeeds. The reason a single station does not air the same guest on similar and adjacent programs is traditional and not exceptional. At the same time I voluntarily surrendered the syndicated Pyne audience to confront Wesley Liebeler on the local Lomax show, to get him off Mark's back, at the request of Mark's friends, then strangers to me. The second time I ran afoul of this program, again on the same station, there was a special dispensation that permitted my doing both competitive shows. What Mark does not say is that his friend Mort Sahl was the opposite side of the coin and to the degree he dared used his own TV and radio shows to promote Mark personally and his book, not the competition.

59 This representation of Arlen Specter as afraid of him alone is the indulgence of ego and deliberate deception. Specter had by then refused at least a dozen confrontations with me and once, having accepted a TV appearance, canceled it when he learned I also would be on. At this period he also refused a syndicated WNEW-TV show rather than face me, as he did with NET. The fact is that Specter did face him in Britain, whereas when I called him a deliberate, repetitious liar and dared him to sue me, he refused even to face me in court.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

77 Here he says that the Warren Commission "has never made public" its "working documents". This is possible only because he has failed to work in them. I have thousands of pages of them in my possession and have aired a number on this station.

80 His representation of CBS is fraudulent. Bob Richter was assigned to interview all the critics. He also came to me for help and promised credit CBS did not give. In fact, they never once mentioned my name or that of my books but, having acquired Lane's publisher, they advertised his book on each of the four shows.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

88 This Carolyn Arnold stuff is from PW and it only. There is no use of it not made in PW, including the footnote.

90 This Baker stuff also is from WWII and nowhere else.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

92 Quoting CBS, "'Did Oswald have time to get to Tenth and Patton in time for the fatal encounter with Tippit?' I know of no responsible critic of the Commission who has raised this point, which CBS pretended was a vital argument of the critics."

This is false. I do. It is no answer to say, "Oswald had more than a halfhour to cover the distance of approximately four miles," for he had first to go to his rooming house and to be there as late as 1:03 p.m., which in itself prevented his getting to the Tippit murder scene in time to commit it.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

97 (see also p.14) Here again reference to the (nonexistent) "index of the basic source material relied upon by the Commission". The error is repeated. It would be interesting to know if he has or has even seen a copy of this bibliography. Take mine. Of course, CBS did not have to go to the Archives to see this. It is available, for only $8.00, on microfilm. He really knows so little about this, he actually says (p.267) that the numbers are "the National Archives file number".

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

103 (253) Why is there no source on this graph? Is it possible that the speed of the car varied this greatly in half a second, less time than a man can put his foot on the brake and take it off? Is it not, for example, just as possible that the camera speed varied? Or that the analysis is wrong because of defects in hhe calculations? With all this footnote flackery, why is there no source?

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

108, 221 "Examination of the Zapruder camera established that it ran at a speed of 18.3 frames per second."

This footnote is in error. Examination of the camera cannot establish the speed at which it ran. In the case of this camera, it could not even establish the speed or speeds at which it could have run. The fact is that there was no test of any kind to show the rate at which film was actualy exposed.

The basis of this chapter comes from my work, what I first brought to light in WHITEWASH, not with CBS or Alvarex or any of the other quoted sources. Here Lane's criticism, which is based upon the invalid work of the Commission for attack on invalidity by CBS, is less honest than CBS, which at least referred to the work of "one critic", as Lane knew. He knows so little about this aspect that he does not acknowledge the variable speed of the camera - or the 30% error in the reenactment. This is in no way relieved by the guarded acknowledgment on 111, where he evades what I firgt began to bring to light in WWII this way, "...in my opinion, no evidence has been produced which would tend to invalidate the correctness of that figure." The question is not at all "if the film did, in fact, run slower", but did it run faster, which is quite possible.

112 Reference to NYTimes review of the basic work he here refuses to credit. Show NYTimes he quotes and comment on the quotation he uses.

113, 197 Quotation from Rush to Judgment that the Zapruder film shows the President "was thrown to the left and toward the rear". Here Mark tries to eliminate his error and take credit for the work of others by inaccurate quotation from his own book by eliminating the word "directly" (RTJ55). And there is source cited is not even the movie, which he could have seen and studied and didn't prior to the publication of RTJ, but the printed stills in Vol. 18, which show no such things as he represents - and cannot. The motion is backward. After a pause the body spins, back to camera, then falls to the left, slowly.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

119 "Although CBS charged ... that I did not 'always allow facts to get in the way' of my 'theories', the network was unable to substantiate that allegation with a single example."

Want me to?

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

125 Ask him to read the paragraph on me and to explain it. Begin by thanking him for his kind "defenae". Ask the source or sources of his statements, that he validate them and explain the context in which he presents them - how, with his great dedication to accuracy and nothing else (see, for example, 119 and CBS), he checked his facts.

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

127 "Ball's names does not appear in Rush to Judgment."

Very good point. WHY dies it not appear in RTJ? Simply because Mark edited all the testimony he nonetheless presented as direct quotation to hide the identities of the counsel as part of his campaign against Warren and Rankin. There were numerous references to Ball in RTJ. (There is also a reference to the WNEW-Nizer thing here that might be commented on.)

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

132 Is this not a rather glib representation of both the "debate" and its consequences? First, was there not a time when you refused to meet Liebeler face to face on the ground you were suing him? Did' you ever file such a suit? I went to California to debate Liebeler and get Mark off the hook because Liebeler was scoring points on Mark. I went to California and Liebeler, literally, fled to the east coast, having by then avoided three confrontations. It was not until the following month, from 133, that the date for the Lane-Liebeler debate was set. With me, even when he agreed, he failed to show up at the studio.

147 This representation of his debate with Nizer is so misrepresentative it is willfully dishonest. Promotion for Nizer's book was then well advanced. He had made a number of appearances in connection with it. A month earlier I had ruined him in a four-hour debate on WOR. The WNEW-TV show had been a debate between him and me from the night of 12/6/66, when the Commission lawyers had failed to show up to face me in even a gang-up. After what happened to him on WOR when he faced me, I was tossed off the WNEW debate. Lane was a lesser evil to Nizer.

162 "One of the early books on the subject was originally self-published."

Why the evasiveness, failure to mention the title? Is it because WHITEWASH was the very first, published a year before RTJ? Here again Mark makes expert use of the verbal elbows, knees and nails, pretending a "defense" that is otherwise intended and phrased. Typical is the footnote, which reads:

"Curiously, Weisberg later was to indulge in that same form of criticism. In a subsequent work he charged that a document was written in a "nasty" style and therefore, 'if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence.' Surely Weisberg would be the first to agree that what is sauce for the goose is saune for the gander."

Now this is in no sense a parallel, not even properly called a "document". I was not making any literary reference. My reference was to an FBI report which was so openly editorial, so very nasty and partisan, it is on that basis alone unworthy of credence. Unlike Lane's representation, I then devoted not the one mention he cites to it, from page 91 of PW, but print the entire report in facsimile on pp.238-9. But even his reference to and quotation from p.91 is selective to the point of misrepresentation. He says I say that because "a document was written in a 'nasty' style" it was "therefore, 'if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence". I do not say that because it is "nasty" it is not worthy of credence. The entire passage is longer than Mark's footnote indicates, beginning on the previous page and giving detailed explanation. But even if we restrict ourselves to what he misrepresents, that brief passage does not warrant his distortion, says other than he represents it to, and says it in less space than his distorted note. It actually says that the report in question "is an argument, not a report. It is nasty, openly prejudicial, disputatious and, if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence." What I actually said is that the report was inaccurate, incomplete, incompetent, a poor argument rather than an investigation (which is not the same as a writing). This is a distortion by Mark that cannot be accidental and is unfortunately typical of his sneaky literary and debating rabbit-punching, all from the back, never to the face.

And thus also he disguises the fact that even in an ex parte writing, where I could not face him, Professor Kaplan was unable to find any error in my work.

.62 Although it is virtually impossible to be unfair to Professor Kaplan, Mark succeeds. Pretending that all he has said about the picture here discussed, the eighth taken by Phil Willis, is in his book, he says, "I have never offered my opinion on that question (whether the picture showed Ruby at the Depository.). I have invited the readers of Rush to Judgment to examine the photograph and make their own decisions." This is rather difficult for those readers, for after promising an extensive photographic appendix, Mark's books came

out with none. It is obvious his readers could not do what he says they could. But what is really the point is that in his radio and TV appearances, which reached infinitely more people than his book, he did exactly the opposite of what he here represents and did say the picture did show Ruby - and did this in my presence.

173 What is lacking in this reference to the Zapruder film is that I brought it to light - the missing frames, the editing of those at each of the missing sequences, of the copies - even the bringing to light of what allegedly happened to the film flowed from me through a newspaper reporter, and all is presented by Mark as though it is his work, for this passage is introduced by the statements that Roberts made "reference to me or my work sixty-seven times" in nine pages.

192 With all credit due Garrison, and giving him enough is hardly possible, this is not his "discovery" but is work done for me by Al Chapman, of Dallas, and reported by me to Garrison in August 1967. It is in pursuance of a theory first advanced by Mrs. Lillian Castellano, of Hollywood, who now has my extensive collection of all the public-convenience charts, of which the sewers are but part, of all of Dealey Plaza, before and after its rebuilding. I showed these pictures on this station. It is not "a very large pipe" that ends on the grassy knoll, but the smallest of all in that area, where others run up to 30 inches.

A CITIZEN's DISSENT - Notes

234 Typical of the dirty writing designed to falsely claim credit for what he had absolutely nothing to do with is this:

"After the publication of Rush to Judgment in 1966, considerable information regarding the possession of the autopsy photographs and X-rays became available for the first time."

The relationship here is like that of the moon and green cheese. There is nothing ~~xxxxxxxx~~ in RTJ on this (or most other aspects) not already well known and not anything like what had already been well publicized, from other sources, notably WHITEWASH and Inquest. Mark knew so little about this aspect that he was then saying that what the autopsy doctors had burned was their notes. He made this mistake so often that even in this section of this book he is so evasive he doesn't say what was burned. In a TV taping of that period I had to correct him on what had, indeed, been burned. He is so uninhibited in his sue of other people's materials that he uses the phrase I used in WHITEWASH, "Best evidence", as the title of this chapter!

FBI report, 12/9/63

"Pre-Publication Statement by Mark Lane," Holt, Rinehart and Winston RTJ brochure:

"But the recent release of the FBI Report (declassified only recently and quoted here for the first time) ..."

"During April 1966, I visited the National Archives and discovered (emphasis added) that the FBI Report had been declassified ..."

Aside from his rather incomplete understanding of this report, whose failure even to account for all the shooting escaped Mark, he knew better. This was anything but the first quotation of the report. First, it was assiduously leaked by the govefnment. Next, it was first quoted in a magazine by Vincent Salandria, Mark's own collaborator; first reproduced in facsimile by me; first in my book; and to his knowledge was being used by Epstein in his then unpublished book, which appeared months before Mark's.

Further, before Rush to Judgment, before Epstein finished his book, Mark knew better. Forgetting what he wrote in this pre-publication blurb and the enormous advertising and public relations campaign by his publisher, Mark told the truth in A Citizen's Dissent, pp.41-2:

"Epstein had informed me of his trip to Vermont to visit Wesley J. Liebeler, a Commission lawyer ... Liebeler had shown him a number of documents ... with one being of genuine significance. It was the then unavailable FBI report of December 9, 1963 ... In London I received a telephone call from de Antonio. He reported that Epstein had told him he had secured a copy of the FBI report and that he added, 'I have my own book now.' ..."

This cannot be regarded as accidental error. Further, Salandria's article, in a magazine known to Mark and to which he has contributed, was in circulation before his pre-publication statement. He knew Epstein's book would be out before his, whether or not he then knew of WHITEWASH. It is a deliberate, willful lie, typical of Mark's attitude and the character of the promotion of his books.

"First" and "Only" for Mark. Ad f or A Citizen's Dissent

From the first Publishers' Weekly RTJ ad, doublepage:

"It is the only completely documented critique of the Warren Commission Report,"

which is false and was known to be. Not until four months later did the publisher agree to cease and desist. He and Mark never stopped. From the publisher's announcement of the film:

"Lane has recently completed a book (then unpublished), the first based on a thorough examination of the complete 26 volumes of the Warren Commission report ..."

With like devotion to truth, Lane and his publisher here modestly claim that it is he who founded "the Reform Democratic Movement", in which such humble lesser personalities as Eleanor Roosevelt and Senator Herbert Lehman, joined. This is a favorite line repeated in the brochure and elsewhere, Its carefully deceptive language exactly the same in all cases.

Of similar integrity is the false representation of sales of Rush to Judgment, as in Book Week, 225,000 copies "in print", and I think later there were higher figures, whereas in the cover ad f o r A Citizens Dissent, the sales figure is given as but 140,000.

Not inconsistent is the modest ad on the front cover of Publishers' Weekly, the most exalted position in the trade. With unended modesty, it bills the book and Mark as "The thrilling story of a lone determined man who stood up to 'the Establishment' - and won." In smaller type, "... this thrilling account of what one man - virtually alone - can do when he is determined ..."

If Mark "won", does not one question what Garrison feels impelled to do? Why those of us still working labor so, or what there is for us to struggle with?

The cover of the book is consistent. There the effort to bring the truth about the assassination to light is pitched as "his dissent".

Now the grim - the word used on the cover - truth is that the one man who was never alone, the one to have widespread assistance in financing, research and other services, the one of the original critics farthest from alone, is Mark, as, with considerable understatement, A Citizen's Dissent, in an entirely different context, proves. As a matter of fact, in one of his partly truthful aberrations, Mark also acknowledged, without indication of the magnitude, indebtedness to a large number of people who did much of his basic research for him. On p.25 of Rush to Judgment those credited by name as investigators and researchers total 17, and he had other significant help. Which is one way of being "alone".

In some cases, these people did virtually all of Mark's work for him, still another way of being "alone".

PLAGIARISM

Three of the appendices of Rush to Judgment properly belong in the text. None is as much as two pages long. None is the sort of thing that is customarily in the appendix.

However, if these had been included in the body of the book after it was in page proof and after it was indexed, the whole book would have had to have been repaged, the index done over, and there would have been great cost and chaos.

Bearing on this is the double-page ad in Publishers' Weekly, which promises that Rush to Judgment will contain "photographs from the archives which have never before been seen by the public".

Now, there is not a single picture in Rush to Judgment. Promises, promotions and expensive ads to the contrary, not one!

Instead, we have three parts of the text called "appendix".

Appendix II is called "The Hypothetical Medical Questions". This is a treatment and an understanding of the Commission's misuse of evidence and its powers that had appeared only in WHITEWASH.

Appendix IV is "The Capability of the Rifle". Here the material appeared in both WHITEWASH and Inquest.

Appendix X is the pure distillation of Lane's bitterest gall. It is mislabeled "Excerpt from the Testimony of Helen L. Markham". It is not. It is a discussion of what Mark missed in her testimony - and she was his big deal. He had tape-recorded a phone conversation with her and had had her interviewed. He had been talking and writing about her for months. Yet he missed the significant misrepresentation by the Commission, presented as though she were not afraid of the perjury she had committed but was afraid she would be hurt by the honor of being asked to appear on TV with the President of the United States. This appeared in WHITEWASH only. Until this "appendix", that is.

Lane and his publisher never satisfactorily explained this seeming plagiarism. I was able to check it wout with someone who had access to the version of his manuscript prepared for copyright.

It is not there.

The same is true of his movie and my material.

This is still another way of being "alone".