

143

A CITIZEN'S MEMORANDUM - notes

These are partial only. Marks in the margin indicate other parts worth of comment, wrong, dubious or outright lies.

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 Chicago, 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. 238 and reads: "See index to Basic Source Materials in possession of Commission, National Archives." There is no such document, there is no such source. This is a direct and poorly-disguised plagiarism from Chapter 4 of WHITE HOUSE II, pp. 56, 59. This is a six-page report, only small parts of which I used. Lane uses only those parts. My source was the Commission's 27th 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 1/8/64 Re: Oswald". Identified by letters, the five are indeed 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 ~~xxxxxxixxxxxix~~ dishonest than usual.

See also pp. 97,

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". ~~The stenographic transcript still was~~ 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 (2K49).

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 make that part of his testimony exactly the same as 100% of the remaining testimony.

27 After all the exposure he had on radio and TV, from his own account, more extensive than any one 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 10% of the time. Here he ~~say~~ ^{say} that WOR had a ban on him. Then, when "bo-king agents" for the publisher approached WOR, "they were informed that

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 assassination. ^{accounting} I have personal knowledge of the program, because Leo Sauvage and I were asked by the ~~XXXXXX~~ 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 was the eminent Louis Wizer. That show, after the debate between Wizer 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, pre-empting 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.

28 A long complaint against David Suskind, 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 Suskind 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.

add → 38 His accounting of the cancellation of his contract by Grove Press, he says, "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 reason-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.

39 Without specifying the time, but continuing to pour-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 gives 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 believe is unique in my dealings with 10 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. Again, the opposite of Mark's version.

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 story often grim story of how his dissent was almost silenced."

This and more on the cover-ad in Publisher's 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."

all Inside this printed "Hearts and Flowers" we learn of the total conspiracy of 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 the ^{his paperback} ~~Lawrence~~ reprint of his book calls "Important New Material Added". Less than 10 pages in all, ^{all for the same} ~~the rest~~ being his retelling of the work of others, from these three pages ^{this language is} ~~parts of two paragraphs~~ are worthy of special consideration. These are ^{own} ~~also~~ Mark Lane's words:

"I appeared as a guest on 185 television and radio programs 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?

However, as Mark knows, for it is his book, there is more than reasonable ground for objecting to the conclusion of his books. 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. That 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 prior 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 counsel that Mark has edited even what he presents as verbatim reproduction of the questionings to eliminate the lewy ~~and~~ names, which in every case appear in the printed transcripts he "quotes."

40 For this discussion of the presentation of his book to ~~Boedley-Hess~~, 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, Mark 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 the attention, ~~of Sonnenberg~~ the book it was gone over by three eminent historians, not only Trevor-Roper, who 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 those thousands of footnotes (mostly duplications, to make footnotes a selling point). See p. 378. 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.

43 Chapter 2 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 book..." as though there were no others. There were, then, both *WHITE ASH* and the second book, ~~the one~~ 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 unfair style" (p. 182), for it is attributable to the literary attentions his own work required to make it publishable.

~~47 "Before August 15, the publication date for Rush to Judgment..."~~
~~Show pub date in pt. later.~~

(47) with correspondence

48 Read the chapter on Burke and get him to tell truth-or tell lies. Rather than "one of the critics had declined a similar invitation much earlier - had done it, facing his representatives in the first more than two-hour one-man "special" that established new ratings. Rather than requiring Keenan to appear with Burke in criticism of the Commission, as Mark says, after the show I did with ~~the~~ Burke 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 that only and in response to the reaction to it. Even his representation of Epstein refusing to appear is false, for until the last minute efforts continued and the night before it was expected he would. Nor is it that a "Commission defender was added". All the

and Mark's surrogates,

There were 2 "defenders" on that show.

members and most of the senior staff were invited, and before the bit about Epstein. 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.

put less than

48-9 While Delandrie deserves credit for his excellent work, in Philadelphia, OAU, the McKinley show, it is I who prepared the audience more than any other, with a total of 24 ~~hours plus broadcasts~~ before Mark was there.

50 Difficult as it is to be unfair to Joe Fyne, 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 Fyne audience to confront Wesley Liebeler on the local Bomax 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 problem, 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.

9-11-68 on THE JAMIE STATION

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, cancelled it when he learned I also would be on. At this point he also refused a syndicated NEWS-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, duplicitous liar and dared him to sue me, he refused even to face me in court.

~~60 That in looking to this source of information of how he was treated by BBC - what, in fact, is even lied about (p. 61 - "I was not paid a farthing"), is money. Show clipping show it was trading at sum BBC ever spent.~~

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 wired 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.

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

89 This Baker stuff also is from FBI and nowhere else.

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 half hour to cover the distance of approximately four miles", for he had first to go to this 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.

See 202
pp 14

97 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 \$2.00 on microfilm. He really knows so little about this he actually says (267) that the numbers are "the National Archives file number".

105(257) 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 the calculations? xxxxxxxx with all this footnote flaccary, why is there no source.

106(261) "Examination of the Repridur camera establishes that it ran at a speed of 18.8 frames per second". This footnote is an 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 actually exposed.

The basis of this chapter comes from my work, what I first brought to light in MITWASH, not with CBS or Alvarez or any of the other quoted sources. Bert 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 subject that he does not acknowledge the variable speed of the camera-or the CBS error in the reattachment. This is in no way relieved by the guarded acknowledgment on 111, where he evades what I first began to bring to light in "VII 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 New York Times he quotes and comment on the quotation he uses.

113-497 Quotation from RTJ that the Z 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 his 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 still in Vol 10, 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.

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". Went he to?

• 123 ~~...his attempt to read the paragraph on p. 26 to explain it, including the sources of mistakes and to validate them in the context in which he presents them.~~ (see 119)

125 Ask him to read the paragraph on me and to explain it. Begin by thanking him for his kind "defense". 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, 118 and 128), he checked his facts.

127 "Ball's name does not appear in Rush To Judgement". Very good point. WHY does 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 are numerous references to Ball in RTJ. (There is also a reference to the "ME" -Nizer thing here that might be commented on.)

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 ~~debate~~ 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 wifully 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 WCR. The WME-TV show had been a debate between him and me from the night of 12/8/58, when the Commission lawyers had failed to show up to face me in even a gangup. After what happened to him on CP when he faced me, I was tossed off the WME debate. Lane was a lesser evil to Nizer.

152 "One of the early books on the subject was originally self-published". Why the evasiveness, failure to mention the title? Is it because WHITEASH was the very first, published ~~in~~ 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 pressed. Typical is the first paragraph of the footnote, which reads: ~~TYPE~~. 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 one line to mention he cites to it, from page 81 of RT, but print the entire report in facsimile on pp 238-9. But even his reference to and quotation from page 81 is selective to the point of misrepresentation. He says I say that because "the 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 ~~xxxxxx~~ says that the report in question "is an argument, not a report. It is nasty, openly prejudiced, disputatious and, if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence." That 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 then 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.

162 Although it is virtually impossible to be unfair to Professor Kaplan,

Mark succeeds. In tending that all he has said about the picture here discussed, & the eighth photo 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 come 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 Ebruder film is that I brought it to light - the ~~xxxxxxx~~ missing frames, the editing of those or each of the missing sequence, of the copies - even the bringing to light of light allegedly belonged to the film showed 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 statement that Roberts made "reference to me or my work six ~~xy~~ seven times" in nine pages.

182 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 of 1967. It is in pursuance of a theory first advanced by Mrs. William Castellano, of Hollywood, who now has my extensive collection of all the public conveniences, of which the sewers are but part, of all of Wesley Place, before and after its rebuilding. I showed those pictures on this station. It is not "a very large pipe" that ends on the grass field but the smallest of all in that area, where others run up to 30 inches.

204 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 ~~xxxx~~ like that of the moon and green cheese. There is nothing 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 ~~xy~~ 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 use of other people's materials that he uses the phrase - used in "CHINESE", "East Evidence", as the title of this chapter!

FBI report 12/9/63

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

"But the recent release of the FBI Report (declassified only recently and quoted here for the first time), ~~but available from the National Archives and Records Service in Washington...~~"

"During April 1966, I visited the National Archives and discovered (emph. 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 government. 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 Judgement, before Epstein finished his book, *and* Mark knew better. Forgetting what he wrote in this pre-publication blurb, the enormous advertising and publication-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 for A Citizen's Dissent.

1st ~~From the first~~ *RTJ* Publishers' Weekly ad, doublepage: "It is the only completely documented critique of the Warren Commission Report", which is false and was known to be. ~~Not until after the campaign to sell the book was over~~ *four months later* did the publisher agree to cease and desist, although ~~he~~ *Stapp* and Mark never ~~did~~.
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. *and elsewhere* *carefully* This is a favorite line repeated in the brochure, its deceptive language exactly the same in *all* ~~both~~ cases.

Of similar integrity is the false representation of Sales of Rush To Judgement, as in Book Week, 225,000 copies "in print", and I think *There were higher* ~~later~~ figures, whereas in the cover ad for A Citizen's Dissent, the sales figure is given as but 140,000.

book Not inconsistent is the modest ad on the front cover of Publishers' Weekly, the most exalted position in the trade. ~~It~~ ^{it} with unended modesty, bills *The* ~~itself~~ 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 hard to, or what there is for us to struggle with?
The cover of the book is consistent. There the *struggle* ^{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 Judgement those credited as investigators and researchers, by name total 17, and he ^{had} other 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".

Zapruder

Having never understood the real significances of the Zapruder film, having done none of the considerable important work on it, having missed the most glaring destruction of ~~the~~ essential parts of it, Mark never ceases misrepresenting who did.

was brought to light
Knowing full well that it ~~appeared~~ in WHITEWASH, ~~for the first time and~~ only in WHITEWASH in photographs, he alleges in his Playboy interview exactly the contrary. Here there is a virtuoso display of both his intergity and his knowledge-of the fact, the testimony and the Commission personnel:(p.46)

"The question of these missing frames was brought before one of the Commission's lawyers last year by David Lifton, a graduate engineering student and an associate of the Citizens' Committee of Inquiry. The lawyer was so concerned he wrote (the former head of the Commission) This Commission lawyer commented: ' I have no recollection that anybody considered what happened to the sign or that anybody was aware of the fact that the frames were omitted".

"Omitted" as a replacement for [^]destroyed [^]is a considerable understatement for Omniscient Mark to be quoting. The lawyer is Wesley Liebeler, from whom Mark *He had obtained* was *my* for a long time running, ~~and against whom he~~ promised to file a suit for calling *Mark* a liar but apparently never did.

Now if there is anyone who did have knowledge and did have "recollection" about these two things, it is Wesley Liebeler, who took the testimony on the same day from the two people who ~~gave it~~. *just that information* With the sign, it was Groundskeeper Emmett Hudson, as I published in WHITEWASH. With the missing frames of the Zapruder film, it was his own *also revealed in very interesting alone* "testimony" in Volume 7 (attached).

Now a year before this alleged interest by Lifton and lapse of memory by Liebeler, all of this was brought to light in WHITEWASH, But Mark, consistent with his pose of having done everything that was done and all that has never been done and alone and unassisted, *pretends* no other books exist. This is consistent with the failure of his book to bring forth any major new information about the

assassination or its investigation and consistent with his own high concepts of personal integrity and ~~legal~~ legal and literary ethics.

There is a
~~It would now be appropriate for him to read the different version~~ *of the*
Some goodish threads added
~~of how knowledge of the missing frames of the Zapruder film was brought to~~
light, ~~as it appears~~ *(p. 387)* in the reprint of Rush To Judgement, heralded on that
cover as important new information.

~~Please read it, Mark.~~

Several other items, each its own kind of monument to the integrity, depth and exhaustiveness of Mark's work, and his dependability, are in the same Playboy interview. On page 48, for example, this; in reference to the documents burned by the doctor in charge of the autopsy:

"Think ~~fixt~~ about this for a moment. Here we have a commander in the United States Navy, who is also a doctor, assigned to perform the autopsy on the assassinated President of the United States, burning his draft notes on the autopsy..."

Now Mark, before this, knew the truth but his vanity prevented acknowledgment of it, for he pretends all knowledge began with and is vested in him. During the taping of a TV show many months earlier he had made the same mistake in challenging me, as had Jim Bishop. Their exchange, so unflattering to both of these self-touted "experts", was edited from the final showing. But on that occasion what Mark had learned is that the autopsy notes were not burned. Worse, they were suppressed by the government. I have receipts for them through the White House and Secret Service to the Warren Commission. What was burned is the first draft of the autopsy protocol itself.

On the same page Mark was asked, "Did the bullet fragments found in the governor's wrist, rib and thigh maych Exhibit 399?" Mark's reply was, "Of course not"..."

No fragments of bullet were recovered from Governor Connally's chest or thigh.

In subsequent apology, the editors of Playboy told me they had devoted an enormous amount of staff time and personnel for three weeks in an effort to eliminate the error in this interview. These are but samples of what remained.

"HELP" TO GARRISON

Mark was in Europe when news of the Garrison probe broke. Despite the fact that his own work was barren on New Orleans and he had done nothing to help with the investigation, ^{RTJ} others of us had, he rushed into print with the statement, I believe from Rome, that he was hastening to New Orleans to give Garrison all he had. On New Orleans, ^{RTJ} from ~~his book~~, that boils down to the seriously-wrong information that ^N Clay Bertrand ^N was a lawyer. The only reference to him is on page 390 and reads, "...and Andrews had told the FBI on November 23 a lawyer named Clay Bertrand called to ask him to represent Oswald in Dallas". The most casual reading of Andrews' testimony, the most limited comprehension, makes clear that Bertrand ^{is} ~~was~~ not a lawyer.

There were other tidbits of such "news", particularly on the electronic media. Then on March 28 the New Orleans States-Item carried the abrupt switch, that instead Garrison had given Lane all his information, which is, of course, the only way Mark could know about the case, having done none of the work himself. In what can in no way be considered proper conduct by a lawyer and in a way promptly seized upon by the defense. Mark said Garrison had given him a "full outline" of his case, rather remarkable because Garrison had by then not fully developed his case, having just begun it.

"When it is presented in court it will shake this country as it has never been shaken before", ^{Mark} ~~he~~ was quoted as saying. UPI quoted ^{this} ~~him as saying~~, "They are going to be embarrassed when the jury says guilty...The foundations of the country will be shaken when the evidence is disclosed in court". All of this in reference to the defendant alone, not a general discussion of the assassination. ^{From a lawyer? Will we never see Shupard's decision?} Immediately defense counsel ^{was quoted} ~~was quoted as~~ charging a breach of legal ethics, ~~and~~ Judge Haggerty as agreeing "Lane's remarks are 'inflaming a public from which we must select a jury'."

Earlier, as though he had the remotest knowledge, having neither known nor written of Ferrie, Lane, as the Philadelphia Inquirer put it February 24, 1967, "said in Paris the death of Ferrie 'may break the case wide open'." His predictions are on a par with his knowledge.

This same story reads, "Lane said he would telephone new information on the New Orleans aspect of the assassination to Garrison". Remarkably, none of this "new information" seems to be in the reprint of ~~his book~~, ^{RTJ} then just out, and none has been heard of since, what was "new" is the need to sell Mark's paperback edition, and that he did.

The information Mark said he would send Garrison is in its skimpiest and least accurate form in ~~his book~~, ^{RTJ} It relates to a Mrs. Sylvia Odio, about whom he ^{really} knew nothing, ^{The few of} and the FBI reports on ^{this that he did find} whom he did not understand.

Although there is no such indication in Rush To Judgement, Lane wrote a series of articles for the Copenhagen paper Estrabladet, the one appearing March 31, according to Reuters, ~~mark~~ reading, "I know who fired the fatal shot at President Kennedy. I know the forces behind the murder of the President." No doubt intending further "help" for Garrison, he also said, "he" was the only person apart from those on Jim Garrison's staff who had seen the extensive evidence collected in New Orleans".

He has not seen fit to let us know, in the more than a year that ^{SINCE THEN} has passed, ^{W/ MUCH MONEY} a year in which he wrote a new book and earned ~~a considerable sum~~ in numerous public appearances, who this murderer is, who the forces responsible are. In fact, his writing is unique in offering nothing like this.

His line, even his exact words, were soon echoed by his friend Mort Sehl, whose concept of helping the investigation is to announce on coast-to-coast TV that a comedian is one of Garrison's investigators. ^{also} Sehl told Jeremy Campbell, of the London Express, a young man dedicated to opposing the discovery ^{of and publishing} ~~or and print-~~ ing of the truth about the assassination, that he, too, knew the name of the assassin and "when Garrison tells his story, the implications will shake the country to its foundations".

Other may have different concepts of who, rather than Garrison, is ^{Selfish} "helped" by such publicity.

With this suspicious beginning, Mark gave up his teaching post at Stanford and moved to New Orleans, where he distinguished himself by doing no

investigative work and picking up what he could from Garrison's files. Thus, ~~in~~
~~the course of time,~~ he was soon billing himself, as in a signed article in a
 west-coast news letter, ~~as~~ ^{the} "unpaid chief investigator for D.A. Jim Garrison".

And all the time I thought that ~~some~~ was "Gurvich"!

In the April 12 Los Angeles Free Press he was writing about the
 Zapruder film and spilling the secrets of the Garrison office just as though
 he knew what he was talking about, as though he had done the work he so glibly
 presented as his, talking about the missing frames of the Zapruder film as though
 he had discovered them and written about them when he had the opportunity. Of
 the film Life gave Garrison, he wrote, "An excellent first-generation color re-
 print was delivered to Garrison and screened by the grand jury..." Aside from the
 screening, all of this, to anyone with the remotest familiarity with the Zapruder
 film, is false. It is not excellent, not first generation, and is not even
 complete. The editing of this rather crude copy is ^{obvious} crude. Among those Mark
 quotes is his adequately uninformed friend, ^{Gary Sanders} who he describes as "~~Gary Sanders~~" an
 engineer, who has made an analysis of aspects of the Zapruder film..." Gary is
 one of the least knowledgeable about the Zapruder film. It is not taxing reality
 to say he knows so little about it that, although he is, thanks to Mark, a flatfoot
 in New Orleans, he is not Garrison's expert on the Zapruder film. (It is, in fact,
 I who took that assistant district attorney to the National Archives and showed
 him what was entirely unknown to the Garrison office.)

Perhaps this is subject to ready explanation: Lillian Castellano, who
 independent of me also discovered the destruction of part of the Zapruder film,
 offered the free use ^{to} of this to Mark ^{IM} and his own ^{superior} judgement ^{he then} excluded it from
 his own writing. He is truly an "expert", on "help", though it has yet to be
 determined how much he has "helped" Garrison. The statistics on the sale of his
 books, however, does show what we know he helped. Also his fees for public appear-
 ances. Aside from picking other peoples brains and work, which I think we can
 look forward to in ^{at least one} another book, and acting as a messenger boy when a member of an
 audience gave him a message for Garrison, it would be nice to know just how much
 investigation he has done while living in New Orleans?

On the subject of Mark's "help" to Garrison and the success of ^{Jim's} ~~his~~ case in court, the story he wrote for the Los Angeles Free Press, issue of 5/3-9/68, ^{his Mark's} is of interest. It discloses ~~the~~ "interception" of a letter by Edgar Eugene Bradley, charged with conspiracy by Garrison.

Aside from the unlikeliness that Mark is here confessing a crime- more ^{Federal} likely ^{his} taking credit for what someone else did - how does publication of this story help anything but the sale of his new book?

And what effect does it have on the use of the evidence in court-or the rights of the accused?

False Claims - Alan Burke

The knowingly false claims by Mark and his publishers never ended, although more than four months later, the vice-president promised they would

be reckoned without Mark, however, and the attractiveness and profitability of lying. This was not because they were not called to attention, and not

because there was no time to correct the inaccuracy in the writing or the advertising and public relations. All were called to Holt's and Lane's attention

three months before publication, four months before the scheduled publication date, *well before*

other changes were made in the book.

The correspondence is unique in that neither Lane nor Holt was at any time responsive. Lane's contribution was to ignore completely all the

proof of his own dishonesty and to threaten me with a libel suit, never filed, for saying what he simultaneously acknowledged was true, *that he had been helped*

This letter in itself ends forever the current lie about how "alone" he was, and it further makes clear the falsity of the new book which makes this pretense, for it acknowledged that

~~all~~ of the income of the Citizens' Committee of Inquiry was spent on his behalf. *He*

"alone" had such help - which is a fine way of being "alone."

When ~~after the fact~~, Mark did not address himself to ~~his~~ lies and false representations, *again* I wrote Holt to tell them he had not in any way responded.

Neither did Holt, until a new and flagrant repetition *there was* to the fraud Mark and Holt *RTJC* apparently felt essential to the success of his book *appeared*. On September 1, 1966

I again wrote Arthur Cohen, whose nonsequitur is classic.

He passed off their fraudulent advertising as "the intramural competition of the experts," promised to be an honest man thereafter (while acknowledging, inherently, that he had received maximum benefit from the fraud), and offered an entirely frivolous non-explanation of the *apparent* plagiarism he did not even bother to deny.

One of the more interesting aspects of this exchange, as it is one of the more fascinating mixed misrepresentations and suppressions from Mark's new opus, is his non-response to the somewhat unusual effort by Holt to ruin me and defend the Commission prior to the appearance of *RTJC* ~~Mark's~~ book. It was on the Alan Burke Show, in New York. Despite all of Mark's many references to it, including the allegation that in some way he there was on the heroic order, he found *no* space for

the simple truth.

Now what really happened is that the station asked the American Trial Lawyers Association to send ^{participants} audience-participants to oppose me. Its then president, Jack Fuchsberg, several months later assured me he had declined any participation, even unofficial. ~~So, in the words of the station as representatives of the Trial-Lawyers' Association,~~

^{Thus,} ~~a motley~~ ^{group} of legal eagles, led by a man claimed as Holt's lawyer by its director of public relations, lay in ambush, ^{while representing to the station that} ~~for~~ ^{these} their ignorance, conspicuous bad manners, scientific incompetence, efforts ^{at} and browbeating and general stupidity, I confess indebtedness, for ~~it~~ ^{is}

^{were from} ~~this that~~ made that show the sensation it was and ~~made~~ perhaps the major single contribution to opening up the subject and calling to public attention the inability of any combination of lawyers to defend the Report. It ran for more than two hours and was, I am told, the first one-man special of that kind in TV history. This, too, you will not find in "A Citizen's Dissent", for to it Mark cannot dissent. ^{Instead, he pretends it didn't happen.}

On September 1, 1966, I asked Holt Vice-President Arthur Cohen for his assurance that ~~these lawyers~~ "none of these lawyers has or had any kind of an association whatsoever with your company." His reply-this time he did answer-was, with the emphasis his, to "assure" me "that there is absolutely no connection between Holt Rinehart and Winston and any television station, and in particular no connection between Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Alan Burke or WNEW-TV in New York." He solicited my further assurance that "any allegation to the contrary" or any inference of pressure on the station "would be malicious and untrue and would undoubtedly be defended by our counsel".

One can only hope that his counsel performs better in court than on TV.

What this non-response, so reminiscent of some of Mark's touted footnotes, ^{retailed} by the thousand as they are, ^{does not} do, is answer what Mr. Cohen could not deny: that his own lawyer took the lead in this attempted literary assassination. I do not think it was his intention to stand by his man

in the moment of his greatest defeat, where he and his numerous colleagues were simultaneously and oh so publicly bested by the man who to Mark is merely a goose farmer (Citizen's Dissent 125).

This
~~my suggestion that he was not responsive not by error, dated September 15, 1966, three days after his letter, has to this date not been answered, and~~ *and accident.*
data I so wrote H.F. / In 21 months they have not
then

his stalwart counsel has aimed no "defenses" in my direction.

That is not unique. It is now almost four months since my letter suggesting that perhaps Mark had not discovered sex, invented the wheel, harnessed the awesome power of nature in ~~his~~ bridling electricity and ~~harnessing~~ *splitting* the atom, and alone and unassisted bested the Warren report, as claimed in the January 29, 1968 ~~xxxxxx~~ Publishers' Weekly. I am no less surprised at his silence than at Mark's, for Mark has established himself as a man content to harvest his reward in the till.