

5/13/69

Dear Mr. Favsner,

You have not heard from me because I have been waiting to hear from Fair at Dell, whose last letter indicated I'd be getting a letter soon. I've also had a letter from the editor of the Sunday New York Times Magazine saying they were studying my charge and I'd be hearing from them "presently".

I sent you, as a sample of his plagiarism, photocopies of Mark Lane's "Citizen's Dissent". He claims this was a "printer's error" when I confronted him (taped with his permission, on TV show). That now seems entirely unlikely, more even than then, for his book has appeared in a Fawcett reprint with exactly the same plagiarism, exactly the same language. I enclose copies. Had this been other than intended, had it been a "printer's error", he should and would have corrected it in the almost a year that has elapsed since he knew that I could prove he was stealing.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

nesses and from an additional and unexpected source as well. 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.<sup>19</sup> The Secret Service agents were called upon to explain that they had priority and that the FBI agents could not have expected their injunction to apply to Secret Service interviews. Very few journalists, even if they had wished to pursue the investigation, could have been as persuasive as the somewhat beleaguered investigators from the Secret Service.

Governmental initiative designed to prevent the publication of a contrary view does not end with an effort to silence witnesses. Indeed, it may begin there, for journalists, being less naïve than most and no more selfless in their dedication to the truth, are clearly given to understand what is expected of them by the authorities. To the extraordinary reporter the scent of censorship is a challenge, not an obstacle, but by definition he is neither average nor available in large quantities. A reporter's courage and initiative do not guarantee the publication of his findings, for the ultimate decision to publish or suppress is not always his. A number of important stories on the subject written and submitted by a leading *New York Times* reporter were killed, as was the original *New York Times* decision to conduct its own investigation.

Just prior to the issuance of the Warren Report, Walter Cronkite's news program decided to film portions of a lecture that I had been delivering in New York City on a daily basis. At the request of the producer, I met with him, the director and the entire camera and sound crew hours before the lecture was to begin. Substantial portions of the lecture were filmed, as were numerous random interviews with members of the audience. The following day I was told by a CBS representative that it had been reduced to nine minutes and that it represented "about the finest nine minutes of television viewing that I have ever seen." "It will be shown tomorrow evening or the next evening," he told me. That was three years ago, and it has not yet been televised.

chester (Harper & Row, New York, 1967) are cited "Manchester" followed by the page (e.g., Manchester, 93).

References to *The Truth about the Assassination* by Charles Roberts (Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1967) are cited "Roberts" followed by the page (e.g., Roberts, 14).

References to *The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report* by Richard Warren Lewis, based on an investigation by Lawrence Schiller (Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1967) are cited as "Lewis & Schiller" followed by the page (e.g., Lewis & Schiller, 21).

### Introduction

1. CBS, IV, 20.
2. See, e.g., Harris poll reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Paris edition), October 4, 1966; Gallup poll reported in the *New York World Journal Tribune*, January 11, 1967; Harris poll reported in the *New York Post*, May 1967.
3. CBS, IV, 20.
4. RTJ, 398 (340).

## PART ONE: THE DISSENT

### I The Death

#### 1 THE FIRST QUESTION

1. *National Guardian*, "A Guardian Special: A Lawyer's Brief," December 19, 1963.
2. *The New Republic*, December 21, 1963.
3. *New York Times*, December 19, 1963.
4. *National Guardian*, "A Guardian Special: A Lawyer's Brief," December 19, 1963.
5. *Ibid.*
6. See XIX, 488, 490; XXII, 843.
7. VI, 212; see *infra*, p. 187.
8. VI, 207; WCR, 19.
9. XIX, 535-536; XXII, 838.
10. Interview of Charles Brehm by Mark Lane, tape-recorded in Dallas, March 28, 1966.
11. See XIX, 488, 490.
12. II, 42-43; VI, 205-223.
13. WCR, 484, 493.
14. See *id.* at 641.
15. CBS, IV, 16-18.
16. See, e.g., *New York Times*, December 6, 1963.
17. See RTJ, 307-323 (256-272).
18. *New York Times*, November 1963.
19. WCR, 560.
20. November 17, 1966.
21. See Index to Basic Source Materials in possession of Commission, National Archives.
22. See *infra*, pp. 144-145.
23. *New York Times*, November 1966.

#### 2 THE CALL

1. CBS, IV, 9.

#### 3 REPORTS FROM DALLAS

1. VI, 205-223; XIX, 479, 487; XXII, 838-839; XXV, 853-854.
2. See XXII, 837-838; interview of Charles Brehm by Mark Lane, filmed and tape-recorded in Dallas, March 28, 1966.
3. See *ibid.*; XXII, 837-838.

### II The Great Silence

#### 4 THE POLICE ARE INTERESTED—IN ME

1. XXIV, 444.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Id.* at 445.
4. See *ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*
7. WCR, xiv-xv; see RTJ, 378-380 (321-323).
8. Gerald R. Ford, *Portrait of the Assassin* (New York, 1965), 436.
9. *New York Post*, February 1964.
10. *Ibid.*
11. John Koptan, *The Assassin: The American Scholastic*, X (1967), 273.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Yale Law Journal*, 1 (1967), 52.
14. II, 32-33.
15. See *id.* at 56-57.
16. *Id.* at 57.
17. *Ibid.*