



**THE LOEB PROGRAM BOARD  
LECTURE COMMITTEE  
PRESENTS  
Great Speakers Series V**

**MARK LANE**

Who Killed John Kennedy? The records are sealed until 2039, but Mark Lane has the answers. A knowledgeable investigator and lawyer, Lane testified before the Warren Commission about his investigation. In his lecture, he will screen the suppressed Zapruder film of the Kennedy assassination, and uncover the cover-up by the FBI, CIA and other federal agencies. Mark Lane is the author of the best-sellers *Rush to Judgment* and *Executive Action*.

4:30 and 8 PM      MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1976  
EISNER and LUBIN AUDITORIUM, LOEB STUDENT CENTER

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TICKETS—\$2.00

INDIVIDUAL PUBLIC TICKETS— \$3.50

EVENING STUDENT SERIES TICKETS—\$ 7.00

EVENING PUBLIC SERIES TICKETS— \$13.00

TICKETS ON SALE AT THE LOEB TICKET BOOTH • 598-3757

Mr. Henry Durkin  
Box 74  
Westfield, N.J. 07090

1/27/76

Dear Henry,

Afraid I have to respond to your 1/23. But I won't mail it until there is need to respond to something else. "o haste.

I was unclear or you misunderstood me. Lane is not lobbying against a new inquiry. That is my interpretation of the result of his lobbying. And if he were to succeed (meaning all those associated with him, too) the net effect would be another whitewash. His probably unrecognized motivation is to make a hero of himself regardless of how. He is loud in demanding a new investigation.

When Author's Guild solicited me for membership their literature is specific in saying they will not engage in litigation for authors. This is why I didn't join. I don't think they can or should as a general rule, especially not for those of independent means. But I also believe that there are some cases in which the interests of all authors are involved. One of these is fraud. Another is fraudulent accountings. Another is refusal to account. Where major publishers commit criminal offenses not only is the interest of all authors involved but the greater power of the publisher is then exerted otherwise he can be jailed. All authors can suffer from the precedent that can be set against a writer of no or limited means. However, Jim Lesar has initiated steps against Dell. They promised him an accounting and in what he received yesterday there was none but there was a counterfeit of one. He'll respond mildly and build a record.

If I could collect some of the money due me, despite my age and condition I would not put it away for older-age security, although I have no retirement. I'd use it to hire help so I can do more.

Peter Koenel wrote the Groden book. Thanks for these welcome offers. Among other ambitions I want to leave as full an archive for younger people, especially students, as I can.

McDonald may spill more on talk shows and interviews, cunning as he is. The best liar can't remember them all, if you happen to tape any.

Thanks,

Garry Wills

## Blackmailing the CIA

The CIA feels it is unduly harassed now; but in fact it is extraordinarily blessed in its enemies. Unfortunately, the very clandestine mystique which has brought it some of its better agents has also brought all the conspiracy-minded kooks swarming out of the woodwork.

Much of the irresponsible criticism of the CIA comes from the same people who have been busily looking for some secret organization, any organization, to blame for the murders of President Kennedy and others. Nothing could help the CIA better than to have its critics all look as wild in their charges as Mark Lane.

The thing has a zany kind of poetic justice. Conspiratorialists reason from a set of assumptions like these: 1) nothing happens by accident, so 2) things that favor the conspiracy were planned by the conspiracy.

Apply those norms to the conspiratorialists' own scatter-gun attack on the CIA. These attacks are helping the CIA, therefore they were planned by the CIA, therefore the conspiratorialists are themselves part of the conspiracy! To accuse them by their

own crazy logic would be a fitting return for all the innocent people they have been accusing through the years.

It is important to disentangle the real criticism of the CIA from loony talk about its responsibility for killing Jack Kennedy and other Americans. That will be all the harder because of Norman Mailer's "Fifth Estate," the drunken project for seeking out conspiracy in all its guises.

*Counter-Spy*, journal of the "Fifth Estate," is printing names of CIA officers around the world. It printed that Richard Welch, the slain CIA station chief in Greece, was in fact a station chief — in Lima, Peru. It hardly "reveals" any facts about Welch. His CIA post was common knowledge in Athens. Besides, *Counter-Spy* itself got the name by doing some basic homework in the State Department's Biographic Register — a game played by all kinds of people, especially foreign agents.

But Tim Butz, editor of *Counter-Spy*, took a cruelly light-hearted approach to the matter, and even said on television that the CIA should have recalled Welch after he was re-

vealed — thus, in effect, taking "credit" for fingering Welch. *Time* magazine now quotes Kirkpatrick Sale, an adviser to *Counter-Spy*: "Our job is to expose every clandestine agent until the CIA abandons its covert actions."

There are many things wrong with that statement:

1. Sale talks of exposing "every clandestine agent" when even editor Butz says that *Counter-Spy* will not reveal deep-cover agents, only light-cover ones.

2. But deep-cover agents are those most likely to engage in covert activities of a violent sort.

3. Therefore *Counter-Spy* is working on the terrorist logic of threatening one group of people (men like Welch, who was not a covert operation type) in order to coerce a second group (the real masters of covert actions) to do their will.

4. It is this admitted coercion that invalidates the whole effort of *Counter-Spy*. The CIA should be examined and reformed, or even eliminated, by open and democratic methods, not by this blackmail from a few people with a printing press. These critics are not only helping the CIA. They are imitating it.

Dear Jim,

12/31/75

This newest foul-mouthing by oud, particularly because it is a deliberate lie and because it becomes the second assault on the possibilities of success for Roat Horton, is too much. It means this situation has to end. How it ends he'll decide unless I have to face it on a radio program or an appearance. From now on I'm imposing no restraint on myself that isn't necessary. I'll not raise the subject but I'll no longer ignore it.

As you know, because of him I've been wanting to get out of the Ray case since 1971 and because of him I have felt I cannot. I'd prefer nothing to do with him and I've been staying away except when he wanted to see me.

I had a notion this kind of thing was in the works, with Lane doing his own thing his own way. This makes them wreckers to me. Remember my note on Legend?

If you find and read my 8/11/75 memo on the second conversation with Shales you'll have an idea of the caution I gave him. I have it on tape.

There was a time when a woman at Qui! phoned me about something, I think another article, perhaps Model's. When I asked about the Shales piece she said their lawyers were having trouble with it.

I've since learned that they even edited the Model piece to make it libel me. He is outraged at the cutting, I think he said of 2/3, and of his fee by \$500. That this was done by editors at Qui! for whatever purposes is clear from both the context and Model's dedication of the book to Sylvia and me. I think I worked out the problem he and Robert had when Robert spoke to me last night. Robert then said the dedication is mostly to me. And the author at the same time calls me a crook?

I have no doubt he would be a witness for us if there is a case. He, too, is hurt by what they've done.

When he called me back I told him to get his tape recorder and tape our conversation. He said he couldn't. So he agreed to my taping it and I told him if he wants a dub all he has to do is ask for it.

Lane's is a different ploy. He is trying to get his directors to sue me. I'll have to write him and make a record on this. I hate to take the time but I think it is now necessary. I'll try to get it done and awaiting your coming if you are coming soon.

He will not dare sue me himself and I'm going to give him every reason, temptation and every other cause I can think of, asking him to give each of his board a copy. Robert is the one who told me of this and his response.

This is the other side of the possibilities I'll have to try to exploit if the course in Congress continues as it is now. It will then serve a constructive purpose. I'll give his board enough to think about.

Too bad those things have to happen. But I don't start them.

best,

# Warren Report Foe Heads New Group

By Richard M. Cohen  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Mark Lane, an indefatigable critic of the Warren Commission report, yesterday announced the formation here of the Citizens Commission of Inquiry, an umbrella organization designed to coordinate the activities of those who believe that Lee Harvey Oswald either did not kill President John F. Kennedy, or was not working alone.

Lane, the director of the newly formed organization, said its purpose would be to generate "a nationwide organizing project to urge Congress to investigate the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the resultant cover-up of the facts by the FBI and the CIA."

The organization, Lane said, would begin legal action for the release of evidence still kept secret by the government. He said some of the most important evidence relating to Kennedy's murder was never seen by members of the commission headed by late Chief Justice Earl Warren and charged by President Lyndon Johnson to investigate the assassination of Kennedy.

The Warren Commission was established by Johnson a week after the Nov. 22, 1963 assassination and turned in its report a year later. Since then, its conclusion that Oswald was Kennedy's sole killer and not part of a conspiracy has come under attack from critics such as Lane.

At his press conference, Lane took some swipes at the commission headed by Vice President Rockefeller which is investigating the CIA, and attacked the commission's executive director, David W. Belin, who had been an assistant counsel for the Warren Commission.

Lane exhibited correspond-

ence with the Rockefeller commission in which he had volunteered to appear as a witness to discuss the Kennedy killing and the CIA. He was told by Belin to first submit a letter and responded by addressing one to Rockefeller himself.

In announcing the formation of his commission, Lane released the names of its executive committee. It includes Richard Barnet and Marcus Raskin, both of the Institute for Policy Studies here; Morton Halperin, former deputy assistant secretary of defense; Linus Pauling, a Nobel Prize laureate in chemistry; John Marks, co-author of "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence"; Bernard Fensterwald Jr., a lawyer whose Committee to Investigate Assassinations was merged with Lane's organization; and George O'Toole, a former computer specialist with the CIA and the author of magazine articles saying the Oswald's voice prints indicates he was not lying when he told officials he did not kill Kennedy.

Despite a free-swinging attack on the Warren Commission and federal police and intelligence agencies, Lane said he himself did not know who—or who else—killed Kennedy.

Lane's press conference was the latest indication of a revival of interest in the Kennedy assassination, as well as the subsequent killings of Robert F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King. Lane, whose one-man lecture tour attacking the Warren Commission crisscrossed the country in the early and mid-1960s, said yesterday that he has recently completed a national speaking tour of 35 colleges.