

March 9, 1967

Dear Mr. Aronson,

Your "Report to Readers" March 4) again impels me to take time from a heavy workday that does not consist of junketing to where Guardian correspondents can find me for comment that should not come from me to tax you for confusing the instincts of friendship with the responsibilities of an editor.

If there is one and only one of those who have written books critical of the Warren Report (excluding Epstein, whose book is not in this category, as he really is not) who cannot help Garrison in his "New Orleans probe, that one is Mark Lane.

If there is one and only one who has already written and published on the other side, that one is Mark Lane. And if there is only one who has, I am confident inadvertently, stumbled on some of the material now important in "New Orleans and used it against what Garrison is trying to do, he is Mark.

These are the things I point out in the epilogue to the one book that adds anything to what had already been published that at all relates to what is now going on in "New Orleans. You apparently have not read it or, like "Mark, have an amazing capacity for not understanding plain English.

In WHITEWASH I exposed the story of "The False Oswald. You have seen transparencies and plagiarisms. No one else has added anything material to it. It outlines as no one else has and as I then could the anti-Castro and CIA involvement. In WHITEWASH II I discovered the reference to Ferris that Lane did not in a document he read so uncomprehendingly he couldn't even put the right date on it (my chapter "Scheherazade) and although I could not then put it in context, I perceived its importance. I tell you this, as I intend all of this letter, in confidence: it is that reference that led Garrison's people to me, not Lane, more than two months ago, and it is I, not the holidaying Lane, who has been working to help them - and from what is in the papers I know I have.

What is Lane going to do to help Garrison when he does the cheap thing he has said and you repeat that he will not and cannot do: "Lane said he would go to New Orleans and put in Garrison's hands all the information he had". What, pray? The "information" that was "right," that the FBI proved there was nothing to the story of the False Oswald, which is what he says (read what he says about Document 1553): This is help to Garrison: It is coverup of the FBI and protection of the CIA, as the most casual reading of this document shows. You'll soon be able to read it. My new and unannounced book on this subject is almost done. I expect it out in six weeks.

Will Mark really help Garrison if he "puts in his hands" the "information" that "Clay Bertrand" was a "lawyer"? This is the stupid, inept thing he says in his book.

He can do best by enjoying his wealth, keeping his mouth closed, and letting those of us who have a sincere desire to do something and who are on our own and silently doing what we can do what can be done. But so you can evaluate your own performance, may I suggest that you read the appropriate parts of Mark's book, where they exist, and then read the eleventh chapter of Whitewash the seventh of WHITEWASH II and the document on page 50. Even the links like the Washington Post knew what the editor of a progressive paper did not and so said March 3, that I wrote Garrison's scenario. If you talk of books, you should know what you talk about.

cc
Bel Ange