

9/11/77

Dear Ted,

Not long after your last call the mailman came. With him there was the dubs of the reel of tape you dubbed for me. Once the session started the University's personnel were available.

What should please you and is an indication of proper scholarly regard for credit is that the eye-catcher before one opens any cassette case is in capital letters, "Ted Gandolfo Tape."

Each separate item is a separate cassette and each is thoroughly identified aside from crediting you.

The quality is excellent.

That this is on cassettes means that I can listen without taking any time from other work. I listen while I take my walking exercise.

Of the Lane shows you included I have listened to all except that Stanley Siegal Show he did with Huie. That is in the machine for the next walk.

These are important tapes in a number of ways. One that is of particular interest to me now is the typical Lane amorality and his incredible flaunting of total ignorance. He presents himself as an expert, one who has done his own original investigation, and lacks the most elemental knowledge of the King assassination and the circumstances surrounding it.

Of the many importances of this one aspect I suggest only two to you:

How the assassins committee was led astray to begin with;

The importance in history and political science studies of the Lane disinformation; its importance in understanding why nothing happens after all the attention Lane gets.

I have listened with special care to what he said of the press on these tapes, especially the WBAI show. He is completely in error except in part of what he says about O'Leary, the part that O'Leary and his paper published. I know because those reporters used me as a source. Lardner's first story was an accident coming from a crack I made when he phoned to ask me about something else. The Burnham piece about which Lane complains did not have the antecedents he attributes to it. That again was an accidental by-product of a conversation I had with an entirely different Times reporter, not in Washington or New York. He figures in still other Lane fabrications about the press, the garbage about Ben Franklin being removed from the story to be replaced for an ax-job by Burnham who was then replaced by Wendell Rawls. The Times wanted my friend to go to Washington to do the reporting on the House committee for a number of reasons only one of which is that he is one of the best of reporters. He discussed this with me, which is what led to his suggesting the story that was then assigned to Burnham only because nobody else had been selected to have that as his beat. Because the Times was not able to assign an expert of its own staff it went out and lured from a good job in Philadelphia an expert on Dick Sprague, Rawls. Nothing sinister or unusual about that with Sprague running the committee. So the net result of all of Mark's self-service lies, designed to make a martyr of him and to poison people against those who expose him, is to exculpate the press for its actual sins. And as any analyst will note in listening to Lane, he has not a single error to attribute to any of these reporters in their reporting of the House assassins. There is none. I am the major source and I have read the stories in question. And as will be obvious on examination, what was wrong for the Warren Commission, the FBI, Secret Service and CIA is not right for the House committee. I cannot criticize one side for certain offenses and then justify the same offenses by the House committee.

I've wandered. My purpose was to tell you that I have the cassettes, that they are valuable, and thanks. I also wanted you to know how fine a way this is handled by the University. If you have not yet heard you will soon, I'm sure. Best,