

MARK LANE  
178 Spring Street  
New York, N.Y. 10012

May 17, 1966.

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Hyattstown  
Maryland 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. was kind enough to forward a copy of your letter, of May 11, 1966 to Mr. Cohen, to me. You state that I "received an income" from my "advocacy". You are in error. From the moment that I entered into this matter at the request of Marguerite Oswald, and up to the present time, my average annual income has equalled approximately one-third of my average annual income for the years immediately preceding that entry. A Danish newspaper made much the same point that you have made, and I felt constrained to bring an action for libel. After the facts were presented to the court, judgment was awarded to me.

During this entire period I have derived almost no income from my work in this field. I drew a salary of \$60. per week from The Citizens' Committee of Inquiry for a short period. That was necessitated by the fact that I had abandoned my law practice and enjoyed no other income. For the remainder of the time, my full-time services were devoted to the inquiry without any compensation.


You stated that I was one "who had a staff and Committee working for him". That is true. I lectured widely throughout the United States and abroad, and all of the income derived from those lectures was utilized to continue the work of the Committee, to pay sal-

aries to the staff, and to send investigators to Dallas so that witnesses might be questioned.

I should like one day to read your privately printed book, as I trust it was written with more care and concern for the facts than was your letter to Mr. Cohen. You state that you "prefer to believe the motivation of most of us is broader than the defense of the murdered accused, that it is the defense of the democratic society." Those two thoughts are to me indistinguishable, one from the other; for only through fair treatment of the accused may it be said that the democratic society functions in the area of criminal jurisprudence.

There is no doubt that the Report of the Commission was credited by many, due to the fact that it was vouched for by the Chief Justice. I am inclined to agree with Professor Trever-Roper and disagree with you that, should the Report be faulted, the Chief Justice who gave his name, must bear the burden of responsibility.

Very truly yours,



Mark Lane

ML/mg  
cc: A.A.Cohen