

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

28

A long complaint against David Susskind, which could better be made by any other critic.

"David would invite me to appear on his 'Open End' program ...but that invitation has not been forthcoming."

If this is true it in no way distinguishes him, which is true of the burden of his complaint, and certainly is less true of him, his book to the contrary notwithstanding, than anyone else. However, what this passage ignores is the fact that he did appear, in October 1964, on what appear to have been the same facilities, with Susskind replaced by Harrison Salisbury and with a number of other panelists. In Washington it had the same spot, and I have a tape of it.

What it all adds up to is a book-length complaint about a media conspiracy against Mark Lane - again, "alone". On the cover this comes out as "Mark Lane replies...to the press and communications industry...and tells the often grim story of how his dissent was almost silenced."

This and more in the cover ad in Publishers' Weekly: "The thrilling story of a lone man determined who stood up to 'The Establishment' - and won! ... story of how the U.S. government and the communications industry attempted to suppress his investigation of the Kennedy assassination - and failed."

Inside this printed "Hearts and Flowers" we learn of the total conspiracy of all the networks - against Mark, alone.

Now if this is true, and could Mark possibly lie? we require an explanation for this language, part of the (for him) modest three-page account of how, Dutch boy with 10 fingers and 20 holes in the dike, he - alone - turned the tables. It is what the cover of his paperback calls "Important New Material Added". Less than 10 pages in all, less than seven being his retailing of the work of others, from these three pages this language is worthy of special consideration. These are Mark Lane's own words:

"I appeared as a guest on 185 television and radio programs originating from almost every major city in the United States. Many of these were important network or syndicated programs, some were specially produced documentaries, two and even three hours long. I think the new response of the media and the fact that a genuine dialogue is now under way in America regarding the events in Dallas is an indication of the resiliency of the American society."

Question: Can both Mark Lanes be honest, honorable men and writers?

A public discussion group in New York recently sought to hold a roundtable session about the Warren Report and its conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin of John F. Kennedy. The major difficulty for the group was in finding any one of stature who was willing to defend the Warren Report and its findings. That is only an example of how the atmosphere has changed in the two years since the massive report and its 36 volumes of supporting testimony and evidence were published. In the United States the Oswald theory then was accepted widely—almost without question—although doubt continued to prevail in Europe, with its historical stance Mr. Wicker suggested that it would be sound procedure for the Congress to pass Mr. Kuperman's resolution and to establish a Joint Legislature Committee empowered to review the whole case and, if necessary, to re-open it."

Almost two years earlier, on November 24, 1964, upon the occasion of the publication of the twenty-six volumes of evidence, *The New York Times* carried a front-page story under the by-line of Anthony Lewis, then Washington correspondent and now chief London correspondent for the *Times*. At that time, Mr. Lewis wrote,

Mrs. Kennedy's poignant recollections of November 22, 1963, were published today along with the testimony of the 551 other witnesses before the commission. Their words and supporting exhibits filled 26 volumes. The testimony overwhelmingly supported the conclusion of Chief Justice Earl Warren and his colleagues as revealed in the commission's report September 27, that the assassination was no conspiracy but the work of one unhappy man, Lee Harvey Oswald.

On many occasions Mr. Lewis had been invited to debate with me regarding the validity of the Warren Report, and he has in each instance refused to accept the invitation. I am genuinely sorry that a dialogue with Mr. Lewis has been rendered impossible by his reluctance, for I should be most anxious to hear his explanation of how he was able to move and digest the material contained in the twenty-six volumes within the few hours that he had them in his possession prior to the time that he felt sufficiently fortified to assure the American people as to their meaning. I was particularly struck with Mr. Lewis' feat since I required more than one year to read the material and to make an analysis, which analysis led me to an entirely different conclusion.

Another example of the news media's new approach to the Warren Report can be found in the signed editorial published in *Life* following the publication of *Rush to Judgment*. As the reader of this book can ascertain *Life* played an important role in assuring the American people that Oswald was the lone assassin. However, its recent editorial called for a new investigation and a new report, concluding that "the Warren Report is not enough."

During the years following the assassination but prior to the publication of my book, I traveled throughout the United States discussing the government's position. At that time not a single network radio or television program permitted dissent from the government's findings. Following publication of *Rush to Judgment*, however, I appeared as a guest on 185 television and radio programs originating from almost every major city in the United States. Many of these were important network or syndicated programs, some were specially produced documentaries, two and even three hours long.

I think the new response of the media and the fact that a genuine dialogue is now underway in America regarding the events in Dallas is an indication of the resiliency of the American society. The rejection of the Warren Report in America followed immediately after the dialogue began, indicating, I think, almost conclusively that the acceptance of the Report was predicated upon the one-sided presentation of the Report and the denial of access to the American people to those who had another view to offer. It appears likely that Europeans rejected the Report at the outset not because they are necessarily "conspiracy-minded" but rather because in Europe both sides were permitted an opportunity to be heard at the outset.

Several important television and radio programs have invited members of the Warren Commission to debate with me, but thus far the members have refused to defend their Report in public. During October Congressman Ford and Mr. Dulles became the first members of the Commission to break the vow of silence and to react to the criticism contained in my book. They charged that I sought to "undermine" the work of the Warren Commission and that my book was a "dis-service" to the "memory of the late President Kennedy." Is it not true, however, that in a democratic society it is not merely a right, but a responsibility of citizenship to question fraudulent governmental edicts? Is not consensus imposed from above the hallmark of a totalitarian society? And was not the "dis-service" to President Kennedy's memory and to