

A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

162 "One of the early books on the subject was originally self-published."

Why the evasiveness, failure to mention the title? Is it because WHITEWASH was the very first, published a year before RTJ? Here again Mark makes expert use of the verbal elbows, knees and nails, pretending a "defense" that is otherwise intended and phrased. Typical is the footnote, which reads:

"Curiously, Weisberg later was to indulge in that same form of criticism. In a subsequent work he charged that a document was written in a "nasty" style and therefore, 'if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence.' Surely Weisberg would be the first to agree that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

in

Now this is/no sense a parallel, not even properly called a "document". I was not making any literary reference. My reference was to an FBI report which was so openly editorial, so very nasty and partisan, it is on that basis alone unworthy of credence. Unlike Lane's representation, I then devoted not the one mention he cites to it, from page 91 of PW, but print the entire report in facsimile on pp.238-9. But even his reference to and quotation from p.91 is selective to the point of misrepresentation. He says I say that because "a document was written in a 'nasty' style" it was "therefore, 'if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence". I do not say that because it is "nasty" it is not worthy of credence. The entire passage is longer than Mark's footnote indicates, beginning on the previous page and giving detailed explanation. But even if we restrict ourselves to what he misrepresents, that brief passage does not warrant his distortion, says other than he represents it to, and says it in less space than his distorted note. It actually says that the report in question "is an argument, not a report. It is nasty, openly prejudiced, disputatious and, if for no other reason, from its language alone not worthy of credence." What I actually said is that the report was inaccurate, incomplete, incompetent, a poor argument rather than an investigation (which is not the same as a writing). This is a distortion by Mark that cannot be accidental and is unfortunately typical of his sneaky literary and debating rabbit-punching, all from the back, never to the face.

And thus also he disguises the fact that even in an ex parte writing, where I could not face him, Professor Kaplan was unable to find any error in my work.

162 Although it is virtually impossible to be unfair to Professor Kaplan, Mark succeeds. Pretending that all he has said about the picture here discussed, the eighth taken by Phil Willis, is in his book, he says, "I have never offered my opinion on that question (whether the picture showed Ruby at the Depository.). I have invited the readers of Rush to Judgment to examine the photograph and make their own decisions." This is rather difficult for those readers, for after promising an extensive photographic appendix, Mark's books came

out with none. It is obvious his readers could not do what he says they could. But what is really the point is that in his radio and TV appearances, which reached infinitely more people than his book, he did exactly the opposite of what he here represents and did say the picture did show Ruby - and did this in my presence.