

# A Citizen's Dissent

To defame publishers and libel the American news media of the 1960s, to state their failures and abdications when society so urgently required their integrity and dedication and so distort them as to make a self-made indictment incapable of withstanding scrutiny of scholars in the future when, in fact, it is one of the great, unnecessary and most costly tragedies in the wake of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, requires a corruption of mind, an overweening ego, a contempt for fact, a dishonesty of purpose, a lack of concern for truth and reality-or consequence and a genuineness, whole-hearted, uncompromising crookedness of which few men are or can be capable.

These are the prerequisites for the ~~original~~ <sup>writing</sup> composition of "A Citizen's Dissent". ~~For this~~ <sup>nature so</sup> ~~an indulgent and generous~~ <sup>ly</sup> ~~Mark~~ <sup>Mark</sup> ~~with these special personal attributes without which he~~ ~~could never have undertaken~~ <sup>exalting</sup> his self-~~exalting~~ task that when he had completed his masterpiece of deceit, rivalled only by the Warren Report in the field, ~~that~~ <sup>thievery,</sup> he had an ~~foundation~~ <sup>of gall, unscrupulousness, trickery, shabby devices and plain, uncontaminated, straightforward lies</sup> ~~of gall, unscrupulousness, trickery, shabby devices and plain, uncontaminated, straightforward lies~~ <sup>It</sup> ~~for the enormous public-relations campaign and promotion made possible by the media he~~ <sup>dedicated to</sup> ~~dedicated to~~ <sup>stifling his.</sup> stifling his.

To accomplish ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~self-exalting~~ <sup>deifying</sup> purpose, Mark drew upon his unique ~~blend~~ <sup>blend</sup> of two ancient and disreputable professions, in each of which he is skilled and efficient as few men ever can hope to be. He combines the lofty ideal of the ambulance chaser with the single-mindedness of the genteel journalist, with his bare face bearing out ~~although it were fit to be seen by decent people.~~ <sup>although it were fit to be seen by decent people.</sup>

It is all the more tragic because Mark began as the one lawyer in this enormous land so over-abundantly supplied with lawyers with the courage to stand <sup>of history, not of law, truth and justice</sup> ~~of history, not of law, truth and justice~~ ~~and protest the historic injustices of the~~ <sup>framing</sup> ~~framing~~ <sup>Though he</sup> Though he

steps short of calling Oswald in court, leaving time to others, which was all  
 the ~~arrangement~~ <sup>what</sup> he needed for claiming to be counsel for the defense (a new concept for  
~~said he would~~ <sup>said he would</sup>  
~~a man who~~ <sup>what his motive may have been</sup> withdrew if he became convinced of his  
 guilt of his defenseless "client") he did, loudly and effectively as he could,  
~~say "This is wrong and I must oppose it."~~ <sup>From his subsequent career it may not</sup>  
~~historically,~~ <sup>he has been</sup> he  
 deserves to be remembered. It was, in early 1964, a major, public responsibility <sup>But for</sup>  
 as would. <sup>he did do, for</sup> we are all much in his debt for it. <sup>what we</sup>  
<sup>reason</sup>

Having said that, and I say it without reservation, for it is  
 true, I have said all that I can honestly say of him that is in his favor.

The Warren Report and its unseemly etc.

There are many unnecessary tragedies that are subtragedies in the  
 major cast of the Kennedy murders. <sup>on</sup> Mark is his own special kind. With this  
 suspicious beginning, <sup>this</sup> ~~only~~ one of that corporal's guard of us working in  
 the field who had any persistence, financial and other, his ~~single~~ investigative  
 independence is so monumental ~~and~~ he has been able to bring to light virtually  
<sup>Solved</sup> ~~nothing~~ <sup>on</sup> not already known and could not even follow through ~~one~~ of his ~~own~~  
~~own~~ contributions without literary theft.

Unblushingly, he was <sup>equal to the task</sup> ~~not~~ that. Because he considers himself  
 both the elder statesman of our band and the sun and source of all knowledge,  
 because he steadfastly refuses to acknowledge that others <sup>(either)</sup> beat him to that  
 relatively small part of the essential knowledge <sup>he</sup> ~~that~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ published ~~and~~  
~~what has~~ ~~developed~~ or developed the new information ~~that~~ he presents as his  
 own, he was incapable of ~~xxxxxxx~~ crediting his source. Thus he needlessly  
 made a taunt of himself in his first book. This cost him little for had he not,  
 his ~~own~~ would have firmly established ~~his~~ this reputation for him.

So exquisitely inadequate is his lawyer's <sup>skill</sup> ~~responsibility~~ as an  
 investigator that <sup>from and does by</sup> ~~of~~ the one thing that should have interested him ~~most~~,  
 what was done to him, he has no inkling. He will learn upon publication of  
 my fifth book, "OCEAN FRONTIER"; This is not to say that I am the James  
 Bond of investigators. <sup>Ben Turpin</sup> ~~For~~ it is to characterize Mark as the ~~great~~ ~~Scott~~  
 of Lyttona Dogs.

Because I do not like <sup>would</sup> ~~appear~~ (as who, indeed, ~~appears~~ to be?)  
 I <sup>(hide behind my slide devices - and I have no need to say)</sup> ~~say~~ what I believe right out, without subterfuge or guile. And, unlike him, I shall herewith prove it - not with phony footnotes ~~hijacked~~ into sales-pitches and non-existent source but with direct textual quotations and, where possible, <sup>and appropriate</sup> photocopies of each. Where I cannot offer photocopies, as with the spoken word, I have tape recordings in my possession.

<sup>(the tapes)</sup> For ~~what~~ I see in ~~Wark's~~ debt. He <sup>+</sup> recognized more and more of my lines ~~but~~ his - as with the conclusions of my first book there his has none - coming back to me when I heard him on radio and TV, <sup>+</sup> I learned how valuable and useful a tape recording can be.

And because he stole, borrowed without a edit, adapted and otherwise utilized enough of what I had written and done, I will largely restrict myself to that.

Once he had thoroughly milked the scholar and lawyer bit with "Dush To Judgment", once he had learned from ~~Jim~~ Jim Garrison, New Orleans District Attorney, that the Garrison people can take to their hearts a man who seems to be and says radical things, Wark resumed that role. His <sup>potential</sup> ~~market~~ for "A Citizens' Dissent" was two groups, that large number of genuinely concerned Americans of all ages who are troubled by the fate inquest with which their popular President was consigned to history, and rebellious youth seeking a better world than they are inheriting. The former, for the most part, will buy anything of seeming worth on the subject. The ~~second~~ second seeks its own kind.

~~Wark~~, Having gotten all <sup>n</sup> possible profit for his <sup>n</sup> "respectability," he thereupon became the radical. Not quite radical enough, for example, to sign the writers and editors protest against the war in Vietnam. <sup>(That would mean jail)</sup> But radical enough to <sup>seem to</sup> say, "I am a radical. I oppose what the government is doing".

In his earlier day he was quite the opposite. As he correctly states ~~(in~~ the book is not 100% lies and distortions; I do not want to give that impression) in "A Citizens' Dissent", when he prepared what he called "A brief

for the defense", there is only one paper in the country that could print it. That is the National Guardian.

One of the most advertised features of "Rush to Judgment" was its thousands of footnotes. <sup>MARK</sup> Not ~~but~~ had more than <sup>in</sup> other books then out or soon to appear. <sup>and that they were entirely dependable</sup> He just capitalized it. With all those thousands of footnotes- and the total was easy to escalate, for example, the first 14 being one (pp 29-30, 418)- that quintessential single <sup>one</sup> credit to the "National Guardian", the one paper that would publish his "brief" <sup>and start him off!</sup> is missing (p.373). This is not because there was a shortage of footnotes <sup>availabilities</sup> at that point, for ~~two~~ of the dozen <sup>my</sup> surrounding the point that one should have been only two are not inappropriate, inaccurate or both. (p.388). In fact, the "National Guardian" is not mentioned <sup>me</sup> once in the entire book (index, p. 478).

This is the least debt Mark bears the "National Guardian" family, <sup>became</sup> important as it <sup>to him</sup> as he assumed the pose of a "radical". He is indebted to Sally Belfrage, daughter of <sup>Cedric Belfrage</sup> then "editor-in-exile", for publication of his book and the wealth and fame it brought him, and to her former boyfriend <sup>for</sup> ~~she~~ supervised a really superb job of editing. From what a number of American publishers unadvisedly told me, before editing, "Rush to Judgment" was unpublishable. Sally told me ~~in 1955~~ that it is she who sent him to her friends in England who arranged his publication and the book's first editing, which was by or in the name of Bertrand Russell, Hugh Trevor-Roper and Arnold Forster. The introduction is by Trevor-Roper. American publisher Holt, Rinehart and Winston thought enough of it and his name to reprint Trevor-Roper's introduction in a special and expensive mailing to the trade and most me or news media and reviewers. Sally's name also does not appear once in

either book (RHJ 478; CD 293). <sup>The pose that Mark did everything all by himself does.</sup> <sup>acknowledged his smaller debt to Sally</sup> He could not have <sup>and remained, as he is</sup> ~~done~~ <sup>his role</sup> ~~it~~, the indomitable, unconquerable, <sup>and a good vocabulary</sup> never-say-die guy who did it alone. This, incidently, is no figurated speech. It is exactly what Holt, Rinehart said in the most expensive ad in the industry, the cover of "Publishers' Weekly" (dated April 22):

"The thrilling story of a lone determined man...." Modestly, this is printed in letters ~~only 5/16th inch high, which is only about 40% larger than~~ usual type size. Humility surfaced is smaller percentage than ~~an iceberg's haws~~ in the normal-type size, where it was slightly qualified this way:

"This stirring account of what one man-virtually alone- can do when he is determined to break through an official "curtain of silence" and bring the truth to the American people".

~~At that~~ ~~But, at the time the dust-jacket prepared,~~ ~~I read~~ like the rest of the ed ( "the story of how the U.S. government and the communications

It is really more. He ~~(also alone)~~ <sup>also</sup> succeeded. The rest of those ~~IMMORTAL~~ ~~breath-~~ words requiring the largest type in the ad so declare. It reads, "The thrilling story of a lone determined man who stood up to ~~the~~ "the Establishment" - and won!"

~~For and while he was in to court~~ <sup>And if he "won", what was it - left</sup> all by himself, as he so unassumingly puts it ~~and the fruit of his~~ <sup>an Garrison and us to do?</sup> ~~great labor hangs, for it is not in his writing.~~

So, rather than deny the ~~breathless~~ reader the account of how he did this all alone - Sally was married by then anyway, and not to his editor - rather than diminish the dramatic impact of the literary David in a Daniel's Den of Goliaths, he puts it this way:

"Before I decided to try for a publisher in England, the better part of a year and a list of fifteen publishers had been exhausted. In London, I submitted the manuscript to James Michie at The Bodley Head..." (CD 40).

This is one of the more intrepid parts of "A Citizens' Dissent", and he <sup>in</sup> ~~will~~ be exploring it further. It is ~~one of the~~ <sup>seven</sup> chapters ~~of~~ "The Making of a Book" (pp 37-45), where Mark, alone and unassisted, as he so daintily expresses it, accomplished ~~the~~ the impossible.

But so the reader will fully understand how unassuming ~~Mark~~

"The thrilling story of a lone determined man...." Modestly, this is printed in letters ~~only 5/16th inch high, which is only about 400% larger than~~

usual type size. Humility surfaced is smaller percentage than ~~an i/2000th shows~~ in the normal-type size, where it was slightly qualified this way:

"This stirring account of what one man-virtually alone- can do when he is determined to break through an official "curtain of silence" and bring the truth to the American people".

~~At that~~ <sup>had been</sup> But, ~~at the time the dust-jacket prepared,~~ <sup>read</sup> ~~it~~ like the

rest of the ed<sup>n</sup> ("the story of how the U.S. government and the communications industry attempted to suppress his investigation of the Kennedy assassination")

~~It~~ is all only "his dissent". *No one else. Mark alone. ← INSERT*

I wonder what Jim Garrison and his staff <sup>had</sup> and all the others of us who had written and published books before Mark's <sup>had</sup> carried public knowledge

~~for and while he was doing this~~ <sup>really</sup> ~~all by himself, as he so unassumingly puts it~~ <sup>and if he "won" what was then left</sup> ~~and the fruit of his~~ *for Garrison and us to do?* ~~great labor hangs, for it is not in his writing.~~

So, rather than deny the breathless reader the account of how he did this all alone - Bally was married by then anyway, and not to his editor - rather than diminish the dramatic impact of the literary David in a Daniel's Den of Babelists, he puts it this way:

"Before I decided to try for a publisher in England, the better part of a year and a list of fifteen publishers had been exhausted. In London, I submitted the manuscript to James Nichie at 'The Bodley Head...'" (CD 40).

This is one of the more intrepid parts of "A Citizens' Dissent". ~~we~~ <sup>in</sup> shall be exploring it further. It is ~~one of the~~ <sup>seventh</sup> chapter ~~(77)~~ <sup>1/11</sup> "The Making of a Book" (pp 37-45), where Mark, alone and unassisted, as he so deintily expresses it, accomplished the impossible.

But so the reader will fully understand how unassuming ~~Mark~~

~~his~~ <sup>gracious</sup> ~~and~~ ~~gracious~~ ~~work~~ can be and how, in a career of commercialized  
 to notes he does not include their number by including disconcerting  
 credits, <sup>anyway,</sup> ~~he~~ ~~can~~ readily reach <sup>it</sup> the requisite thousands by unassisted  
 typographic and literary flatulence, invention and imagination.

*(I point out that)*

From this little incident, so minor it accounts for his entire  
 demerit ~~says otherwise, as though lost and guilt are akin),~~  
 wealth ~~(which is now not inconsiderable, although the~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)~~  
 it can be seen that Mark has a standard of personal integrity few can  
 equal, a sense of gratitude without parallel and a code of ethics beyond  
 adequate description.

Any comprehensive analysis of Mark's second book ~~can~~ <sup>easily achieves</sup>  
~~serious~~ <sup>long</sup> length without exhausting the veridical material. My problem will  
 be what to leave out. Therefore, I begin with what can give the reader a  
 rich understanding of Mark's fundamental nobility. There will be nothing to  
 in any way diminish the <sup>readers's</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Mark</sup> ~~recitation,~~ for ~~it~~ is almost unswerving, seeking  
 by ~~no~~ other level save ~~the~~ <sup>design</sup> careful ~~xxxxxxxx~~, as when he does give credit to a  
<sup>of the</sup> few ~~unpublished~~ researchers who have no books in competition with his.

While it is still possible to be impersonal is a good time to  
 return to what he calls "The Making of a Book". It was not "made" by what  
 has been described to me as a virtual rewriting by or under Benjamin Sonnenberg,  
 Jr., for he is credited merely with "editing" the two times he is mentioned  
 (pp.42,53), each ~~xxxxxxxx~~ <sup>of the two times</sup> in less than a sentence. One might be  
 considered less than generous from the context in which it appears (p.42). The  
 paragraph has to do with a <sup>self</sup> reading, for libel. The last half is this sentence:

"Nevertheless only a few trifling changes were made regarding the  
 substance, while the style was considerably improved due to the careful editing  
 by Benjamin Sonnenberg, Jr., an American then residing in England".

A hasty reader might get the idea that all the changes in the reworked  
 book were "only a few" and at that "trifling". <sup>it</sup> ~~sure~~ <sup>as readily</sup> he to, ~~Mark~~ would not take  
 offense.

*This scant credit*

is, however, exceedingly generous when compared to the sole (and unindexed, p. 177) mention in "Push to Judgment". Under the "acknowledgments", a heading from which the word "grudging" is absent, there is this sentence:

"I am deeply indebted to Benjamin Rosenberg, Jr., whose numerous and invaluable suggestions (my emphasis) found their way into this volume."

Nor is this, compared with some of the other "acknowledgments", ~~at~~ *less than uninteresting.* This ~~is~~ opening passage begins:

"I gratefully acknowledge the advice, encouragement and assistance of many men and women". Without any indication that they did his work for him, Mark then notes some he describes as "among the many amateur investigators who journeyed to Dallas". Two of these are Harold Feldman and Ruth Fortel.

The first chapter after the Prologue is "Here the Shots Came From". Here and in his numerous <sup>appearances</sup> ~~1~~ "don't pay attention to ~~the~~ "A Citizen's Dissent" of this kind, for without doubt ~~we~~ had considerably more radio and TV time and public appearances for which he was paid (the rest of us put ~~aside~~ together) ~~mark~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~far~~ <sup>much</sup> of what witnesses said. I happen to believe that eye witnesses are among the most dependable sources of information about unexpected events and that the vote of the witnesses is the most certain way of establishing truth. ~~He~~ <sup>and</sup> others may legitimately ~~disagree~~ <sup>disagree</sup>. The courtroom necessities and experiences of lawyers convince them otherwise.

Now it happens that <sup>long</sup> ~~before~~ <sup>1</sup> Mark ~~had~~ <sup>did</sup> ~~finish~~ <sup>finish</sup> his book (but not before he was contracted to have done so, to which we shall return) Harold Feldman wrote an entire magazine article on this "CIA Liberation", <sup>The New York Times</sup> ~~also~~ <sup>also</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~subject~~ <sup>subject</sup>. ~~work~~ <sup>work</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~material~~ <sup>material</sup>. "Times" devoted reasonably prominent space to it in December 1964.

~~(I repeat myself. Very inefficient, I feel).~~

And Mrs. Fortel told me ~~she~~ <sup>she</sup> ~~before~~ <sup>before</sup> Mark's first book was published that she had done his medical <sup>work</sup> ~~research~~ for him. This is a field in which <sup>she has had experience, an added bonus and an added secret report from with</sup> ~~there is nothing in what I have heard and read of Mark's words where I have knowledge to persuade me here is not at least one dependable.~~

*she has had experience, an added bonus and an added secret report from with Mark's records and public.*



*This scant credit*

is, however, exceedingly generous when compared to the sole (and unindexed, p. 177) mention in "Push to Judgment". Unless ~~in~~ <sup>inherent but</sup> "acknowledgements", a heading from which the word "grudging" is absent, there is this sentence:

"I am deeply indebted to Benjamin Sonnenberg, Jr., whose numerous and invaluable suggestions (my emphasis) found their way into this volume."

Nor is this, compared with some of the other "acknowledgements", <sup>less than</sup> ~~uninteresting~~. ~~The~~ <sup>uninteresting</sup> opening passage begins:

"I gratefully acknowledge the advice, encouragement and assistance of many men and women". Without any indication that they did his work for him, Mark then notes some he describes as "among the many amateur investigators who journeyed to Dallas". Two of these are Harold Feldman and Ruth Fortel.

The first chapter after the Preface is "Where the Shots Came From". Here and in his numerous <sup>appearances</sup> ~~appearances~~, <sup>1</sup> don't pay attention to ~~the~~ "A Citizen's Dissent" of this kind, for without doubt Mark had considerably more radio and TV time

After <sup>lengthy</sup> discussion of the point in WHITEWASH, I invoke a non-legal formulation, ~~with~~ William Shakespeare, in Act IV of "All's Well That Ends Well": "'Tis not the many oaths that make the truth, But the plain single vow that is vow'd true." *The majority can be wrong.*

~~The~~ courtroom necessities and experiences of lawyers, convince them otherwise.

Now it happens that <sup>long</sup> before Mark <sup>had</sup> ~~begin~~ <sup>not finished</sup> to write his book (but not before he was contracted to have done so, to which we shall return) Harold

*The issue of "The Minority of One" dated March 1965 - This is Feldman's entire negative article of this "situation", The New York man's <sup>also</sup> ~~also~~ <sup>the subject</sup> work and material. "Sirens" devoted reasonably prominent space to it, in December 1964*

~~(Some self-given, un-indexed or lost).~~

And Mrs. Fortel told me ~~the~~ before Mark's first book was published that she had done his medical <sup>work</sup> ~~work~~ for him. *This is a field in which she has had experience, an added bonus and an added secret not shared with Mark's readers and public.* ~~There is nothing in what I have heard and read of Mark's words where I have knowledge to persuade me hers is not at least as dependable.~~

8 (Mark is well-willing to assume any responsibility if it will make him appear heroic)

Mark's  
"The Making of a Book" begins with the ~~mainly~~ ~~assumption of responsibility~~  
assumption of responsibility for the fallible part of the Citizens' Committee of  
Inquiry, which had financed him and helped him in numerous other vital ways. It  
was his reliance in Denmark, his marriage there and his decision to "read in  
Denmark to finish the book". This, he says, was "at the very end of 1934". Those  
narrow souls who know and understand that might interpret this confession to  
really mean he had bilked the Committee dry, so the hell with it.

*(Can quite false)*  
However, if at the end of 1934 he was about to "finish the book", his  
works there seems little reason for his not having delivered it to Grove Press,  
which had given him a ~~substantial~~ *reasonable* advance and announced its publication for  
March 15, 1935. My recollection of this is clear, for I would not sign the  
contract under which I wrote ~~INTRODUCTION: THE REPORT ON THE HANSEN REPORT~~, until  
the publisher (since, fortunately, moved into what for him is the less dishonest  
occupation of 'customers' men) unless he guaranteed to have it out by March 15.  
My ~~own~~ willingness to jeopardize the contract + very much wanted was not vanity.  
It was my apprehension that Mark's book would be as inaccurate as what he had  
*written and said*  
by then ~~produced~~. This, I feared, could be fatal to the quest for truth and the  
public will ingness to believe criticism of the Warren ~~Report~~ *part*.

Mark mentions Grove twice. ~~The~~ The first time it is to say that a then  
literary agent, Oscar Collier, whom he had met and suggested he write a book. Within a  
few days Oscar had a contract with Grove. "I was to meet the president of the  
company and some of the editors at lunch. We met, talked, signed contracts for  
a very modest advance" is the entire first reference (pp. 31-2).

The second one is part of a paragraph (p. 38). On the preceding page,  
without reference to his contract to deliver ~~the~~ book in time for it to have been  
*(and did he need editing?)*  
edited, set in type, proofread, the type transferred from galley to page forms,  
indexed, printed and bound within hard covers, then promoted and *distributed*  
to reviewers sufficiently before publication date for the reviews to *be assigned and written by the time*  
*the book had*  
*and then for the book to get into common read channels,*  
some good, he says that in January and February of 1935 he and his wife suffered *were* *ing*

exposure to the harsh ~~which~~ weather in a small house when his father-in-law arranged for an English-speaking stenographer and a telephone so that ~~the~~ "the final draft of the book" could be completed. Mark is precise here. It would seem that he did the dictation then and that it was thereafter transcribed. <sup>He</sup> ~~He~~ <sup>still</sup> ~~it~~ would have been such for later to meet his contractual obligation.

"In the interim", he writes, "Grove Press had changed <sup>its</sup> ~~his~~ mind. The contract was cancelled, I was informed, and no substantive reason was offered.

As I have come to know and understand Mark, I take this all to mean that where he scripts a Baltic Puccini he was starting his book again and that what he describes as "no substantive reason" is his failure to abide by any of the central terms of the contract.

~~and Mark's book still a year from publication.~~ <sup>By</sup> ~~Osaka~~ <sup>Osaka</sup> ~~September 1963~~ <sup>Osaka</sup> ~~was then~~ <sup>Osaka</sup> ~~overly-committed and would not consider offering another contract for more than six months. However, he had a pleasant visit. #~~ <sup>Osaka</sup> ~~is the man who negotiated~~ <sup>Osaka</sup> ~~the contract which was to have been done prior to the issuance of~~

If Grove ordered a book on the Kennedy assassination prior to the appearance of the Warren Report, which could have been anticipated to have the great sale it did, delivery of that book even a reasonable time after the Report did not give him the merchandise he ordered. And author may have his own ideas about the subject and ~~the~~ content of his book, as may the publisher. My own opinion is that the more important works were those analyzing and commenting on the official story. <sup>(pitch at contract time.)</sup> ~~Mark's big~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~if less than~~ <sup>entirely faithful</sup> self-representation, is that he was "counsel for the defense", a natural for a pre-Report book. It would have been no sweat, especially if he were ~~and had~~ what he claimed, for him to have done this. <sup>Three</sup> ~~writers~~ <sup>European</sup> did. They are Leo Sauvage, Joachim Joesten and Thomas Buchanan. Not at all remarkably, Joesten and Buchanan are not mentioned in "A Citizen's Dissent". Sauvage is mentioned in passing twice, <sup>(once p.39)</sup> ~~and to~~ say that an American contract for publication of his book (very carefully not dated) was broken, then <sup>(p.125)</sup> to repeat a slur. For Mark and his concept of self, there was abundant reason for not mentioning Joesten (aside from the fact that he is one of the many of us who earlier did what Mark was claiming for himself). <sup>Joesten's</sup> ~~The~~ dedication of "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy takes up an entire page. It begins, "The brilliant and courageous New York Attorney" and is "To Mark Lane"! That <sup>not</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>and</sup> grateful ~~man~~ who proclaims he did it all alone -and won - requires no ~~more~~ more compelling reason for not mentioning Joesten in his own book on his own alleged "suppression".

exposure to the harsh English weather in a small house when his father-in-law arranged for an English-speaking stenographer and a dictaphone so that ~~the~~ "the final draft of the book" could be completed. Mark is precise here. It would seem that he did the dictation then and that it was thereafter transcribed. <sup>He</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>it</sup> ~~earlier~~, it would <sup>still</sup> have been such too late to meet his contractual obligation.

"In the interim", he writes, "Grove Press had changed <sup>its</sup> ~~his~~ mind."

The contract was cancelled. <sup>As I have come to know and understand Mark, I take this all to mean that where he scripts a Baltic Puccini he was starting his book again and that what he describes as "no substantive reason" is his failure to abide by any of the central terms of the contract.</sup>

<sup>and Mark's book still a year from publication!</sup> ~~He~~ <sup>By</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>never</sup> no longer Mark's agent (and Mrs. Marguerite Oswald's, which Mark didn't mention) when I met him in September 1965. Oscar was then president of a small publishing house, ~~and~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~September 1965~~ <sup>1966</sup> he was then ~~overly-~~ committed and would not consider offering another contract for more than six months. However, ~~at~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>most</sup> ~~pleasant~~ <sup>recent</sup> visit. ~~He~~ <sup>is</sup> the man who negotiated the contract. ~~He~~ <sup>Grove</sup> said the book was to have been done prior to the issuance of the Warren Report, that the advance was \$1500, and that Mark had not delivered the manuscript and had not returned the advance. This left his relations with Barney Rosset, president of Grove, such that he felt it would do me little good were he to speak for me, the publisher with whom I had a contract having broken it while drooling in the till over the advance orders for it.

<sup>INSERT</sup> ~~after reading Mark's representation and recall that Oscar had told me,~~ <sup>of what he proceeded to have</sup> ~~I~~ <sup>asked</sup> Dick Gallen, general counsel for Grove and a man who had in the intervening years become my friend, if Oscar's account was true. Dick affirmed ~~it~~.

Were a devil loving scripture to add the appropriate passages in these two references to Grove, he would find that on page 22 <sup>Mark</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>of</sup> says that the "very modest advance" which was \$1,500 and not modest for a man repeatedly portraying himself as starving - <sup>is</sup> ~~it~~, in fact, the total royalty on \$2,500 copies of a \$8.00 book, and it is not uncommon for hardback books to sell

exposure to the harsh English weather in a small house when his father-in-law arranged for an English-speaking stenographer and a dictaphone so that ~~the~~ "the final draft of the book" could be completed. Mark is imprecise here. It would seem that he did the dictation then said that it was thereafter transcribed. <sup>However,</sup> <sup>still</sup> if it earlier, it would have been such too late to meet his contractual obligation.

"In the interim", he writes, "Grove Press had changed <sup>its</sup> ~~his~~ mind. The contract was cancelled, I was informed, and no substantive reason was offered. ...no one at Grove Press had even seen the manuscript when I was informed that the book would not be published...." **INSERT**

*"4 Citizen's Dissents"*

~~This~~ is not quite the representation unsolicitedly given me by

Oscar Collier when he was no longer Mark's agent (and Mrs. Marguerite Oswald's,

*and Mark's Bob still away from publication.* <sup>By</sup> <sup>Oswald</sup> which Mark didn't mention) when I met him in September 1935. Oscar was then president of a small publishing house, Fleet. ~~By~~ <sup>By</sup> September 1936 he was then

overly-committed and would not consider offering another contract for more than six months. However, he had a pleasant visit. <sup>He</sup> is the man who negotiated the <sup>Grace</sup> contract. He said the book was to have been done prior to the issuance of the Warren Report, that the advance was \$1500, and that Mark had not delivered the manuscript and had not returned the advance. This left his relations with Barney Rossel, president of Grove, such that he felt it would do me little good were he to speak for me, the publisher with whom I had a contract having broken it while drooling in the till over the advance orders for it.

**INSERT** <sup>What Oswald did to him</sup> After reading Mark's representation and recall <sup>of</sup> that Oscar had told me,

I asked Dick Gallen, general counsel for Grove and a man who had in the intervening years become my friend, if Oscar's account was true. Dick affirmed it.

Let a Devil loving scripture to add the appropriate passages in these two references to Grove, he would find that on page 22 <sup>Mark</sup> ~~he~~ says that <sup>of</sup> the

"very modest advance" <sup>is</sup> which was \$1,500 and not modest for a man repeatedly portraying himself as starving - it, in fact, the total royalty on 2,500 copies of a \$3.00 book, and it is not uncommon for hardback books to sell

many fewer copies) that "much of it was required to assist the Committee through a particularly difficult period". But on page 37, where he so <sup>stalwartly</sup> ~~ably~~ assumes responsibility for the financial and other collapse of the Committee because he was not there to do everything, he also says that "at the very end of 1964", the Committee was broke. This, he says, was "particularly" because of "my abandonment of fund-raising responsibilities". This left the Committee with its "funds...exhausted", unable to pay "even the modest monthly rental of \$50", with the "only full-time employee" then a "volunteer, and rather than incur additional debts the office was closed".

So, it would seem that if, in fact, "Mark gave 'rush' on that \$1,500 to the Committee, it was well before the end of 1964, by which time he was to have completed his book that he hadn't done.

And it would seem that to a lawyer, which Mark is, the <sup>non-fulfillment</sup> ~~breaking~~ of a contract is not adequately represented in his words, "and no substantive reasons offered."

<sup>From</sup> My own experience with American book publishers, much more extensive than Mark's - about 10 times so, from his own accounting of having submitted his manuscript to 15 of them (p. 40), <sup>which is</sup> hardly the "most of the leading publishers in the United States" (p. 33) <sup>lowly, unprincipled and bad businessmen.</sup> I think they are ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ <sup>are</sup> ~~making~~ money <sup>1</sup> in spite of their best efforts. They are a poor lot to be deciding what books will and will not be available to the Mexican people. ~~Until~~ <sup>Until</sup> "A Citizen's Dissent" I considered it impossible to say anything that could be at all <sup>fair</sup> ~~unfair~~ to them.

Here I acknowledge, without any reservation, that in almost every reference Mark makes he succeeds where I could not have.

In promotional <sup>NY</sup> "A Citizen's Dissent" Mark says that 15 publishers agreed to publish his book and then chickened out. I doubt if it is true of a single one and I know it is untrue of those where I have knowledge in every case. More, in at least one case, what he ~~also~~ <sup>his manuscript</sup> implies, that ~~he~~ <sup>with that publisher</sup> was too strong, it is contrary to my reason for refusing to contract because they wanted me to make

"HITLERISM" even stronger, in a manner considered would be irresponsible.

This was <sup>to</sup> H. H. Norton. The <sup>to</sup> reason for Eric Hansen, executive vice president and editor in chief, to mention Mark's book to me at all. He volunteered that, in his judgement, it was a poor piece of literary work and not at all, in the form in which they read it - before those even at Britains and Sonnenberg - not at all persuasive. Several other editors, unsolicitedly, told <sup>me</sup> ~~me~~ the same thing.

What Mark has done, knowing better, is to translate the enthusiasm of the average editor into a contract <sup>for the publisher</sup> ~~for his manuscript~~.

I would estimate that not fewer than 50 editors went out of their way to praise "HITLERISM". There was not a single serious adverse editorial criticism. The book as published, is the first draft, with no professional editing at all. In this form it became <sup>me</sup> its own kind of best-seller, as a private edition, by offset reproduction of the manuscript, and as a reprint, where not a single word was changed by a large publisher.

However, it cannot be said ~~to~~ because so many editors liked the book, a number predicting it would be a best seller (one, at a house Mark named, saying it would be the best-selling book of 1935) that this many publishers agreed to do it. There is a vast difference between editorial approval of a book and a signed contract.

In Mark's case, I never heard a single editor say a good thing about the book ~~that~~ <sup>manuscript</sup> he read.

In his account of his churchmousing, forgetting that English-speaking <sup>Danish</sup> typist and the dictaphone, and the pretense that he had the <sup>manuscript</sup> for Grove, Mark says (p. 59) that after he had made quite a number of specified submissions, he had "bitter and difficult months. I had but one copy of the manuscript, some of it typed, portions handwritten, and I was possessed of neither the time nor the funds to have other copies made."

How remarkable it is that at what cannot be far from this time





on 13  
4

then lapped it. Viking doesn't chew. They suck, but move their jaws as though chewing. Although I have not seen it, I have been told by Viking people that in an effort to help Mark he was given a fourteen-page, single-spaced critique of his manuscript.

Perhaps, to Mark, Viking's greatest sin is publication of Edward J. Epstein's "Inquest", which was also out before "Rush to Judgement". (it was by then also "out" of the hardback field, in reprint). ~~MOVING EXPOSE~~ The week "INQUEST" Epstein had a front-page review in "Book Week", New York's best seller was WHITEWASH, which had had no advertising or reviews and was not, at the week's beginning, available in most stores. Several weeks later "Inquest" was being "remaindered", that is, the stocks has been sold to discounters who were offering it at <sup>\$1.00, 80%</sup> less than its <sup>initial \$5.00</sup> regular price ~~\$5.00~~.

In dealing with Epstein, in making a personal ~~eye~~ vendetta out of his pique, Mark solidifies for us one of the great failings of what could have been a significant book. Epstein, simply, is a yellow dog available for yellow-dog contracts. He is an on-the-make guy typical of those of his generation who look at the one ahead and profit for all its vices. He is determined to make it and is capable of whatever this requires, other than hard work.

~~Edward J. Epstein~~ became a "critic" of the Warren Commission by his unquestioning acceptance of its basic false conclusion: Oswald - Assassin.

He became a "scholar" with the least scholarly work, quiet language, and the touting of a sycophant press. So deficient is his own "scholarship" that Sylvia Meagher did his notes, by far the best thing in "Inquest".

Ignoring most of the Commission's "evidence", which requires time and effort to study and understand, Epstein used the journalistic approach, interviewing staff lawyers, each of whom had his own errors to hide. Most active of these lawyers was Wesley J. Liebeler, who was in charge of "conspiracy", which the Commission never investigated. In feeding Epstein the pabulum of his book, Liebeler converted the "scholar" into the vehicle for his own self-justification. Liebeler

was in charge of "conspiracy", which the Commission never investigated. In feeding Epstein the pabulum of his book, Liebeler converted the "scholar" into the vehicle for his own self-justification. Liebeler was in charge of the New Orleans apology for an investigation - (strange Epstein failed to mention this in his 7/13/68 New Yorker piece, isn't it?). As Liebeler put it, his colleague, Albert Jenner, was too busy running for the presidency of the American Bar Association.

Without Liebeler, no "Inquest".

Epstein has commercialized the fraud that he is a "critic" of the Warren Report. What he from the first did was to pretend <sup>opposition</sup> ~~to be~~ while trying to show the government that, by making simple changes in an un-~~acceptable~~ digestible fiction, it might get it swallowed. As time went on ~~he~~ became more and more of a government supporter.

As time went on, it became more and more certain that the ~~government's~~ government's case was untenable and ultimately would fall. When Jim Garrison's ~~case~~ <sup>INVESTIGATION</sup> became public knowledge, Epstein to the rescue. He went to New Orleans and returned to write a book-length article for the "New Yorker" so bitterly and excessive, from what the man who says he is responsible

for ~~Epstein's~~ Epstein's original publication told me, the "New Yorker" would not print it. <sup>Epstein's qualifications, other paper availability; he knew nothing of the New Orleans part of the case and has no intention - not even the slightest</sup>

When the government openly the campaign against Garrison, on the side of Defendant Clay Shaw, while <sup>a</sup> federal ~~judge~~ <sup>judge</sup> was trying to engineer some means of halting Garrison, the "New Yorker" resurrected that Epstein-cultivated slime, skimmed it a bit, and published it in the issue of July 13, 1968.

The marriage between the "New Yorker" and Epstein's was consummated in Viking's bed. Richard Rovere, "New Yorker" veteran, wrote an introduction for "Inquest" <sup>embarrassing to</sup> anyone but an Epstein or a ~~Leno~~ <sup>Leno</sup> would have blushed. Rovere thereafter helped Epstein in other ways.

Because the "free-press" finks support the ~~government~~ government on this at any cost, the attack was widely publicized. In it Epstein hedges his bets a bit, as befits a straightfoward "scholar" of his his breed, with ~~the~~ little hints and clues that Garrison may be right and the government wrong. But his

is federal vitriol, poured on Garrison and all criticism of the Warren Report.

Epstein has become a wealthy young man from this career.

Now while he was doing his ~~job~~ <sup>attack</sup> on Garrison and the cause of truth and justice, another "scholar", John Sparrow, warden of All Saints, part of Oxford (another part of which has a hydrophobic, bathless tradition so gallantly carried on by Sparrow's pen) was preparing an article <sup>awaiting</sup> ~~attacking~~ all ~~other~~ criticism of the Warren Report. It appeared in the "Literary Supplement" of the ~~London~~ <sup>"Sunday"</sup> Times of London. All such scribbling becomes popular in the apologist press. Sparrow's got great attention. Suddenly it blossomed forth in the United States as a "book", hardly respectable

Prime defense but with R.C.K. run the dist.

~~the~~ pamphlet size, which was awarded a burst of spectacular TV attention. <sup>through a</sup> ~~it~~ did nothing as a book, but as a vehicle for TV and newspaper attack on criticism of the government and its critics, it was a wow.

distributer, Random House, and its printer, V.B.G. It also depends on the government for its rights and for contracts

Here was a new formula: reprint a magazine article, without changing a single word, and call it a book.

Just the formula for Epstein and Viking. His "New Yorker" article was announced as a Viking book.

The inference that Viking is not brave may not be warranted. It may take much courage to undergo this financial risk - unless there is subsidy awaiting, or prospect of profitable reprinting, which <sup>in many very many ways, also can be</sup> ~~can also be easily subsidized.~~ ~~subsidized, in many ways.~~

Most Americans are not aware of it, but through their government they are the country's largest purchaser of books. If they stop and think of all the government establishments, like military posts, and of all the stuff ~~are~~ used up by official propaganda, like the United States Information Agency, the possibilities will suggest themselves.

In at no point really telling the Epstein story, in never once telling how a ~~small~~ <sup>small</sup> ~~group~~ <sup>group</sup> of concerned Americans tried to tell the truth of the murder of their President and its subsequent official whitewashing, in never ~~permanently~~ <sup>permanently</sup> ceasing to personalize, in always pretending that whatever was done he alone did, <sup>Mark</sup> also failed to write a vital part of the history of the era and the country, and of the assassination <sup>and its consequences.</sup>

such relatively unimportant personages, as from Holt's phrasing, as "Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Senator Lehmann". There is a whole, double-column page of this treacle, including references to the "warmth" of the endorsement <sup>it</sup> then-  
candidate John Kennedy and Senator Humphrey. *Mark and HHH quite a trick!*

~~Holt's phrasing~~

There are two other publishers that look alone could persuade me to defend. I never expected the day.

"At one time it appeared that the New American Library was certain to publish the book, but at the last moment it was declined".

Translated this means that, as with HILLMAN much earlier, in my case about April of 1968, the editors liked the idea of a book on the subject. As of the time she told me she had been able to take care of work in England, which was much later that year, *Sally Belfrage* also told me that, as with my book, the owners could not be persuaded. The decision, as in most cases with the viable books on the subject, the decision is not editorial. It was policy.

"Viking Press indicated great interest". HILLMAN had been well-received editorially there, also about April 1968. The editor, who later wrote me he had a high opinion of the book, could not bring it. Viking once published a novel that the exalted J. Edgar Hoover considered had a less than the ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> stirring picture ~~xxxxx FBI xxxxx~~ in it. Even since, every time Hoover breaks wind more than 200 miles away, those ~~hours~~ <sup>in Viking's Madison Avenue</sup> building re-enact the 1906 San Francisco earthquake. Mark says the ~~xxxxxx~~ president wanted "immunity from 'unfair attack'." When ~~xxxxxx~~ my rejection was communicated to me, I was told Viking considered the subject dead, that no book on it could make a profit.

With both books Viking simply lacked the courage. They waited for miltoest and

INSERT

~~the book. <sup>latter</sup> Viking doesn't care. It makes but makes it pass as a cheap change~~

There are other publishers who read "Rush To Judgment". From what their editors tell me of the original version. I think even Mark's ingenuity might have been strained had he mentioned them by name. Instead he says that

~~with~~ "we" meaning him and The Bodley Head, "had just about run out of publishers when" Holt asked to <sup>(#45)</sup> publish it. By then it had been offered to some who do not quite fit the description of "the most important".

As part of the hero-building this short chapter is essential, as Mark considers his solitary hero Mark. ~~So~~ <sup>he</sup> required a little padding having nothing to do with "The Making of a Book". One except worthy of direct quotation deals in ~~it~~ <sup>than in retrospect</sup> ~~an~~ <sup>even</sup> other ~~than~~ <sup>Mark</sup> is likely to consider heroic. He has taken credit for turning ~~Epstein~~ <sup>Epstein</sup> on (and that I consider less than heroic - it is hardly susceptible of apology) and Epstein had told him that Wesley J. Liebeler "had shown him a number of documents...with one being of genuine significance. It was the then-unavailable FBI report of December 9, 1968, ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>(41)</sup> Mark's description is warranted. That report was ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>important.</sup>

"I urged Epstein to try and secure a copy...." <sup>(42)</sup> Mark was in London when he learned Epstein a) had a copy, b) had his own book and c) would not give Mark any of his materials, including this report. Mark tried. He is indignant. <sup>D. J. F.</sup> ~~But~~ <sup>he own the subject and everything on it?</sup>

After publication of Epstein's book (which fol <sup>INITIAL PUBLICATION</sup> ~~lowed~~ <sup>led</sup> of "HITMASH" by only a little less than a year), the New York "Times" printed this squib in its weekly "Book Review": "Mark Lane's yet-to-be published critique of the Warren Commission's report has been making the rounds for over a year, with continuously revised drafts", which may say something about its editorial acceptability - or lack of it.

<sup>Ferdinand's</sup> This ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ <sup>xxxxxxxxxxxx</sup> of his book, which was published a year after HITMASH, all of whose contents it did not reproduce - and it <sup>little or</sup> ~~added~~ <sup>nothing new and</sup> both accurate and consequential - <sup>and</sup> several months after Epstein's.

This did not deter Mark one bit. In his pre-publication statement of the expensive brochure <sup>Holt</sup> distributed, he wrote, "During April 1968 I visited the National Archives and discovered that the FBI report had been declassified" <sup>and</sup> then quotes <sup>only</sup> what Epstein had told him.

His "discovery" no doubt was expedited by Vincent Salandria's public-

*in the "Mimicry of One" dated April 1966 and out in mid-March.*

tion of extensive <sup>DIRECT</sup> quotations from it. Salvaris was one of those to whom Lane expressed indebtedness in "Rush To Judgment".

*INSERT*

This except is modest covered with another by Mark in the same

one would never know from the formulation of the "acknowledgement" what these people did, who they are or that, in fact, they were not practically Mark's employees. This is the way the "credit" reads: "Among the many amateur investigators who journeyed to Dallas to gather information were:"

Except for Mark's wife and <sup>his film</sup> ~~the director of the film~~ he made, these

are and were independent people, as we all are. Vince is an established, ~~competent~~ competent, respected lawyer in Philadelphia. His is among the first substantial critical writing. Those Mark names are largely those who initially did some work and then, for varying reasons, abandoned the field.

Thus he also succeeds in giving the false impression that he alone is continuing whereas he is doing ~~no work~~ <sup>and longer has done</sup> ~~and there are a large number~~ <sup>there is a much larger</sup> of the most

brilliant and dedicated people doing even more substantial work <sup>than</sup> earlier.

<sup>What and thus</sup> Vince <sup>did</sup> for Mark is ~~hardly~~ <sup>by</sup> not adequately described as "among

the amateur investigators who travelled to Dallas". He, the George Nashes, and Harold Feldman, among others, did much of the basic work Mark presents as his own.

~~Mark~~ <sup>He</sup> could as honestly call himself Columbus and announced himself discoverer of America as imply that he had "discovered" this particular FBI report ~~or even that he "discovered"~~ it had been declassified. A number

*before Mark's book was printed and more than you*  
If this does not really tell us how Mark's magnificence got to be

published, the affair of the FBI report does say much about "The Making of a Book".

Not at all what Mark intended, but much <sup>perhaps</sup> ~~really~~ <sup>about that and what he is</sup> think.

It is difficult if not impossible to determine at this point whether some of Mark rubbed off on Holt, <sup>or both</sup> ~~or vice versa~~, but it makes little difference.

The ethics of one are as substantial as those of the other. Holt took a very expensive double-page ad for "Rush to Judgment" in "Publishers' Weekly" <sup>the May 10, 1966</sup> ~~for~~

*015*

*in the "Minority of One" dated April 1966 and out in mid-March.*  
tion of extensive <sup>DIRECT</sup> quotations from it. Salandris was one of those to whom Lane expressed indebtedness in "Rush To Judgement".

*INSERT*  
This excerpt is modest compared with another by Mark in the same brochure:

"But the recent release of the FBI Report (declassified only recently and quoted here for the first time....)"

To Mark's knowledge every part of this statement, break it as finely as you will. *is false. Each is a deliberate, knowing lie.*  
*more than a year earlier*  
HITENASH had a dozen references, and that was no accomplishment, because the contents of the report had been carefully filtered and leaked to the press even before transmittal to the Commission. "quoting" from it is no accomplishment, that having been possible since early December 1963.

The report was never "released". Nor was its declassification "recent", except in Mark's lexicon of expediency.

You have to know Mark to know how unexceptional this entire episode is, but I do not recommend the prerequisite. He used of the report what *(and Salandris with my idea) But Salandris used it in only a limited way.*  
Spstein did, *Spstein hardly understood it. Even if he "discovered it" and "quoted it for the first time".* *(LTL)*

In the sense in which he uses first quotation, that, without doubt, he knew Vince had done. Its presence in "The Minority of One" *was* *for which Mark also* *was* *the* *publication date* *1966. The first facsimile reproduction was in the* *revised edition of "HITENASH", which went into general distribution May 7, 1966, long* *before Mark's book was printed, and more than four months before it was published.*  
If this does not really tell us how Mark's magnum opus got to be

published, the affair of the FBI report does say much about "The Making of a Book". Not at all what Mark intended, but much *perhaps,* *about that and about him.* *really think.*

It is difficult if not impossible to determine at this point whether some of Mark rubbed off on Holt, *or both* *via. verses,* but it makes little difference. The ethics of one are as substantial as those of the other. Holt took a very expensive double-page ad for "Rush to Judgement" in "Publishers' Weekly" *the May 15, 1966* *per*

*unsecret*

~~Nov 10, 1956.~~ By this time the <sup>secret</sup> of Viking's publication of Epstein's book was no more secret, and the publication of Leo Sauvage's "Oswald affair" (much earlier published in France, a remarkable achievement for a man who was also a full-time reporter) by World was <sup>scheduled</sup> ~~likely~~ to be a little ahead of Holt.

It is quite an impressive ad. It is uninhibited, clever, effective and false. This is a not-unkind way of saying it is typical of both Mark and Holt.

It also led to my first-and-unintended-contact with Mark.

In retrospect, now that I think about it, I can think of no reason for anybody ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ to want any other kind.

Here, so the reader will not miss it, is where I get personal.

The ~~"Publishers Weekly"~~ ad struck me as in particularly poor taste. Aside from the normal puffery -and I'd hoped for higher standards on this subject and from the man who had already attempted to stake a claim to unquestioned total ownership- it was just plain, unadorned lies that should have troubled even an unscrupulous man. Then there was just cheap, commercial nastiness. When addressed to the booksellers, it was not aimed at me, although mine was the only book then out, as much as Epstein <sup>and other books</sup> and Sauvage's. Their books were <sup>to go into</sup> commercial channels, mine a private printing, <sup>than</sup> was not, although it was on sale. It was later that ~~Holt~~ <sup>Holt</sup> publisher addressed me, and in a unique manner.

"Don't settle for anything less than the definitive book on the subject" is the modest final, large-type line, very black and in capital letters. ~~and~~ Just as large, down the middle of both pages, are these blurbs that in any rational context are but lies: (emphasis in original)

"It is the only completely documented critique of the Warren Commission Report; It reproduces photographs from the archives which have never before been seen by the public; It examines the complete text of the recently declassified F.B.I. Report on the Kennedy assassination...and a great deal more."

The self-styled poor boy had hit it rich and knew what to do with



riches-use them against the poor.

Say what you will for "Rush To Judgment", it is not a complete or a really documented book, and it is hardly "completely documented". There are vast areas not touched upon. None of the material it does deal with does it deal with "definitively". <sup>P</sup> For example, although Lane and his introducer, the Regius professor of History, Trevor-Roper (who early distinguished himself by apologizing to the sycophant ~~Warden~~ Warden of All Saints, Oxford, John Sparrow, <sup>publicly</sup> by apologizing for being right) call the humble barrister "the advocate", and in other ways, aided and abetted by the well-financed Holt publicity department, say that it is Lane and he alone who defends Oswald. What you find in the book is nothing on Oswald's legal rights and how they were abused. There is no ~~single~~ single chapter on this or any of the related subjects. There need have been none, for that subject had earlier been adequately covered by the "goose farmer's" non-legal writing. For two years <sup>WITENAS#</sup> it was the only book to address this and the relevant questions that are basic to any understanding of the assassination or its causes and aftermath.

Lane was such a stout and solitary defender of Oswald that he proclaimed his <sup>possible</sup> ~~probable~~ guilt, never alleged his innocence, and established a new concept of advocacy by saying that were he to become convinced of Oswald's guilt he'd have nothing more to do with the dead Dreyfus. Again, what was published and available to the persevering book reader suffered not a whit from Oswald was defended, his innocence of the assassination this because ~~that, too~~, <sup>had</sup> had been announced by the non-lawyer goose farmer.

Holt's concept of both definitiveness and legal advocacy-defense of the accused- find unusual delineation. In the small type, ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> the best that can be said for Oswald is the Epstein doctrine, that perhaps he wasn't alone. And of Lane and his book, so definitive, so <sup>de</sup> "debatating" in the largest type of the ad, "Lane offers no 'assassination theory'." He does expose serious and irrefutable inconsistencies." Tut, tut, Archibald.

"It reproduces photographs", etc. Uniquely, in invisible ink! There

is not one! That, too, was remedied by the aforementioned non-lawyer, the advocating non-advocate.

"It examines the complete text of the recently-declassified F.B.I. report", etc. Here I cannot say that Mark didn't read it-if not in Solandria, Epstein or Weisberg, then in the National Archives, a matter of a few minutes, for the "complete text" is ~~slight~~ <sup>short</sup>.

Recollection can be fallible after two years, and I can think of no reason to re-read "Rush to Judgment". Unfortunately, one of the less shrill bold-face lines in the ad is no less deceptive than the rest. It promises, "This book is illustrated with photographs and contains a Register of witnesses and a full index". That index is of names only and is <sup>table</sup> slightly over five pages in length <sup>only</sup> by virtue of ample leading. It could readily fit in five <sup>pages</sup>. It has only the names of people. Is Lane so hot after the FBI and its report? No mention in the "full index"! That professional <sup>" "</sup> fullness is less than a third the extent of the non-professional index to "HIREMASH", done by my wife.

With all this expensive advertising, there is no chapter on this FBI report. The 24th is entitled "The Preliminary Report", but it is not this one. With more than 5,000 advertised footnotes, there is none on this line to identify which "preliminary report", and there were dozens.

However, it is my recollection that Lane's "complete" examination of this report was through Epstein's <sup>by US and</sup> mind and Solandria's. This part, I freely acknowledge, he did not steal from me. I regret it, <sup>since he had a limited opportunity</sup> for the touted scholar Epstein did not ~~not~~ understand the report, <sup>neither</sup> did Lane. Neither was interested in analysis or understanding, <sup>both</sup> were interested in the same speculations and end sensations -the FBI did not agree with the official account of the President's wounds. Although I don't think the FBI was here seriously in error any more than Lane or Epstein, I do know it could have been wrong.

What neither caught is the fact that in its allegedly definitive report on the President's murder the FBI had virtually nothing on the murder in <sup>the</sup> polemic against Oswald, the first major official federal frameup, and pretended

to give the complete account without mentioning all the shots <sup>known to have been</sup> that were fired or even all the known injuries to the resident!

"This Is Your FBI" -and your Lane and Epstein, lawyer and scholar!

WHITWASH, first in appearance, did not suffer these deficiencies. That certifies ~~that~~ Lane did not steal this from me. ~~What a xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ <sup>He</sup> reserved his <sup>left</sup> for other things, where his dominating vanity was more directly involved.

So I wrote Arthur A. Cohen, then vice-president and editor-in-chief of Holt and, as I later learned, Lane's shepherd, a quiet letter <sup>on</sup> May 11, 1966 citing a few of the "several inaccuracies" in the brochure, ~~xxxx~~ not then having seen the ad. I also called the festal inaccuracy of the "regius history-professors statement that the Chairman "never failed" to attend the meetings of the Commission. <sup>The Chief Justice</sup> ~~xxxx~~ <sup>g</sup> ~~xxxx~~ was not, in fact, the member of the Commission who attended most hearings and ~~that~~ only a sixth of them had as many as a single member present, the staff, as traditionally it always does, doing the real dirty work. ~~He~~ Warren has enough responsibility to ~~shoulder~~ <sup>with</sup> what is his own. Neither the quest for truth nor the establishing of fact is served by a personal campaign against the Chief Justice, which Trevor-Roper as well as Lane <sup>deliberately</sup> mounted.

In this letter I said a simple thing that apparently caused ~~mark~~ deep offense. In suggesting that while he might be considered "an advocate", he was hardly "the advocate" and "I think it is less than precise to suggest the 'other side' is but a belated defense of Oswald". Here I said Lane should not ~~be~~ suffer because "He was the only one who received an income from his advocacy, the one who had a staff and committee working for him. He, as em I, is but one among a number". I should not have forgotten all that pre-paid air travel, but I did.

Holt never did answer the letter. They sent a copy to ~~mark~~ who <sup>wrote</sup> replied May 17.

"You are in error", he objected, ~~in~~ in saying "that I 'received an

income' from <sup>my</sup> advocacy'".

hereupon he proceeded to ~~xxxxxxx~~ confirm that he had, <sup>5</sup>complain<sup>g</sup> merely that it was inadequate, in his opinion, <sup>and</sup> of too short duration.

Next he said, "You stated that I was one 'who had a staff and a Committee working for him'. That is true."

(Since he included no other possibly he already had one. if this was his "mp")

This took up all the first double-spaced page and part of the second. He then expressed the hope "one day to read your privately printed book" and the ~~xxxxxx~~ "trust" that "it as was written with more care and concern for the facts than was your letter to Mr. Cohen". This line was intended for Cohen, for Mark did not then and has not since alleged a single published or other error by me in my/writing ~~xxxxxxx~~ or my speaking or in any of the ~~several~~ direct confrontations where our relationships were less than brotherly.

He objected to my statement that the "motivation of most of us" should be "broader than the defense of ~~the~~ the murdered accused, that it is the defense of the democratic society." His comment was intended for another audience, for he and I both knew it was not responsive and was evasive. "The 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." (my emphasis).

Mark carries coals only to Newcastle. He and I both know that it is not alone in "the area of criminal jurisprudence" that "the democratic society functions". He drew a correct distinction between our attitudes and the thrust of our work and again, while pretending otherwise, <sup>affiliated</sup> what I had said of him.

He could not resist renewing his campaign against the Chief Justice, <sup>now</sup> ~~so~~ could <sup>he</sup> address himself to the gross and deliberate error of his book, then still four months away. He believes, rightly, that many believed the Warren Report "due to the fact that it was vouched for by the Chief Justice. <sup>ii/ To this he adds a Warren-Report-like non-statement,</sup> I am inclined to agree with Professor Trevor-Roper and disagree with you that, should the Report be faulted, the Chief Justice <sup>y</sup>

who gave his name, must bear the burden of the responsibility." Thus, without reference to the deliberate factual error Lane evaded answer and that error is preserved on ~~page~~ the first two pages of his book. *It is part of his prearranged campaign and will be in.*

Here Mark is consistent. Having reached no conclusion in his, the only "definitive" and "complete" book on the subject, a deficiency he remedies in his public appearances by apt use of mine as his own, he devotes the final chapter to an unrestrained attack on Warren <sup>It is</sup> so malevolent, when the record was bad enough without it, that he pretends Commissions and Committees are bound by the rules of evidence and this was an exceptional violation. <sup>He has other</sup> such other dishonest devices. The fact is that such bodies are not and never have been so restricted, for their proper function is fact-gathering, not judicial determinations, and they cannot function if they are inhibited by the rules of evidence and other ~~such~~ vital prerequisites <sup>in</sup> of judicial proceedings. His insistence would have been more effective if he had pointed out that <sup>the Commission</sup> ~~it~~ could and should have abided by the rules of evidence and other <sup>proper</sup> ~~such~~ procedures where no <sup>restriction of its capabilities</sup> ~~such~~ would have been the result; <sup>that</sup> its failure to do so is indication of its awareness of the fault and error of its work from the beginning. A close friend of his associate Emilio de Antonio, <sup>the movie producer,</sup> a responsible man who is also an editor, phoned me in shock when he got the word from Mark's camp that "after the last chapter, you are supposed to feel that there is nothing but suicide left for Earl Warren".

This is the "Mark method" of dispassionate analysis, factual reporting, advocacy and the "defense of the democratic society".

My reply of May 19, a ~~plain~~ foolishness that assumed Mark was capable of honesty, concluded:

"I note ~~xxxx~~ these things in my letter that you ignored, and I am content to let it rest there. I also note your gratuitous insult and I will ignore the very obvious responses....for it is not my ~~xxxxxxx~~ intention or desire to engage in an exchange of insults. I have more constructive purposes to which to put my time and certainly you must. I will be satisfied if you will

ch 22

September 1, 1966

Mr. Arthur A. Cohen  
Vice President and Editor-in-Chief  
Holt, Rinehart & Winston  
383 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10017

Dear Mr. Cohen:

In our previous correspondence I have called to your attention certain inaccuracies in "Rush to Judgment" and your prepublication advertising of it. I expressed the hope you would correct the inaccuracies, which are also doctrinal, and cease the false advertising, which is damaging to me and to my book, WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT. You at no time replied to my letters, referring them to Mr. Lane, whose letters were not responsive.

My last letter, to you and dated May 20, called to your attention the fact that Mr. Lane had not in any sense replied, aside from a tacit acknowledgment of the truth of my complaint.

I now find that, instead of ceasing and desisting in these false claims, they are being continued, in an even more damaging manner. I quote from your current release:

"Lane has completed a book, the first based on a thorough examination of the complete 26 volumes of the Warren Commission Report ..."

Aside from the obvious consistency in saying the single volume of the Report is composed of the 26 volumes of the appended documentation and whether or not it is thorough (which it is not) and whether it was Lane who completed the book, it is entirely and knowingly false and quite hurtful to me for you to persist in the lie that this book, of which you are the publisher, is "first".

I again call upon you to cease this and other questionable aspects of your advertising campaign, to show some of the decency mutual friends find in you. Is it possible, Mr. Cohen, that Holt, Rinehart and Winston cannot face the competition of the book that was first, that stands entirely alone and unassisted, that is without such vast resources and wealth as Holt possesses, that opened up the field for you and others, and that, despite all the handicaps, is a popular success?

I should also like to ask about Appendix X in your book. I note this is not an appendix but is really part of the text. I note further that in your ad in the May 16 "Publishers'

Mr. Cohen - 2

Weekly" you not inconsistently promised what does not appear in the book, "photographs which have never before been seen by the public". So far as your book is concerned, these photographs are still unseen.

While this promised appendix does not appear, what is seen is something clearly not in the original text of your book, something previously published only in WHITEWASH that apparently I alone had detected in the testimony of Mrs. Helen Markham, with which Mr. Lane had labored so greatly and with which I had publicly credited him. In truth, I alone defended him.

So the remarkable disappearance of the promised photographic appendix and its replacement by text that, had it been belatedly included in the body of the book, would have required its remarking and additional pages is something else to which I would appreciate explanation. I would like this reply to be from you, not Mr. Lane. I hear enough from him when I hear my lines, not in his book, on TV.

There is one further item that troubles me. On my appearance on the Alan Burke Show on WNEW-TV in New York I was, happily, set upon by a crew of lawyers. It has been reported to me, I hope inaccurately, that there is a connection with Holt, Rinehart and Winston. May I have your assurance that this is not the case, that none of these lawyers has or had any kind of an association whatsoever with your company, and that their exclusive association was with the Trial Lawyers' Association?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Registered - Return Receipt

MT

COPY

HOLT, RINEHART AND WINSTON, INC.

Arthur A. Cohen  
Editor in Chief  
General Book Division

September 12, 1966

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Hyattstown  
Maryland 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you so much for your letter of September 1st. It was not that I sought to ignore your original letter to me, however not having been at that time as familiar with all of the details of what appears to be the intramural competition of the experts, I referred the letter to Mark Lane for answering. I am sorry that you did not find his answer satisfactory.

We were and remain of the opinion that RUSH TO JUDGMENT by Mark Lane is justified in being regarded as the first study published by a major American publisher dealing with the entire investigation of the Warren Commission. It is indeed true that your book was published and available, however I confess to having been unaware of the originality of your own contribution until Mark Lane apprised me of it. To the best of my knowledge we will not be advertising again the claim of Mark Lane's ~~xxxx~~ book being the first. It seems now to be an irrelevant and unnecessary claim and particularly so since indeed your book had been available.

Your interpretation of the absence of photographs from our volume is rather more "sinister" than is in fact the case. When Mark and I discussed the preparation of the book it was my opinion that it would be desirable to have photographs and at the ~~xxxx~~ time -- considerably in advance of manufacturing estimates -- Mark consented to the desirability of including a signature of photographs. In due course, our publicity and advertising department, in its preliminary advertising, made reference to a photographic section. Subsequently it was dropped because of cost and moreover because we regarded any photographic presentation as at the most partial. As you will note from our further advertising in the public press there has been no reference to a photographic section.

Last but not least I do wish to assure that there is absolutely no connection between Holt, Rinehart and Winston and any television station, and in particular no connection between Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Alan Burke or WNEW-TV in New York. Please be assured of this as if any evidence or allegation to the contrary should be forthcoming and an indication that pressure was placed by Holt either on the station or that show, it would be malicious and untrue and would undoubtedly be defended by our counsel.

I do continue to wish you all success as I continue to support and wish success to the publication of RUSH TO JUDGMENT.

Sincerely yours,  
signed  
Arthur A. Cohen

AAG/js

cc: Mark Lane, Mr. Tribe

\* See



restrain the public inaccuracies."

Then I wrote Cohen, "I am calling to your attention the fact that Mark Lane does not address himself to the fact I raised in my letter...This, it would seem, is tacit confirmation. The truth, in fact, is as I told you."

Cohen was then and remained too busy cooking up fraudulent ads and claims to respond, then or later. When I saw the "Publishers' Weekly" ad I again wrote him May 17. Even Lane didn't dare try and defend that. I asked that he desist the false ads, cited proof of their not-accidental falsity. The concluding paragraph ~~sentence~~ might not have please him or Mark:

"There certainly must be enough good things you can say about Mr. Lane and his book not to require false and damaging assaults upon your competitors. I do hope you will 'discover' them, that you will retract the false and damaging claims you have made that are not true and that in the future you restrict yourself to those advantages your wealth gives you and allow the competitive books to be judges on their own merits."

By September 1 there had been a number of ~~xxxxxxxxtxxxxxxxxtxxxx~~ rather excessive dishonesties, where Holt apparently imposed few strictures on itself and Mark none whatsoever. My letter to Cohen of that date raises them with less passion than I felt, for I had by that time read Mark's book and detected what cannot be missed, two very open thefts, among other things. After an introduction repeating he/affirmed the accuracy of my previous protest by ~~his~~ their silence: Lil-marked part, to end.

I sent this registered and this time he did answer, if he did not respond, on September 12: lil-all

Cohen is a skillful editor who earned his executive position. That he here is saying is that four months prior to appearance of his book he knew his advertising was fraudulent and that he persisted in it knowing this until he had completed ~~xxxxxxvxxxxxxxxtxxxx~~ the program predicated <sup>on the</sup> by fraud. What he did not say-and what ~~he~~ <sup>and Mark</sup> did not

do-~~we~~ to cease the even more fraudulent public-relations campaign. It reached infinitely more people than the ads, particularly by radio and TV, where Mark got saturation time, even if his second book says exactly the opposite. From the time of this letter onward Mark never ceased his public lying, his ~~xxx~~ ego being more dominating than his sense of shame or the letter being entirely non-existent.

His "explanation" of the absence of photographs is ~~convoluted~~ <sup>spurious</sup>. Had he any economy/motives he'd have had much less blank space in the book. But the blank space increased the ~~xxxxx~~ size of the book and loaned it self to the campaign based upon imputed but absent "thoroughness". Other wasted space could have been utilized, like that <sup>"Register"</sup> squandered on the advertised list of witnesses.

*only*

As Lane lists them, there were 233 persons at the scene of the crime of whom *he claims* 11 were not called. The Commission published a list of what it designated "witnesses" twice this long, not all at the scene of the assassination and some a new concept in "witnesses", such as an unauthenticated news story that was known to be inaccurate. Sylvia Wagner had already published what is in the Lane "register" and much more. It is padding of a kind calculated to unwarranted lend an air of completeness. It is understandable with all that extensive and expensive advertising that the two-dozen lines reproduced from the FBI report in the appendix, so moderately described as an "examination" of the

*Something, some fished, had to try & hide this cheap flashery.*

"complete text" and the inference being the only reproduction and the only examination, could not be omitted. This accounts for one of the pages that would have been in pictures.

Never has a publisher ~~excluded~~ <sup>excluded</sup> out a selection of "sensational" pictures "never before seen" on the ~~various~~ <sup>various</sup> ground they could only be partial. They need not be. Those relating to the ~~presence~~ <sup>possibility</sup> ~~presence~~ in the TCBP doorway <sup>was in</sup> can be complete in less than two pages, with an excerpt from the pertinent FBI report. *(There is no need for "totality", which is always an impossibility.)*

*(Thrown in for good measure, as I did in WHITEWASH-4.)*

*(at the trial of the Munich.)*

Nor is it at all exceptional that once the changes in the book were

made and there were no pictures Holt stopped its false advertising.

My challenge to Cohen was direct if it was polite. Lane's enormous

pr.

ego could not abide his more towering incompetence in having missed the real

*(He did not, however, do his own Markham work. Vma Belandria did an appreciable part.)*  
story of Helen Markham's perjury even though one of the very few meaningful things he had done personally was to interview her in advance of her testimony.

*He had flubbed his own ball and could not live with it. As I told Cohen, Appendix 10 is not apparently material. It is refused.* belatedly ~~there~~  
10 was part of the text in any book. It could not ~~have~~ be ~~there~~ included because

of cost. The entire book from that point would have have to have been reprinted, which would also have delayed it, and the entire index would have had to be re-done. That is in Appendix 10 would have been obvious to any careful worker. Lane, had he been, would not have missed it, particularly with his own gal. But he did.

He lifted it from CHITTYASH, the only place it ~~was~~ appeared. Cohen's silence on

*At this point despite the direct challenge is sufficient confirmation. Mrs. Markham had perjured herself. She was deposed again to try and get her to relive her perjury. She had asked "Will I get in trouble over this?" Wesley*

Hiebeler assured her ~~she~~ she would not. At this point the words "Pointing to telegram" were added to the transcript. That telegram was an invitation to Mrs. Markham to be on TV with the President of the United States. No rational person could possibly interpret that as any kind of trouble-making, particularly when, as Mrs. Markham had, the government had already given contrary assurance, and more particularly when the entire proceeding was about her clear and unrelieved

*over which she was terrified*  
perjury before the Warren Commission members in Washington. Lane adds nothing to what I used, didn't use all of what I did, being content with what was enough to save his omniscient face in his own omnipotent eyes. In so doing he picked up one of the my frequent if logical errors, one that is of no consequence but none the less is wrong. **INSERT B**

Cohen didn't respond because he didn't dare. Lane didn't scream because he is the guilty one, the original thief, and he knew it.

This was not the only case. There are two others at the very least

made and there were no pictures Holt stopped its false advertising.

My challenge to Cohen was direct if it was polite. Lane's enormous ego could not abide his more towering incompetence in having missed the real

story of Helen Markham's perjury even though one of the very few meaningful things he had done personally was to interview her in advance of her testimony.

*(He did not, however, do his own Markham work. Miss Liebeler did an appreciable part.)*  
 He had flubbed his own ball and could not live with it. As I told Cohen, Appendix 10 was part of the text in my book. *(It is not apparently mentioned. It is referred to belatedly there)* It could not be there included because of cost. The entire book from that point would have had to have been reprinted, which would also have delayed it, and the entire index would have had to be reworked. What is in Appendix 10 would have been obvious to any careful worker. Lane, had he been, would not have missed it, particularly with his own gal. But he did. He lifted it from WHITEWASH, the only place it ~~was~~ appeared. Cohen's silence on

*A* this point despite the direct challenge is sufficient confirmation. *Ms. Markham had perjured herself. She was deposed again to try and get her to relieve her perjury. She*  
 Mrs. Markham had asked "Will I get in trouble over this?" Wesley Liebeler assured her ~~that~~ she would not. At this point the words "pointing to telegram" were added to the transcript. That telegram was an invitation to Mrs. Markham to be on TV with the President of the United States. No rational person could possibly interpret that as any kind of trouble-making, particularly when, as Mrs. Markham had, the government had already given contrary assurance, and more particularly when the entire proceeding was about her clear and unrelieved perjury before the Warren Commission members in Washington. *over which she was terrified* Lane adds nothing to what I used, didn't use all of what I did, being content with what was enough

*A* Despite his poor-boy claim of having no copies of his manuscript, I knew Lane had mimeographed it. A friend who had access to a copy checked it and found this Markham "appendix" not in it.

he is the guilty one, the original thief, and he knew it.

This was not the only case. There are two others at the very least

in those ten appendices. One more is from me-at the least-and one from Epstein. There ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> no need to rub Cohen's red face in the mud. One example sufficed.

Lene had made a big thing of his knowledge and portrayal of the medical evidence which he to this day does not really understand. Part of ~~it~~ <sup>this</sup> is because so much of his pretendedly original work-remember that "all alone" bit? ~~work~~ is not original, not even his, and part because of the carelessness and incompetence that is uniquely his. He wrote all his stuff without ever realizing that the Commission had substituted a ~~hypothetical~~ hypothetical question for the real and crucial one with its "one-bullet" fantasy, the concept that a single bullet had inflicted all seven non-fatal injuries on both Kennedy and Governor Connally. This, too, ~~was~~ appeared only in HITEACH. Lene's lifting is incomplete, ~~but~~ <sup>again, he</sup> adds nothing. It is his Appendix II.

*part because he pretends himself to be an expert.*

"The Capability of the Rifle", Appendix V (like III, like IV, ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> in any book part of the text, ~~where~~ <sup>none</sup> could not be added without the expense and time ~~lost~~ <sup>was</sup> of reworking the book. The purpoined handling of this slight part of the subject, <sup>much</sup> with more treatment, is from Epstein's rather than my book or approach.

Appendix III is part of the "Autopsy Descriptive Sheet Prepared by Commander James J. Humes", according to ~~Lark's~~ <sup>him - commander</sup> incorrect caption. It was not prepared by Humes but by his assistant, ~~A. J. Thornton~~ <sup>A. J. Thornton</sup> Boswell. This is a sample of the authenticity unique to Lark and "Rush to Judgment". With the exception of the retyping of an affidavit by Constable ~~Leitzman~~ <sup>Beymour</sup>, already adequately quoted at several points <sup>in</sup> the text and consist~~ing~~ <sup>ing</sup>, as used in the appendix, with filling up the empty number of pages left by the removal of the pictures, all the ~~work~~ <sup>little remaining</sup> of the appendix ~~is~~ of the book by this man who did it all alone is the work of Stewart Golanser.

So, I said Lark is a crook, <sup>and</sup> provided he is a crook, and he has neither sued me, so he threatened to for saying he had ~~help~~ <sup>help</sup> -in the very same letter in which he acknowledged it - ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> punched my nose, as he also threatened to, but again, didn't. <sup>only</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>is</sup> not the ~~first~~ <sup>only</sup> ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~threaten~~ <sup>threaten</sup> ~~me~~ <sup>me</sup> ~~with~~ <sup>with</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~first~~ <sup>first</sup> nose,

He threatened Wesley Liebeler for the long et time. Liebeler had called him *romme shone*  
 a liar. ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~had to be~~ really crazy to contest <sup>F</sup> that. Lying is first nature with  
 him. It is consistent, natural, and I think it is only fair to acknowledge,  
 very persuasive. His nose-punching threat against me was for the bene fit of the  
 others in the TV studio where, on the air and to his face, <sup>because he promised no alternatives</sup> I had proved him  
 a crook. <sup>and a liar</sup> ~~then he~~ <sup>impl. in situation</sup> deferred his threat until "after the show" I reminded him  
 there was no need for delay. He apparently felt such a need, for he didn't, not  
 then and not during the half-hour we ~~met~~ <sup>remained</sup> <sup>for different reasons,</sup> in the same facilities after  
 the show. It has taken him several years, <sup>not</sup> to get around to punching Jones Harris'  
 still-unpunched nose. <sup>Way</sup> <sup>ARK</sup> always picks the nose I cannot understand, for he displays clear  
 evidences, except for <sup>to/</sup> putting his in other people's business <sup>courage,</sup>

In fairness <sup>of</sup> <sup>Mark,</sup> I think I should acknowledge that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> only menaced  
 (if that is the right word) noses belong to those much older (perish the thought,  
 I am old enough to have been his father) or smaller <sup>than he.</sup>

Unless it is <sup>an attempt at</sup> ~~the~~ nose-punching, to which his own self-respect might  
 foolishly drive him, there is no likelihood of <sup>Mark's</sup> <sup>calling him</sup> <sup>doing anything about my</sup>  
 a crook. <sup>That is my libel.)</sup> <sup>(He is my foe. He will not invade judicial</sup> <sup>criticism.)</sup> <sup>He is so contemptuous of all</sup>  
 normal concepts of decency, honor and property rights that he doesn't really  
 think out his few "covers", carelessly citing non-existent sources and then  
 inventing non-existent footnotes for them.

There is no more likelihood that he will charge me with libel than  
 that Arden Specter, former commission counsel, <sup>ever will</sup> ~~will~~. I first pointed the accusation  
 that Specter was a deliberate liar then went to his city, Philadelphia, <sup>and</sup> made a  
 public speech in which I apologized for ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> doing him justice, adding  
 that he was repetitively a deliberate liar. To be certain there was no question  
 about my intent I also phoned the newspapers and personally reported <sup>had said and</sup> what I was about  
 to say about Specter. There is no question about either. To call Lane is crook is  
<sup>so/</sup> as solid and factual as to call Specter a liar - which Lane also is, <sup>he is</sup>  
~~and~~ even when it isn't necessary.

Cohen, unlike Lane, could not bring himself to ignore all the charges I made. ~~xxxxxxx~~ *His "response" about the [unclear] [unclear]* ~~Allen Burke-WNET-TV~~ *show* thing is both imaginative and cute. Here is the story, which is nothing like the references to Burke, the station and Lane in "A Citizens' Dissent".

~~(Epstein refused)~~  
I had been invited to appear on the show and had been told it was a kind of pleasant, informal back-and-forth thing. What I didn't know is that Epstein had refused and the real format of the show. It was not live, as I'd anticipated. The taping, scheduled for about 20 minutes, lasted two hours more. It was a real-live Perry Mason, with four well-prepared lawyers laying in wait in the audience to ruin me. All were armed with my book and the expensive official version of the Report. It was a hot-and-heavy gangup, professional as lawyers can be, and also as indecent.

*aired the end of the following week*  
That show probably did more to open the subject and interest media people in the New York City area than any other single thing. It was aired before Mark's book appeared. It won all-time high ratings and was a major sensation. It had taken those lawyers most of *the time to let me know silence golden can be.* *(The mother's knee-fought victory, that silence is golden.)* *(two hours)*

*It continued ringing through the night and day.*  
My phone began ringing the moment it went off the air early one Sunday morning. One of the callers had been told, in advance of the airing, by the Holt publicity man, that he had arranged the ~~xxx~~ ambush. Until it was aired he had no idea what had happened to his Indians, who were not boastful. But I was outraged, though the show made the unavailable ~~xxx~~ WNET-TV New York's best-seller by the end of the week. The station answered my complaint by saying it had *consistent with* ~~its custom~~ merely asked the American Trial Lawyers' Association to provide audience opposition. Joshua ~~xxxx~~ Fuchsberg, then association President, confirmed that the invitation had been extended but added that it had been rejected.

*(it seemed obvious)*  
I had reported this to Cohen, saying the Holt had done the dirty work, and asked for his "assurance" that "this ~~xxxx~~ is not the case, that none of these lawyers has or had any kind of an association with your company."

*non sequitur and inference*

Cohen is almost as quick as Lane with the threat of an unintended but threatened suit:

"I do wish to assure you that there is ~~is~~ (his wasted emphasis) absolutely no connection between Holt, Finehart and Winston and any television station, and in particular no connection between Holt, Finehart and Winston and Alan Burke or WNY-TV in New York". If anyone said this (and who had? He had made it up, personally) it would be malicious and untrue and would undoubtedly be defended by our counsel".

Fervently it should be prayed that Holt's counsel perform more adequately in court than *in TV the way* (in an ambush of a mere Maryland "goose farmer").

In my reply of September 18, I asked him to answer the question not of his invention ~~but~~ but the one I asked and that of the purloining of Appendix 10. I described these questions as "quite specific" and said, "I await a responsive answer". *R. So, I await.*

In two years there has been none, from him or from Mark, or to the letters I wrote *about their joint* ~~after~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ second exercise in literary lightfingers.

Mark did not entirely ignore this Burke incident or its consequences, of which he ~~was~~ was the unintended and perhaps not accidental beneficiary. During the subsequent developments Cohen was very much in evidence *and* with him, I presume, the weight and influence of Holt and its then-owners, who ~~were~~ were heavy advertisers.

MetroMedia, well-known as the sole owner of WNY, had a reaction like amplified gangbusters to the show I did, unintentionally made into a real Horatio Alger sink-or-swim by bumbling, city-boys Holt, who never heard of all the kinds of people who sometimes are farmers and the kinds of people the necessities ~~of~~ ~~know~~ no more of geese than Mark, which is not of farming makes of farmers. They also ~~know nothing at all~~ ~~enough~~ enough.

MetroMedia decided on a special <sup>"</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>"</sup> that included more than me for one side. Lane, ~~and~~ ~~and~~ Penn Jones, ~~Zola-like~~ Leo Sauvage were the others. The

Commission and its staff, to a man, declined and were championed by Professor *Jacob*

*"Jerry" Cohen ("Jake the Fake" to me). He* almost immediately lost his official federal sponsorship, and fumbling Jim Bishop, whose cover was "moderator".  
*DUGGED ALONG BY VINCE SALVENDRIA*



29. *It Then then was written "A Night in the Life of your Bishop!"*

~~It is not~~ "Tumbling" is not a figure of speech. It got so awkward, sitting between Lane and me, ~~and~~ and living with his own very naked and very public ignorance, that he spilled a cop cup of coffee that beautiful expensive sports coat more elaborate than that of the average do <sup>man</sup> in the sneakier New York areas.

Preventing ~~the~~ <sup>total</sup> evisceration of ~~both~~ Lane, the Commission's opponent, ~~and~~ Jake Cohen, its defender, and Bishop, the "Moderator", delayed the airing of that "special" a long time. It was that hard to edit me out. David Schoenbrun was brought in ~~as~~ <sup>an</sup> added voice to salvage what could be of poor-little -strike-it-rich -with -pap-boy Bishop. The taping lasted from about 8 p.m. until something after four the next morning, with one ten-minute break. Busy Little Vice-President <sup>id</sup> ~~Beaver~~ ~~Cohen~~ stayed through all of it. Jake couldn't quite make it and left before the end, untrus to either the dramatic or CIA traditions. Mark, understandably, <sup>broke</sup> ~~a~~ <sup>what I had joined</sup> prearrangement with Penn ~~and~~ so immediately ~~he~~ he left character long enough to pay for his own cab.

~~Mark~~ <sup>me</sup> ~~thinks~~ ~~that~~ ~~is~~ ~~true~~ ~~about~~ ~~Alan~~ ~~Durke~~ ~~and~~ ~~NEP~~, aside from ~~the~~ not being contaminated by "old ownership, it is that <sup>legitimate</sup> our side of this question there was <sup>no decision</sup> ~~only~~ ~~over~~ ~~the~~ ~~question~~. That was established by the record, of which Mark was no part, aside from the end men-lawyers.

After ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> really difficult job of editing out ~~all~~ <sup>expressing</sup> ~~the~~ ~~material~~ ~~that~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~relevant~~ could be that ~~and~~ ~~Mark~~, ~~and~~ ~~Bishop~~, a three-hour tape <sup>was</sup> produced.

I was <sup>able</sup> to arrange a press-preview in Washington. At it retrograde Vice President Mark Evans announced that the Commission staff, which had eschewed confrontation, <sup>requested</sup> had ~~kept~~ a private show of its own-all one side. Driving home that night, a cool and quiet 45 minutes on empty superhighways, <sup>my</sup> that ~~provided~~ opportunity for thought, I deliberated whether it was not time to decide who is Daniel and who the lions. Before retiring I wrote NEP, saying that "as the senior member of the minority (our show had been called "The Minority" part" even though it had both sides), I want you to know that when reciprocal courtesies are extended, I will accept them." Three weeks later a giggling Paul Noble, the ~~producer~~, <sup>my</sup>

phone to say, "Okay, Earl; you're on". I ask if the Commission staff, every one of whom by then challenged had ~~declined~~ declined to confront me, had agreed to face me ~~over~~ in a gangup. He said a minimum of four had. The date was January 3 and the arrangement was we'd gather in the ~~NEW~~ <sup>office</sup> studio the night before to agree on the ground rules.

December 5,

I was there-alone. Wesley Wisbaler, who had been needling Mark to face him while Mark declined, pleading his non-existent law-suit, was not there.

Arland Specter, who refused to accept my challenge to face me in court, who had quit an Educational TV show when I accepted, flew to England ~~instead~~ <sup>prefering</sup> to face Mark <sup>m BBL</sup>

The lions feared Daniel in their own den. This speaks more of the lions than of Daniel.

That night, with my ulcer in flames, Paul, Mel Bailey, then program director, and one of the vice-presidents, evolved this substitute formula:

I would confront Louis Nizer with any Commission staff who would agree to be championed by him, with a moderator, not a Bishop, and <sup>all about him</sup> with fair ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> time. A date was agreed to later by phone, after Nizer accepted.

Meanwhile, OR radio decided on a radio special. This also is mentioned in Mark's second book. Nizer had a Commission lawyer, eminent ~~Albert~~ <sup>Albert</sup> Jenner, who had contracted Mark to ~~backed out~~ <sup>agreed to confront me</sup> on several ~~times~~ <sup>occasions</sup> (once he pleaded a forget an Christmas party <sup>in the second week</sup> the following year!), was also to be there, Leo <sup>Alpert</sup> Savage ~~was with me~~ <sup>and</sup> it was quite a thing. Originally scheduled for two hours it

ran four. Originally scheduled for a single daytime presentation, it was aired four times in prime time for a total of 16 pre-empted commercial hours. It is a very rare thing, indeed, when any top-rated and top-priced, clear-channel radio station dedicates 16 hours of ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> come to public service. While it is possible to complain against OR, it is not because they feared the subject so much they'd not air ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> or because they refused the time.

Even more to the station's credit is the generous sum spent on advertising the show in advance of taping, and the repeated advertising of the three reruns.

*After  
Jenner did  
not show he  
was replaced  
by Wisbaler  
to hate those  
whom  
he was  
opposing  
in the  
first  
book  
about the  
55,000  
which he  
knew was  
wrong. It was  
about the  
subject.*

Nizer will never forget or ever live down those four hours, relived as they were and aired before his peers. He has not since agreed to another debate. Again, this says more of Nizer than of me. Anyone not intimidated by his reputation and knowing anything at all about the subject can <sup>Nizer</sup> ~~imagine~~ if he can persist enough to get an occasional word in. Few people know less than Nizer, about the Warren Report or the assassination. That he dared debate at all is incredible. It can be explained, if at all, by his need to promote his then-new book, so appropriately titled "The Jury Returns", and the obvious genuflection to the Supreme Court, to which the cases of his clients go.

If Nizer didn't dare face me again, he also didn't dare back out of that TV show after what I had done to him. The solution was simple: I got bounced. Mark did it instead. <sup>Mark</sup> Nizer was visibly shaking on camera before the first word was spoken - and it was his - and he never stopped. <sup>Chalmers</sup> Nothing had to happen on that show to cause this and nothing did. Mark was busy selling his book and defending himself, and having a little unavoidable fun with poor Albert Jenner, who makes the temptation too great.

I doubt if anyone else could have described these three events quite as realistically as Mark - doctor, lawyer, Indian Chief, side-show barker, medicine-man - not <sup>Manchhausen</sup> - not even Annias. Here is what he published on page 43 of "A Citizens' Dissent":

In New York City, WNEW-TV showed the greatest interest in the subject, and ingenuity as well. Alan Burke, who often ridicules the views expressed by his guest, was among the first to invite me to appear. One of the critics had declined a similar invitation, no doubt due to fear of Burke's caustic wit. I too approached the program with real concern, but, as it developed, without reason; Burke provided a serious format for a two-hour discussion of the Warren Report. His questions were fair and revealed a knowledge of the facts. When the dignity of the program seemed threatened for a moment by a persistent member of the audience, Burke interceded.

Mel Bailly and Paul Noble at the same station approached me regarding a special program. They conceived of a number of the leading critics involved in an open-ended discussion of the Report. Props and films were to be placed at the disposal of the participants. When Epstein refused to appear, the program was slightly altered so that a Commission defender was added. The program was syndicated and was therefore shown in a number of other cities. Subsequently, the same team produced another discussion program designed as an answer to the first. They invited me to meet with Louis Nizer and two Commission attorneys. That program too was broadcast in other cities.

Mark did not totally ignore <sup>either</sup> OR, after acknowledging that it had given him ten hours during the Commission's life, he complains that he had been "banned for life" because he was denied a third such show. Reading page 27 reveals no possible reason. It is just that OR was part of the media gang-up on him. The "indictment" of the station concludes this way: "Two years later, his ~~book~~ "Rush to Judgment" was published and our cause respectable (note that slick backeting between the late publication of his redundant book and the sudden "respectability" that simultaneously and, the inference is clear, <sup>only,</sup> thereby came to "our cause"), booking agents for the publisher sought to arrange and interview with me with a dialogist <sup>(sic)</sup> who was broadcast by OR. They were informed that the ban was still in effect. During 1967, OR presented what was widely advertised as "The Warren Report". It was to be a "two-hour uninterrupted discussion" with the four leading critics and defenders of the Report. I was not invited to participate."

From this you are to believe- PLEASE BELIEVE IT - MARK WANTS YOU TO- that there can be no "leading critic" other than he. That Sauvage and I had done our books long before him and neither ~~of us~~ ever had the questions of personal integrity raised that are always raised with Mark is immaterial. <sup>behavior and</sup> He says that side. ~~is~~ him. Here he says it.

Mark plays both sides of the monopoly game. He is bitter that OR does not share his own high opinion of himself. He is bitter about all the media, the very media that made him, for without the attention ~~is~~ so unrelentingly ~~and~~ given his book could have sold as it did and he'd not have made the loot he hides.

No one else could defend the unimpeachable Mark does. Even the pioneer people-ester Joe Pynes, who has made a wealth-yeilding career out of debasing his guests, no one but Mark could libel Pynes. <sup>He does. Because Pynes would not alter a standing station and program policy to air him (at about the same time and</sup> that his friend Bert Shel Sehl did not less than a half-dozen times in person, aside from Sehl's never-ending promotions. Sehl had a hunk of the Lene-monopoly-xixyx action. <sup>show willingness</sup> ~~this~~ is the case on practice <sup>with</sup> ~~is~~ TV stations and programs. I also gave up the Pynes show

in December 1966 to meet Wesley Liebeler, from whom Mark was then running, *because that*  
*too, was* on the same station. Only Liebeler didn't ~~show~~ *appear*. Instead, on the one day of the  
week the National Archives is closed, a Sunday, he sent the explanation he had  
to be there working.

It would be possible to continue almost endlessly with similar incidents,  
all carefully redesigned to serve Mark's concept of a special media gangup  
*concepts* against him, it is Holt's *idea*, for it is the sales-pitch of the book as it is  
the doctrine. On the dust-jacket it comes out that way: "Mark Lane replies...  
to the press and the communications industry...and tells the often grim story  
of how his dissent was almost silenced." Only "his" dissent, note, please.

The cover of "Publishers' Weekly" is equally modest and accurate: *no less*

"The thrilling story of a lone determined man who stood up to ~~the~~  
"the Establishment" -and won! (And who do you think owns Holt and paid for this  
anti-"Establishment" ad? CBS!). This is the largest, and very large, type. In  
ordinary type, "...fully documented story of how the U.S. government and the  
communications industry attempted to suppress his (emphasis added) investigation  
of the Kennedy assassination-and failed. ...stirring account of what one man  
(emphasis added)-virtually alone- can do when he is determined to break through  
an official 'curtain of silence' and bring the truth to the American people."

This reads better, if no more accurately, to the tune of "Hearts and  
Flowers". But if Mark "won", without doing any work since, as this book  
abundantly proves, what in the world are Jim Garrison and the others of us  
wasting our time on? Perhaps there is a kind of answer. We'll soon see.

Mark has a short memory, except when it comes to ~~other people's~~  
*where* other people's literary properties are when he wants to steal them. Or perhaps  
it is his moral delication to the ancient lawyer's maxim, "Denis erectus sciam  
non habet". Anyway, he and Holt either forgot or didn't care about this  
beastful addition to "Rush to Judgment" for the reprint edition:

"I appeared as a guest on 135 television and radio programs  
originating from almost every major city in the United States. "Any of these

were a vibrant network or syndicated programs, some were specially produced documentaries, two and even three hours long." This is the sine qua non of ~~the~~ "suppression". I'd like to see ~~with~~ love some of ~~it~~ it. So, with this representative sampling of the validity, integrity, "completeness" and fairness of his complaint against those who "suppressed" him with 185 acknowledged shows, there remains one ~~reason~~ <sup>into</sup> we must bite to get the full flavor of Mark's own particularly kind of honesty.

He devoted an entire chapter to it ("10 A World Premiere").

Mark doesn't like what BBC did to him. He shouldn't. It is what he did to me on the Alan Burke Show. Mark didn't fare as well with BBC. But then, Mark is Mark.

The deck and the deck were stacked. He knew they would be, in itself an asset. He knew by whom and how, *Commissioner Gump, Chairman Beck, Specter's <sup>all</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>it</sup>*

After agonizing publicly about the great sacrifice he had made to fly to England to appear on the show, which included the world's premiere of his movie named after his book, after asking the reader to share the abuse heaped upon him by those dreadful people at BBC, Mark explains, "...But this was an important program and well worth the effort. (Isn't he the dedicated one, though?) By worth the effort I did not mean it would be financially rewarding for since I was not paid a farthing for the program, and in fact was compelled to cancel speaking engagements for which I was paid, the program was, in that sense, worse than a total loss." Real gone guy on the public service, that Mark.

It is quite true he "was not paid a farthing for the program".

Emile de Antonio told the Associated Press it was 40,000, "the most money that has ever been paid for a film for a single transmission by anybody in the United Kingdom". The "New York Times," which thought the deal worth more than a half-column of its "suppressive" news space, said identically this. The British press reported the same figure.

Mark certainly knows his farthings, as he knows his backers, for there is not <sup>*Sensational Record Dummer*</sup> a word <sup>*the*</sup> in his "complete" book, with an entire and longer than average

Chapter on this subject alone. It is 13 pages. <sup>Several of chapters</sup> ~~number~~ are merely two <sup>pages long.</sup>

Nowhere does this author of complete and thorough books say he got \$40,000, a record price, for the one-time use of his film, which also got that much free publicity throughout the world. He says, instead, that he didn't get a "farthing" — a farthing is a fourth of a British penny.

So, Mark, who got more free air time than everyone else working in the field together, complains first that he didn't get <sup>of it</sup> all and then that a monster effort was made to suppress him.

The title would be more apt if the word were spelled "descent".

Mark is a master of the xxx knees, nails and teeth kind of writing, where he has no opponent. On the few occasions where he has, his technique is that of the southern reactionaries, filibuster. He can spend more time saying nothing new, use more unnecessary words, than the reader of his edited output would imagine.

He is at his persuasive best when he is unopposed. There he has literary jewels for the reading swine. He can have no higher opinion of the reading public from what he serves it, what he takes its money for. A few examples should be enough.

Referring to an address by Joseph A. Bell, former Commission lawyer and a prominent member of the California bar, Mark quotes Bell as having said, "Never in my life have I been so scurrilously attacked as by Mr. Lane in his 'Rush to Judgment'." Lane's final word is "Bell's name does not appear in 'Rush to Judgment'."

If anyone is capable of being unfair to Bell, as difficult an achievement with him as with most of the Commission's lawyer, Mark is the man. Bell's performance on the Commission and thereafter would seem to warrant almost any condemnation. It is of conspicuous and successful dishonesty, basic to the elemental conclusions of the Report and diametrically opposed to 100% of the testimony he personally adduced. It is also 100% opposed to all the other relevant evidence.

The point is in Mark's pretended response, which is literally truthful and designedly false and non-responsive.

Mark focused on the chairman of the Commission, and its general counsel, his particular bete noir, so that the reader would not be able to direct his anger at anyone else, Mark took liberties with the sworn testimony which he presents as unaltered, in direct quotes, and with the composition of the Commission and its staff. As this appears in his hardback and his reprint, the only member of the staff is its general counsel, J. Lee Rankin, former solicitor, of the United States. Consistent with this he altered every one of the many excerpts of testimony to eliminate the name of the lawyer conducting the interrogations. Without exception, each is faceless, without any identification. Without a single exception, every line of the allegedly directly quoted testimony was altered, by Mark alone, to replace the name of the staff member with the letter "M". So, he did not mention Ball by name. He did, however, make much use of the testimony Ball elicited, the part of the Report he wrote. ~~xxxxxxx~~

He is not without mention of Ball. All he did was not spell out the name. Had he not done this, some of his readers might have concluded that his animus against the chairman and general counsel ~~xxxxxxx~~ should have been directed elsewhere.

Beginning on page 132 is a fanciful account of how Wesley Liebeler avoided confrontation with him. One such incident, involving a joint appearance in a Denver TV station, sounds exactly like Liebeler, he pulled the same trick on me. He agreed to a debate, the sponsor agreed to pay travel expenses, and then Liebeler demanded a fee, without which he would not appear and with which the debate was impossible. Nowhere does Mark say that for the longest time he was running away from confrontation to Liebeler, a point to which I will return. ~~Mark~~

*On that he demands a higher fee than Liebeler.*

When we get to page 157 of ~~xxxxxxx~~ this careful distillation of half-truths and misrepresentations designed to make Mark more heroic



that even he would dare claim, and responsible for the Garrison investigation, his help to which should be interesting, we are in the midst of peeling that is essential to his falsification of his ~~Liebler~~ Liebler-confrontation record.

"On July 21, 1964," Mark writes, "Wesley J. Liebler took the testimony of a New Orleans lawyer, Dean Andrews, who ~~had~~ previously had told agents of the FBI that a man calling ~~himself~~ himself 'Clay Bertrand' had called to enlist him as Oswald's attorney after the assassination".

Here there is a citation to the first five pages of Andrews testimony in Volume 11.

This passage immediately follows his complaint that Liebler had alleged ~~his~~ inaccuracy on Mark's part (page 133).

The citation to Volume 11 ~~incorrectly~~ does not relate to Mark's text. Even with five pages referred to, where he really intends but the top of page 386, he is still wrong. At this point Andrews was testifying about Oswald's personal appearances at his office, well before the assassination. The ~~relevant~~ relevant testimony begins on page 381, where Liebler first asked Andrews about the Bertrand call.

While Liebler throughout refers to Andrews conversations with and interviews with the FBI, this does not mean that Andrews reported the Bertrand call to the FBI. <sup>He</sup> didn't. He phoned his friend John Rice, Special Agent in Charge of the New Orleans Secret Service office - and the right man to call anyway, with the Secret Service still in charge. Liebler was understandable anxious to avoid reference to Rice. The FBI reports were much more to his liking, for they were disputatious, argumentative and false. They were as admirably suited to his not impartial purposes as if Mark had joined that side and given it his not inconsiderable best efforts. Rice's name is not mentioned a single time in the Warren Report or all 15 volumes of testimony. *or either of Mark's books.*

This is not bad for Mark. <sup>He</sup> has the wrong footnote and the wrong ~~government~~ *government* bureau, ~~and~~ *and doesn't have the right name here or anywhere else* right where he protest his infallibility. *There's more to come.*

The next sentence in this part of Mark's text on page 137 reads:

"The Commission was sufficiently disinterested in 'Clay Bertrand' to refrain from making reference to him in its Report. Let the potential significance of the Andrews testimony can be ascertained by the fact that the first men ~~xxxxxx~~ indicted for conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy, <sup>was Clay Shaw,</sup> ~~xxxx~~ a man charged by the New Orleans District Attorney with being 'Clay Bertrand'."

Here there is one of Mark's better literary performances, a footnote which in its entirety reads; "

"This criticism of the Commission's indifference to potentially important testimony is not offered here solely with the benefit of hindsight. The name 'Clay Bertrand' does appear in 'Rush to Judgment', and the New Orleans District Attorney has stated that his interest in the case was stimulated in large part by reading that book."

Here there is another footnote, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ entirely irrelevant to what may or may not have influenced Garrison. It reads, "See RTJ 339-390 (351-352)."

Now if there is one thing beyond <sup>d</sup> doubt, it is that reference to Clay Bertrand in 'Rush to Judgment' could have interested no one except a Commission partisan looking for ammunition to use against Mark.

Pages 331 and 332 of "Rush to Judgment" should interest the Liebler team, whose injustices Mark has just complained of a couple of pages earlier, for on them <sup>f</sup> there is no reference to or hint of Andrews, Bertrand or anything at all even suggesting New Orleans or anything that did or did not happen there. <sup>I</sup> It is one of Mark's better accuracies.

There is no reference to Bertrand on page 339, either. On page 390 there is the error that Andrews phoned the FBI from his hospital bed on November 22, whereas he called the Secret Service. Here Mark describes Bertrand in these words, "a lawyer named Clay Bertrand". What little else he quotes from the testimony is considerable less in volume, or meaning than a number of other sources available to Garrison and none is as inaccurate.

*one of the few things is made that up, based on an Andrews just he mis understood. One can imagine how much manuscripts "stimulated" Garrison, who in real life has been Andrews' friend.*

39A

It can be agreed that Mark's "criticism of the Commission's indifference to potentially important testimony is not/here solely with the benefit of hindsight". Mark's hindsight is no better than his own foresight, which qualified him as the only author of a serious book dealing with the Warren Commission testimony to wind up with <sup>goal</sup> no understanding of Andrews' testimony. "Rush to Judgement" is the only book to mention Andrews' name from which the reader will get no meaningful understanding of what <sup>Dean</sup> he knew and could have testified to, had his knowledge been desired by Liebler any more than by Lane.

It is not "solely" the "benefit" not of hindsight that Mark seeks. What he seizes is credit for the work of others, and that he here grabs for himself, in his own book, with his own firm sense of honor and native incorruptibility, <sup>to grab a win,</sup> there is <sup>hindsight.</sup> no "hindsight"; <sup>no "hindsight";</sup> M, of course <sup>not!</sup>

There is a story Mark is fond of telling. I've heard it from him several times, <sup>until now,</sup> in silence, until I became concerned about the <sup>prospects</sup> possibility of Garrison and the rest of us surviving his greed, incompetence, unscrupulousness and limitless capacity ~~for~~ for distortion and misrepresentation. He drove from Dallas to New Orleans, he says, to interview Andrews only to find that Dean would not speak to him. <sup>His reputation preceded him. Dean</sup>

Mark to Dean

It never once occurred to the omniscient investigator who did everything all by himself, who combines in his one lawyer's all-seeing and all-understanding mind why, why Andrews was terrified <sup>or of what,</sup> of talking, what that could mean. Another did, therefore Mark, in his own writing, takes <sup>full</sup> credit for ~~what~~ <sup>what he had nothing to do with.</sup>

In any event, not without cause, Andrews detests him, needs no publicly prompting to express himself lucidly on this, and is/contemptuous of what he calls Mark's stupidity. He readily volunteers other no more complimentary descriptions of Mark's character.

a ~~lawyer~~. Shew is a public-relations man who had managed the International Trade Mart in New Orleans and was a successful amateur playwright. ~~The one thing he could not be called is a "lawyer."~~

There is only one writing on Andrews and Bertrand that has significance, and that is mine, ~~the~~ WHITE ASH, which was completed well before Mark began his work, ~~and which deals with Andrews and his testimony at great length, as it does with the "False Oswald" part of the assassination story, for the first and by far the most complete time. In OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, written and published well before Mark wrote his second book, there is considerable amplification and new material, an enormous collection of suppressed Secret Service and FBI reports.~~ Garrison has on several occasions called this the most important of the assassination books, which has nothing <sup>to do</sup> with the point here. I have never mentioned it before because without doubt, all the writing, good and bad, accurate and inaccurate, had some influence on him.

Had Lane had the slightest intention of being honest <sup>NOT</sup> and grabbing all the ore it which is not his, he would at this point <sup>report</sup> ~~report~~ what I did at some length, that Garrison had made his first arrest in connection with the assassination before Mark had opened his mouth, on November 25, 1965. The only reason he didn't make it earlier is because he couldn't get his hands on David William Ferris, charged with Shew as a conspirator in 1967. Garrison was talked out of it by federal agents. He released Ferris. His whole story appears only in OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, as Mark also knows. It is ~~not~~ <sup>nowhere</sup> in his writing; <sup>(nowhere in his writing)</sup> writing, not even those accurate footnotes of his.

39A here.

Garrison was not interested initially in reopening his investigation by my writing. Mark's or any others. That was accomplished by a conversation with ~~HEX~~ Louisiana Senator Russell Long, Garrison's political associate, whose own father Huey was felled by an assassin.

However, if what Garrison thinks of the writing about Andrews and Bertrand is a point here, which it is not except for Mark's demand that the world recognize his exclusive monopoly on having brought to light new fact of the assassina-

tion and the right to speak on it, there is an expert on it, Dean Andrews.  
In a reply November 1967,

he told me his first knowledge of Garrison's interest in the assassination and  
him came when late the previous year <sup>when</sup> "the Agent" walked into his office, sat  
in the "the very chair you're in, tossed a copy of WHITEMASH on the desk and said,  
'Dean I thought you'd read this'."

Because of this rather typical ~~un~~ scruple that so permeates Mark's  
writing, I think it neither <sup>e</sup> inappropriate nor immodest to quote an impartial  
expert, a man who has long sided with the Warren <sup>Report</sup>, Max Lerner. He said  
of my handling of Andrews' testimony <sup>New York "Post"</sup> in his column of November 27, 1967:

~~What (Garrison) said~~ "Certainly he (Garrison) has read Harold Weisberg's  
new paperback, OSWALD IN THE GRILL: CASE FOR CONSPIRACY WITH THE CIA, which I infer  
from the fact that he wrote a foreword for it, and also from his heavy reliance  
on Weisberg's two earlier books, WHITE RASH and WHITE RASH II. (Garrison did read <sup>Disputed</sup>  
~~the~~ <sup>IN NEW ORLEANS</sup> in manuscript before it was published, before he wrote the foreword—E.W.)  
....I read Weisberg's new book eagerly...because I wanted to discover what his  
friend Garrison had developed...What I found to my delight were two long  
documentary portraits of Dean Andrews...His interview with Wesley Liebeler  
...and even more his telephone interview with Bob Scott of radio station WMAC  
in Boston are the stuff of great documentaries....puts all the hep-cat novelists  
to shame."

Bob Scott is my reporter friend who I had briefed in advance, knowing  
about the Garrison investigation in advance and helping it secretly for some time  
as I had seen while Mark was gallivanting in Europe. When the news of the investiga-  
tion broke, Bob, prepared for it, phoned Andrews and got admissions from "Deano"  
before his guard was up. They <sup>prediction</sup> ~~spun~~ to the ~~government~~ he'd perjure himself to save  
his life. I supplied this to Garrison. He used it to get the ~~best~~ conviction.  
<sup>Grew help, that made it read "vindictive" too!</sup>  
Parenthetically, Andrews respects my writing and is friendly with me.

<sup>He and his family say I am the only one who understands him and has written of him  
fairly and honestly, even his favorite niece who kissed me on introduction before  
she told me that the ~~the~~ federal agency for which she works is classified</sup>  
through I am partly responsible for his conviction -

information she is not permitted to share!

So much for the unexceptional integrity of Mark's writing and the scrupulous accuracy of his quotations and footnotes. We were, however, *discussing* his handling of Liebeler for avoiding confrontation when the opposite was true.

Two of Lane's west-coast friends, Maggie Field and Bill O'Connell, who I had then never met but who also had gone out of their way to extend kindness and courtesies to me, *phone* me toward the end of 1963 to enlist my aid. Liebeler, they said, had Lane on the ropes, *this* ~~and with Lane they were jeopardizing~~ all effort in that area to attain a reconsideration of the Kennedy assassination. Would I go out there and take Liebeler on?

I would as soon as I had put "WHITEWASH II" on the press, I agreed, and O'Connell, aided by other Los Angeles area researchers, made arrangements, including for radio and TV appearances and *the* Liebeler confrontation earlier referred to. Bill sent me tapes of Lane's and Liebeler's appearances. There is no doubt that Mark was not doing well. He avoided face-to-face confrontation ~~alleging~~ he was about to file the suit he never *did pursue* against Liebeler.

With my second book published, my indebtedness thereby increasing by about \$10,000, I abandoned it to its own good fortune and set sail for Liebeler. I had been led to believe he would be in the WBBM studio, as earlier referred to. He had been invited (at my instigation), to confront me in Chicago December 10. Instead was a request that he read my second book before he debated his work on the Commission. It went immediately by air. He had been asked and had agreed to confront me on the Harv Morgan show in San Francisco the night of December 15. I was there and he wasn't. Instead there was a taped statement that became nothingness with about five minutes of comment. I *gave* up the syndicated Fyne Show, *like Mark, whose does not admit it, knowing that station policy precluded that* which would have sold copies of "WHITEWASH II" to face Liebeler on the Lemax Show on the same station. Liebeler was not there, ~~either~~, and he was not again on Lane's back.

Mark's great and good friend, Mort Sehl, had me on his radio show (he reserved TV for Mark, pushing him in person six times) so I could defend Mark, then also under attack by Governor Connelly as a "scavenger". (If Connelly ever reads this he'll know the right words.) For three hours I fielded every complaint against Mark, and there were plenty, save one. That was from a former New York clothing-store owner who claimed every time Mark entered his store he stole something. That I referred to Mort, who had one of his ever-ready tirades for response.

For none of this did I ask or expect thanks. I did not do it for Mark. I did it for what the rest of us seek and he tries to steal from us. I did it without pay or compensation of any kind, without payment of my travel expenses, and at the cost of promoting the book not then on sale. Had I delayed this trip as little as a month, as I then knew, and made it when the book could have been in distribution, those appearances could have sold enough copies to <sup>help</sup> pay the printing cost at least.

Not once did I say those things so obvious about Mark's unusual integrity, which was not an issue. Nor did I ever hint at anything like his above-quoted contracts. His repayment will soon be of interest.

Another ready example of what in other endeavor is called "dirty pool" is on page 234, here modest Mark says, "after publication of 'Rush to Judgment' in 1968, considerable information regarding the possession of the autopsy photographs and X-rays became available for the first time".

The relationship here is like that of the moon and green cheese. <sup>He would with as much</sup> There is nothing new, except Mark's particular distortions and errors, in any of the medical or autopsy writing in "Rush to Judgment". The books then out for some time, which had everything accurate Mark had and much he did not have, were HITCHCOCK and "Inquest", <sup>Epstein's</sup> ~~an error of which~~ on the autopsy put considerable leverage on the government. What was more likely than any other writing caused official worry was a forthcoming "Saturday Evening Post" article on the autopsy by Richard Thelton, author of the best-selling and uncomplimentary biography of

*point was volume said, "the Member disintegrated America" or "after the horse shed the skin"*

Joseph P. Kennedy, "The Founding Feather". I had been helping Dick and knew what he could have written and didn't-what the government could not anticipate he would omit.

Typical of Mark's great contribution to public understanding of the autopsy is his insistence that what the doctor in charge burned was his original notes. With the most rudimentary research and limited understanding of the language Mark would have known that the original notes existed at the time of the testimony, well after the burning. I have the receipts tracing these original notes from the autopsy bench to the Commission, <sup>which suppressed them.</sup> that was burned was the first draft of the autopsy. In a way, this is much more sinister.

In the topic of the "Minority Report" one of those more heated exchanges that were edited ~~out~~ to save Mark's face was an exchange on just this. This also is where Bishop spilled his coffee.

Mark is not beyond learning, even if he must learn the lingo and its phrases from a "goose farmer". In "HITLERISE", <sup>1</sup> refer to these autopsy pictures and X-rays as it had not occurred to his legal mind to do, as what his profession calls "the best evidence". When he got around to "A Citizens' Dissent", Mark called this chapter- you guessed it- "The Best Evidence". <sup>3</sup> ~~without reference to his course or education.~~

~~The~~ Citation of the unfortunately numerous similar examples <sup>out Mark's</sup> through ~~xxx~~ books and ~~the~~ <sup>his</sup> speeches would be redundant. However, this close to his credit-taking for the New Orleans investigation, with which he had nothing to do and which he <sup>1</sup> refused, with his own grim determination, to ~~go~~ <sup>work for</sup> even after ~~moving~~ <sup>moving</sup> ~~back~~ to New Orleans (Garrison had yet to learn the source of all his blessings) how Mark connived that should be set forth. ~~The record is clear.~~ He makes a clear record when he employs his propagandists' skills.

Mark was in charge when news of the <sup>2</sup> Garrison investigation broke, on February 17, 1937. <sup>think</sup> Those of us who had been helping it while ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Sig-shotted around had been silent so the investigation could proceed. When it became public we maintained the same silence, save for backgrounding the press.



Mark is a man who knows a good thing when he sees it. He promptly announced to the press that so surprised him alone that he was rushing to New Orleans to give Garrison all he had. By now the reader has an idea of what this added up to - that Clay Shaw <sup>is</sup> a "lawyer."

Then David Ferrie died so mysteriously. Mark, who had <sup>no</sup> thinking that a Ferrie ever lived, the only pretentious maniac having been in "HITLER" II in a context he could not steal, promptly announced in Paris, as the Philadelphia Inquirer <sup>is</sup> ~~has~~ <sup>very</sup> quoted him, that "the death of Ferrie 'may break the case wide open'." His predictions are almost as sound as his facts. He is little troubled. It gets his name in the papers and on radio and TV and sells his books.

The same story <sup>adds</sup> says, "Lase said he would telephone new information on the New Orleans aspect of the assassination to Garrison". Since the <sup>fact</sup> ~~fact~~ that Clay <sup>is a "bunch"</sup> Pentrend exhausted his published ~~see~~ "information" on the "New Orleans aspect" - he had just brought out the reprint of "Rush to Judgment" with the unfulfilled promise "important new information added" on the cover with nothing of New Orleans in its 10 added pages - what his "new information" might have been is a secret Mark shares with AFME. Neither is likely to talk.

Meanwhile, Mark had written a series of articles for the Copenhagen paper, "Estrebladet". The one appearing March 31, according to Reuters, said:

"I know who fired the fatal shot at President Kennedy. I know the forces behind the murder of the President". This truly important "new information" he seems not to have imparted to Garrison, <sup>and</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> certainly did not publish it in <sup>"Rush to Judgment", or,</sup> "A ~~Wide~~ Citizens' Dissent". Perhaps it is because the world is not yet ready to accept the guilt of Peter Cunt and his trolls!

Collaborator Mort Sahl liked this act. ~~He told the~~ ~~Washington Express~~ ever-credulous Jeremy Campbell of the London "Evening Standard" that he, too, knew the name of the assassin, and "when Garrison tells his story, the implications will shake the country to its foundations". Sahl, it will be remembered, told the nationwide "Tonight" show that he is one of Garrison's investigators. <sup>a comedian</sup> Could he

have proof that Joe Miller is the real killer?

By March 29th Lena was in New Orleans and the story had changed.

It was no longer all the important contributions he was making to the investigation and the sensational new data he had turned over to Garrison. It was that Garrison had give <sup>- alone -</sup> him the "full outline" of his case, a remarkable accomplishment when it is recalled that at that point Garrison still had no case - was in the infancy of the investigation that a year and a half later was not completed.

"When it is presented in court it will shake this country ~~xxxxxx~~ as it has never been shaken before." He also said, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ "They are going to be embarrassed when the jury says guilty...The foundations of the country will be shaken when the evidence is disclosed in court." Shades of the Shepherd decision, it really ~~xxxxx~~ takes a lawyer to know the comment that is inappropriate - that might exculpate a guilty man, as Shaw's lawyers were promptly to announce - *and they will sell books and get names in headlines.*

*Reportedly* Mark gave up the available post on the faculty at Stanford, without complaint from California ~~tax payers~~ <sup>no</sup> who already have one Wesley Liebeler teaching their new generations of lawyers, and moved to New Orleans, where he ~~could~~ refused to do any investigating <sup>law</sup> ~~why~~ should the patent-holder do the work of his licensees? *Instead he would* and distinguished himself in any way, all promote ~~himself~~ <sup>He is</sup> and where ~~could~~ get paid for it. ~~It is~~ His pay is not peanuts. ~~It is~~ <sup>into</sup> the fourth figure for a speech. *from by telling them all the new things he says*

*These things that promote Mark as genuine "confidence"*

One rather memorable if chance meeting comes to mind. And it makes me wonder why, when Mark was in New Orleans as fast as he could fly there from Europe, he had not <sup>yet</sup> given the grand jury the benefit of all his sensational new information so pertinent to its investigation by the time I testified, April 22, 1967, the first writer to appear before it. Anyway, Rick ~~Turnley~~ <sup>Turnley</sup>, then of WDSU-TV, and his date, who was not his wife but the daughter of Federal Judge Wisdom, were taking me around the French Quarter after dinner. He bumped into Mark, who had that day addressed the New Orleans Junior Bar.

"How did it go?" Rick asked?

"Oh, fine," *Mark* exulted, "although they did send me a letter telling me I could not mention the pending case."

Mark does not embarrass easily, lucky California law students.

Dedicated as he is to Garrison, Mark favors him by not conducting any investigations, for unlike the uncritical editors of his writing and the ~~xxx~~ recourseless readers of his books, in court there is opposing counsel.

This is not the way *Mark* puts it; it is only fact, scandalous fact <sup>to</sup> the *overburdened* ~~overworked~~ staff members.

Close to *Mark's* taste is the way it came out in <sup>(April 1968)</sup> "Forum", the publication of the State of Washington Citizens' Committee of Inquiry, over an article he wrote:

"*Mark Lane*, author of 'Rush to Judgment', is now serving as unpaid chief investigator for D.A. Jim Garrison".

And all the time I thought that was <sup>Bill</sup> Gurvich!

How low helpful is *Mark's* spilling of what he represents as Garrison-office secrets. The inside stuff is always good for a play. His decision to write for the underground press and the small newsletters just happened to coincide with the scheduled appearance of the second book that he wanted to sell. Until then he had nothing to write.

Until then one of those who had helped him most on the West Coast, Steve Burton, had the assignment. Steve is chairman of the Los Angeles Citizens' Committee, a decent and brilliant young man who has conducted excellent investigations and introduced the subject into the "Los Angeles Free Press" and the "Liberation News Service". When Lane felt he needed this slot to promote himself and his coming book, he created a non-existent Garrison ~~affront~~ disappointment with Burton, leaned on his inside sources, and took Steve's assignment. This lasted just long enough to get *Mark* a lot of publicity,

launch his book ~~in~~ in front of the generation catered to by this new press. *Then Mark*

*was M. Bernsteining with his folk.*

His "help" to Garrison was conspicuous in his May 3, 1968 article. of his "interception" of a He there wrote ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ letter by Edgar Eugene Bradley, another man charged with conspiracy by Garrison. Aside from the unlikeliness

of any such public confession of a federal crime, even by a man with such talents from for self-propaganda, assuming <sup>at</sup> that this time Mark spoke the truth. What effect does ~~his~~ <sup>his confession</sup> have on the use of that evidence in ~~the~~ court?

The many other ways in which Mark has helped Garrison (while allegedly helping himself to all <sup>the</sup> information gathered by others) need not here be enumerated. One more example should be enough.

One of the best-kept secrets of Mark's writing career is his lack of understanding of the motion picture of the assassination taken by Abraham Zapruder. He has made no study of it—that takes time and work, demeaning to the holder of exclusive rights—which makes it easier to write and say what he would prefer <sup>that</sup> the Zapruder film shows as a substitute for what it does show. It makes it easier to avoid reference to those books which did bring to light what is known about the Zapruder film and its unassailable evidence, none of which he authored.

So, in the "Free Press" of April 12 he <sup>wrote</sup> that the copy of the film "Life" had given Garrison in a compromise agreement when he had subpoenaed the original, is "an excellent first-generation color reprint." This must be reassuring news to "Life", which knows better than anyone else how <sup>untrue</sup> each of these characterizations is.

It is not ~~an~~ "excellent", it is poor; it is not "first generation", it is a bastard, copied <sup>d</sup> from more than one non-original "original". And it is not even complete.

Mark has ready experts to attest to this. One he quoted as "Gary Sanders, an engineer". Gary is a kid enamored of Mark, who got him a <sup>minor</sup> job as an investigator with Garrison. He knows even less about the Zapruder film than Mark. The last I heard of Gary he was applying for a job as a watchman at a Los Angeles-area aircraft plant.

Mark has never been troubled by the destruction of the crucial frames of the Zapruder film, perhaps because he was unaware of it from his own "thorough" investigation until he read it in WHITMORSE. Otherwise, he'd have known

that no copy of the Zapruder film made from the original can include what is missing from the original. It is not this alone that is missing from the copy given Garrison.

To Mark, these permanently-destroyed, irreplaceable frames are merely "missing". He told "Playboy", which interviewed him for its February 1967 issue, not that this was brought to light <sup>only</sup> in "WHITE MEN", but that "the question of the missing frames was brought before one of the Commission's lawyers" (strange this new reluctance to mention Liebeler by name) by a student, Dave Lifton. Liebeler, Mark says, then wrote Henkin. Rather unusual, since, as Mark should have known, it is Liebeler who took Zapruder's testimony, knew these frames were missing, as I had already exposed, and suppressed it with a barely audible "Gops".

If the reader has not by now learned how well Mark knows my work, he soon will.

His "Playboy" version is not quite the same as that morsel of "important new material added" to the reprint of "Rush to Judgment". There what he seems to be talking about is the abandoned Lifton theory that the road sign between Zapruder and the President that for a significant period blocked the President from the lens was moved because it had been struck by a bullet. That it had been removed and replaced, not strangely, was not exposed in "Rush to Judgment" but <sup>again</sup> in "WHITE MEN". No less strangely, it came out in a deposition taken by Wesley Liebeler, with whom Lifton enjoys his own associations. It was ignored by Liebeler and the Warren Commission because, once that sign was removed, no accurate re-enactment of the crime was possible, and the official re-enactment was indispensable to the framing of Oswald.

It is unfortunate that Lifton didn't go out of the theory business after his most original one, that the assassination was actually committed from papier-maché trees that the power structure removed during the night. He explained to me at great length how he had photographic proof of it. That proof is as yet unpublished, as it will forever be.

At no point in this "important new information added" in the reprint

edition of "Push to Judgment"—standard sucker bait to con those with the hardback edition into buying this cheaper one also— does Lark acknowledge that any of the Zapruder film is <sup>destroyed.</sup> ~~missing~~. If he didn't discover it or steal it it just didn't happen.

What good is an exclusive patent if you do not exercise your rights?

Here is that memorable paragraph: from page 367:

Potentially the most complete record of the assassination consists of the 8-mm. motion picture film taken by an amateur photographer, Abraham Zapruder. The Commission published most of the frames from that film but failed to publish frames 208 through 211. A street sign, visible in frame 207 is but partially visible in frame 212, for the photographer panned to photograph the moving limousine. In frame 212, lines of stress seemed to be present on the sign, and these lines change in length and in intensity in succeeding frames. They appear to intersect upon the lower left portion of the sign, but that portion is no longer visible by the time frame 212 was photographed. What the Commission has failed to publish, then—frames 208 to 211—may be photographs of a portion of the sign struck by a bullet, for the lines may be the result of energy transmitted through the sign by the bullet's impact. This question was raised by David Lifton, a graduate engineering student and an associate of the Citizens Committee of Inquiry, with one of the Commission's lawyers. The lawyer was so concerned that he wrote to J. Lee Rankin, the Commission's general counsel, and to Norman Redlich, a Commission attorney. The Commission lawyer wrote: "Our physics major critic explains the marks on the sign as follows: Energy was transmitted to the sign by the impact of the bullet. This energy caused the surface of the sign to refract light waves in a pattern similar to that which actually does appear on the sign. I personally have no way of knowing whether this is correct or not, but it seems plausible to me."

~~Not only were the relevant frames removed before pub-~~

*He then says of the non-existing frames, they were "removed before publication".*

From the top:

This film is not "potentially" the "most complete record of the assassination". There is nothing approximating it in all the evidence.

The Commission didn't just "fail to publish frames 208 through 211" it couldn't. They do not exist in the original, and it is not these alone.

A "street sign" is not "visible in frame 207" and "but partially visible in frame 212", for there is also <sup>unintentionally</sup> no frame 207 as there is no <sup>at all</sup> frame 212. What is identified as frame 207 is an altered version of ~~frame 207~~, with the alteration clearly visible - even to Mark as he looks ~~at~~ just this sign. The mutilation is from the splicing. What is called ~~frame 212~~ is actually the top half of 208 to which the bottom half of ~~212~~ has been spliced.

That ~~ought to be enough~~ <sup>is a fair sample of his</sup> of this kind of expertise, <sup>of the</sup> and <sup>and of "help" to</sup> integrity of writing and research, if the word does not of end, <sup>garrison.</sup>

Another is his statement on page 103 that "examination of the 16mm camera established that it ran at a speed of 18.3 frames per second". Mark's science is brother to Lifton's physics. Examination of the camera <sup>could</sup> not disclose the speed at which it actually exposed film. That <sup>is</sup> possible only by study of the film itself. This study ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> never made - for the government dare not take it. That particular camera, and I own a duplicate, has two settings, normal or 18 frames per second and slow motion, or 48 frames per second. Either is the speed at which it is usually set.

However, unlike most movie cameras, which have fixed settings, this one <sup>has a sliding</sup> ~~change is~~ control. The barest pressure of the finger on the control can shift it from one speed to the other. The motion is so slight it escapes the eye. So, although it is extremely unlikely that it happened, the speed at which this model of camera exposes film can be varied from about 18 frames to about 48 frames per second.

Despite the advertising accreditation of his scholarship by Holt, there is no alteration of this fact possible, as it is also impossible to state how rapidly that camera exposed film during the assassination by "examination" <sup>of</sup>

of the camera.

The different version ~~of~~ offers on page 281 is no more accurate:

"The FBI laboratory and the Bell ~~Telephone~~ <sup>Howell</sup> Company established in ~~separate~~ <sup>Depruder's</sup> tests that the film ran through ~~the~~ camera at the speed of approximately 18.3 frames per second."

WHITREWSH II about the camera and the handling of evidence that FBI allegedly failed the Bureau in its government  
Mark read his sources here with no less than his customary care <sup>for the FBI</sup> <sup>in the FBI</sup>

These tests were merely of the rate at which the camera ran when it was held at

the "normal" setting and do not establish the speed at which the camera ran during

the assassination at "slow motion". They make no mention of the variable speed <sup>that is possible, nor does the provision Mark who, remember, did it all - all by himself!</sup>

Having decided that the Depruder film shows the president being

simultaneously driven to the rear and to his left by the so-called fatal shot, Mark is unhappy with any question of his error. He has obtained <sup>ing</sup> <sup>fact or wife</sup> <sup>fact and</sup> who dare question the holder of the monopoly patent?

On page 118 he quotes <sup>accurately</sup> <sup>the accuracy of</sup> "Rush to Judgment" (read "orecle"):

"When the bullet struck the President's head, as one can see from the photographs, he <sup>thrown to his left and toward the rear (with his arms outstretched).</sup> was thrown to his left and toward the rear of the limousine." In the single

accurate reference to his own book, page 36 (there is nothing relevant on <sup>cited</sup> pages 4-5), he actually is much more specific. On page 127 he cites the

reproductions of the stills from this movie in exhibit Volume 18, an indeterminate <sup>1 up p 22</sup> number beginning on page 70, as authority for this statement, "This film ~~dras~~ <sup>re-</sup> <sup>ally</sup> shows dramatically that when the bullet struck the President's head it drove him instantly and forcefully to the left and to the rear".

Mark insists that the action is first <sup>both</sup> <sup>leftward and</sup> <sup>rearward</sup>, and these are parts of a single action. He conceives this to be proof of the shot coming from the rear of the grassy knoll.

(He also claims a patent on the <sup>designated</sup> use of the word "grassy knoll" based on his having <sup>not</sup> familiarized himself with first-day, wire-service copy. This patent, if he chooses to exercise it, he will have to contend <sup>not</sup> with <sup>tolerant competitors</sup> ~~competent writers~~ but with patent wire services. However, there is apparently no patent Mark does not claim.)



One the reader understands how difficult patents are to come by in this field, how impossible to enjoy a copyright, as Mark has so abundantly demonstrated with my own, he can better understand Mark's un<sup>w</sup>giveness on learning that one of the most patents he holds is on error. The assassination just didn't happen that way, the Teppuder film doesn't show it that way, and Mark owns the copyright on what didn't happen and the film doesn't show.

Having gone to all this trouble to establish falsehood as fact, a ~~monopoly~~ monopoly previously enjoyed by the Warren Commission and its apologists, Mark was perhaps understandably ~~peevish~~ peevish (a Free Press" description would probably be more precise, if less acceptable elsewhere) when I interrupted one of his fillibusters on a Washington TV show on which he was my guest the night of June 4, 1968. Or at least I thought he was my guest until he started his customary uncredited use of my material as his.

It would have been difficult to have avoided proving him wrong before that audience, had I then the disposition, and, having just read so much of my own ~~unpublished~~ <sup>purloined</sup> writing in "A Citizen's Dissent" I was not so disposed, for earlier in the series of seven shows ~~I had gone into just this part of the~~ I had gone into just this part of the film. When I had finally persuaded even ~~him~~ <sup>Mark</sup> that he was wrong, his indignation was mighty. What difference did it make if the President did not go ~~xxxxx~~ <sup>back and left</sup> at the same time? The Commission was wrong anyway, wasn't it?

The truth, as any reasonably careful examination of the excellent color slides in the National Archives shows (remember that Holt Fleckery about all Mark's original discoveries in this very same National Archives?) is that the President is driven backward with incredible force. Very rapidly in motion, but with painful exquisite slowness if studied on the slides, he then pivots counterclockwise. It is only after doing this that he falls to the left, onto Mrs. Kennedy.

And there is, dear reader, a difference. Mark uses the question "what difference does it make?" rather more often than single-minded devotion

(by the government.)

to truth warrents. He pulled the same line when, on the "Minority Report" show I proved that another picture, <sup>one of a number taken by AP photo order James W. Aronson</sup> was altered. The line is more properly Liebler's, and he also used it about the same picture, which he also entered into evidence in corrupted form. The difference is that where the president without doubt was hit from the front, he need not have been hit from the point mark postulates, <sup>no does the Zapruder film prove he was-</sup>

The difference is also between truth and falsehood, and, particularly when the subject is a Presidential assassination and its official investigation, that should be an ever more important difference than it usually is.

In any event, this should be enough to establish just how much Mark knows about the Zapruder film, the most important single piece <sup>available</sup> of evidence, and just how much real "help" he is to Garrison.

Mark, in other areas, is a genuine expert on help. Mostly it is on helping himself to ~~what is that~~ the property of others. Because I called him a crook to begin with and also proved it to begin with, I think it would be unfair to leave the impression that this is an infrequent, temporary aberration with him or that he is really a clever crook.

It is not infrequent and he is not good at it. He might be if he really tried. I think he doesn't care. On that same TV show, when I tried to credit someone who had done original work in another area and postulated its <sup>e</sup> ~~misuse~~ improper use without credit, Mark was explicit in justifying literary thievery ~~by~~ others. It can safely be assumed he extends the same right to himself. Whether or not he ~~xxx~~ claims the right, he does exercise it. In most cases this is difficult to establish, for the same source can be consulted and quoted.

For example, although it would have helped "Back to Judgement" no end, Mark was blissfully unaware of the pretty rotten trick played by the FBI with Mrs. Carolyn Arnold's evidence that could have proved Oswald was not even on the sixth floor at the time of the assassination. After I published it in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITE MEN and reprinted the facsimiles from the appendix of that book for <sup>store</sup> ~~count~~ displays, he stole it. <sup>(pp. 85-9)</sup> ~~Also~~ doing, he got his footnotes

(p. 270)

crossed. Are y'listenin', Wesley Liebeler?

Next page, next incident, same thing-save that the footnotes are not in error-just impressively redundant. In a single short paragraph there are four repetitious footnotes, which, of course, swell the total ~~and make~~ <sup>more</sup> the plagiarism <sup>and make it</sup> seem more impressive. This one deals with Dallas policeman Harrison L. Baker. All of it was available for "Rush to Judgement" and, complete as it is and thorough as Mark's work indubitable is, it simply is not there. Had he included it in "Rush to Judgement", which he most assuredly would have had he known about it, that part dealing with where Oswald was at the time of the assassination ~~would have been more impressive~~ <sup>would have been more</sup> persuasive.

We can ~~miss~~ <sup>miss</sup> these things. I had not noted it for inclusion in my own first book, and when I did, I had missed it in the Commission's printed evidence and saw it in the files. So, despite his publisher's almost incessant tooting (with anyone else there'd be no need for the qualification, but Mark can tolerate more than ~~most~~ <sup>additional</sup>), Mark, too, was imperfect. The difference is that whereas Mark missed it for ~~this~~ <sup>this</sup> first book, he read WHITE WASH II

(A few illustrations from Thompson's book are on pages 40, 63, 64, 89, 112, 171, 180 and 234. Like Lane and for the same purpose, to claim what otherwise he could not and to hide his thievery, Thompson lists the appearance of the books to which he added but conjecture and knowing error, in this sequence: "Inquest", "Rush to Judgement", "Whitewash" Those other books that appeared before his, WHITEWASH II, OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, and PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, from which he also cribbed without inhibition, he pretends have no existence-pp. viii-ix. <sup>and yet</sup> ~~But~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~wife~~ <sup>wife</sup> Epstein ~~helped~~ <sup>helped</sup> from ~~Oslandie!~~)

deep and sincere belief that he ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> the subject and the field, and ~~xxxx~~

with the certain instinct of the rabbit puncher, attributed it to me. <sup>He got a pretty good sized curve from young.</sup>

Before we analyze these two cases, a word of mitigation for Mark.

<sup>Literary</sup> ~~These two~~ <sup>fingerings</sup> are in ~~xxxxxx~~ his response to the series of

(p. 270).  
crossed. Are y'listenin', Wesley Liebeler?

Next page, next incident, same thing-seve that the footnotes are not in error-just impressively redundant. In a single short paragraph there are four repetitious footnotes, which, of course, swell the total ~~work~~ <sup>and make it</sup> the plagiarism seem more impressive. This one deals with Dallas policemen Harrison L. Baker. All of it was available for "Rush to Judgement" and, complete as it is and thorough as Mark's work indubitable is, it simply is not there. Had he included it in "Rush to Judgement", which he most assuredly would have had he known about it, that part dealing with where Oswald was at the time of the assassination <sup>ould</sup> have been more ~~impressive~~ persuasive.

We can ~~all~~ <sup>miss</sup> these things. I had not noted it for inclusion in my own first book, and when I did, I had missed it in the Commission's printed evidence and saw it in the files. So, despite his publisher's almost indecent touting (with anyone else there'd be no need for the qualification, but Mark can tolerate more than ~~just~~ <sup>additional</sup>), Mark, too, was imperfect. The difference is that whereas Mark missed it for ~~this~~ <sup>his</sup> first book, he read WHITE ASH II prior to his second and ~~picked~~ <sup>picked</sup> it up from there, without credit.

For Mark as for other mortals, this is stealing. He thinks it is both right and his right. If he is not unique—for example, Joseph Thompson did it in <sup>1</sup> ~~more concentrated form~~ <sup>"Six Scenes in Dallas" where</sup> ~~all of his footnotes reading, "according to a~~ <sup>document recently discovered in the archives" actually meant</sup> <sup>according to</sup> what I lefted from "WHITE ASH II"—he is more ~~and~~ sanctimonious.

Mark has a little twist of righteous indignation he propagandizes throughout the country. <sup>privately</sup> I had cited several of his swift stealings to others working in the field. He instinctively took what is true of him, the deep and sincere belief that he ~~owns~~ <sup>owns</sup> the subject and the field, and ~~xxxx~~ with the certain instinct of the rabbit puncher, attributed it to me. <sup>He got a pretty good sized can of beans from you.</sup>

Before we analyze these two cases, a word of mitigation for Mark. <sup>literary</sup> ~~literary~~ These two <sup>lightfingerings</sup> are in ~~xxxxxx~~ his response to the series of

(p. 270).

crossed. Are y'listenin', Wasley Liebelor?

Next page, next incident, same thing-~~save~~ that the footnotes are not in error-just impressively redundant. In a single short paragraph there are four repetitious footnotes, which, of course, swell the total ~~make~~ <sup>and make it</sup> the plagiarism seem more impressive. This one deals with Dallas policeman Garrison L. Baker. All of it was available for "Rush to Judgement" and, complete as it is and thorough as Mark's work indubitable is, it simply is not there. Had he included it in "Rush to Judgement", which he most assuredly would have had he known about it, that part dealing with where Oswald was at the time of the assassination ~~ould~~ have been more ~~impressive~~ persuasive.

We can ~~all~~ and do ~~not~~ miss these things. I had not noted it for inclusion in my own first book, and when I did, I had missed it in the Commission's printed evidence and saw it in the files. So, despite his publisher's almost indecent touting (with anyone else there'd be no need for the qualification, but Mark can tolerate more than ~~just~~), Mark, too, was imperfect. The difference is that whereas Mark missed it for ~~this~~ first book, he read WHITE ASH II prior to his second and <sup>stole</sup> picked it up from there, ~~without credit~~.

John's  
Thompson  
his book  
180, was

For Mark as for other mortals, this is stealing. He thinks it is both right and his right. If he is not unique-for example, Josiah Thompson did it in "Six Scenes in Dallas" <sup>where</sup> in ~~more concentrated form~~, all of his footnotes reading, "according to a document recently discovered in the archives" actually means <sup>approximately</sup> "according to what I lifted from WHITE ASH II"-he is more ~~and~~ sanctimonious.

Mark has a little twist of righteous indignation he propagandizes throughout the country. <sup>privately</sup> I had cited several of his swifty stealings to others working in the field. He instinctively took what is true of him, the deep and sincere belief that he ~~owns~~ <sup>owns</sup> the subject and the field, and ~~xxxx~~ with the certain instinct of the rabbit puncher, attributed it to me. <sup>He got a pretty good sized laugh from you.</sup>

Before we analyze these two cases, a word of mitigation for Mark. <sup>literary</sup> These two ~~lightfingerings~~ are in ~~xxxx~~ his response to the series of

four CBS hour-long "special" TV apologies for the government. CBS also plagiarized, including the entire idea, which I had earlier proposed to them and they had permanently and forever rejected, in writing. The difference between my proposal and their performance is slight: I had not considered a dishonest job.

Here I think it also fair to note that Mark is not one to refuse all credits. First, he is shrewd enough to know he has to include some. He credits Ray Marcus, who has done excellent and important work but had not written a competitive book. And Marcus is his good friend who also helps him mightily in California. However, he never credits <sup>imaginative</sup> Lillian Castellano, who ~~tried~~ tried to give him very good material, free, that Mark didn't have sense enough to use. Lillian and I had separately and independently, discovered <sup>official</sup> ~~some~~ <sup>some of</sup> misreadings of (the photographic evidence, as Marcus and I also had. Of course, Lillian also can not perform the service for Mark that Ray does.

So, when Mark is trying to clobber CBS for its dishonesty and he knows they, too, have lifted from WHITEASH, he is happier pretending he doesn't know than in admitting the possibility anyone could ~~find~~ here on page 108 he discusses the CBS belief that the shaking of the Supruder camera was caused by what <sup>Supruder</sup> had seen and is an additional proof that the President had been shot earlier than the official ~~fact~~ fiction permitted, <sup>Mark</sup> repeats the CBS false credit that is to a two-year later source. Mark and CBS both read that, in a much more complete context, near the bottom of page 49 of WHITEASH. There is an additional difference: CBS read it much earlier than Mark, in the limited edition to which Mark had no access of which I know. CBS had the two top executives of the "specials" department read it before rejecting the idea - and the need <sup>B/</sup> for paying for it,

*and foregoing this additional misstatement (to now do any thing that he chose. He chose is chosen.)*

Mark had it easy in his palming of what I had discovered with Mrs. Arnold. I had also put the entire story together for him. That <sup>single</sup> part of this chapter of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEASH (pages 74ff) is longer than <sup>many</sup> ~~most~~ of his chapters. It is pretty complete. Here is the real story:

In the course of framing Oswald, the Commission sent the FBI back to the Texas School Book Depository Building for the umpteenth time in March, 1964, to get signed statements from each of the employees. This included Mrs.

Carolyn Arnold. In no case does the file contain the original signed statements, <sup>for a reason the</sup> as the ~~WALKER~~ Baker incident illuminates. In each case it is <sup>a retyped copy. On all other cases, these</sup> ~~the~~ version not photocopied, which is <sup>are probably accurate,</sup> faster and much cheaper. <sup>Elsewhere photostats of the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~original~~ <sup>original</sup> ~~statements~~ <sup>statements</sup> ~~written~~ <sup>written</sup> by the FBI, said before the witnesses signed them.

*are photostats,*  
*the*  
*original*  
*statements*  
*written*  
*by the*  
*FBI,*  
*said*  
*before*  
*the*  
*witnesses*  
*signed*  
*them.*

<sup>"SIGNED"</sup> Mrs. Arnold's statement was published by the Commission because it was <sup>it was drafted with this in mind and includes what is necessary for that purpose. It omits all else.</sup> necessary to the frameup. The key line here is "I did not see Lee Harvey Oswald at the time President Kennedy was shot". She also says that she left the building at a "about 12:25 a.m." and does not remember seeing any stranger. She was "in front of the building".

When I printed this statement by facsimile in <sup>the appendix of</sup> ~~REPORT ON THIS MATTER~~ I did not give its source. Instead, I referred to the text, where the source, Volume 22, page 634, is given. Mark merely incorrectly assumed that it came from the same source as the earlier FBI report of an interview, <sup>likewise</sup> printed in facsimile on my preceding, facing page. ~~THIS REPORT~~ This report I had retrieved from official oblivion in File 5, where it is page 41. This earlier interview with Mrs. Arnold <sup>unbags the cat</sup> ~~lets the cat out of the bag~~. She saw Oswald as she was leaving the building. He was in it, near the front door, but inside it, adjacent to the warehouse doors that are close to the main, front entrance. Oswald, quite obviously, could not have been at that ~~a~~ sixth-floor window ready to knock off the President and on the first floor ready to observe it at one end the same time. So, the ~~the~~ earlier FBI report, <sup>expressed a part of</sup> ~~is indispensable~~ to the frameup, merely lies in quoting Mrs. Arnold. She did not see this report, which is not a statement by her and did not require her signature. Therefore the agents could get away with lying. They misrepresented the time from almost the moment of the assassination to "a few minutes before 12:15". Even then, the Commission ignored this viewing of Oswald where its

*the appendix of*  
*REPORT ON THIS MATTER*  
*I did not give its source.*  
*Instead, I referred to the text,*  
*where the source,*  
*Volume 22, page 634, is given.*  
*Mark merely incorrectly assumed that it came*  
*from the same source as the earlier FBI report of an interview,*  
*likewise*  
*printed in facsimile on my preceding, facing page.*  
*THIS REPORT*  
*This report I had retrieved from official oblivion in File 5, where it is page 41.*  
*This earlier interview with Mrs. Arnold*  
*unbags the cat*  
*lets the cat out of the bag.*  
*She saw Oswald as she was leaving the building.*  
*He was in it, near the front door,*  
*but inside it, adjacent to the warehouse doors that are close to the main, front entrance.*  
*Oswald, quite obviously, could not have been at that*  
*a sixth-floor window ready to knock off the President and on the first floor*  
*ready to observe it at one end the same time.*  
*So, the the earlier FBI report,*  
*expressed a part of*  
*is indispensable*  
*to the frameup, merely lies in quoting Mrs. Arnold.*  
*She did not see this report, which is not a statement by her and did not require her signature.*  
*Therefore the agents could get away with lying.*  
*They misrepresented the time from almost the moment of the assassination to "a few minutes before 12:15".*  
*Even then, the Commission ignored this viewing of Oswald where its*

preconceived and pre-ordained solution to the crime could not tolerate him, on the first floor. Mrs. Arnold was not <sup>called as</sup> a witness. The report ignores her evidence <sup>entirely.</sup>

~~The~~ <sup>These</sup> pivotal things are masked in the second report: first, that Mrs. Arnold saw Oswald as she was leaving the building, ~~at the right~~ correct time, and that she was standing in front of the building and could not have seen Oswald, who, there is every reason to believe, was standing in the doorway behind her, hence out of her sight.

Here is how Mark takes from my writing that part he wanted, to which in this case he did not add any error except in his footnotes: It is from his pages 88 and 89:

before 12:30 PM. An employee of the School Book Depository Building told the FBI on November 26, 1963, that she had left her office on the second floor of the building "to go downstairs and stand in front of the building to view the Presidential Motorcade. As she was standing in front of the building, she stated she thought she caught a fleeting glimpse of Lee Harvey Oswald standing in the hallway between the front door and the double doors leading to the warehouse, located on the first floor. She could not be sure that this was Oswald, but said she felt it was."<sup>65</sup> In a subsequent signed statement which she executed for the same agency, Mrs. Arnold said she "left the Texas School Book Depository Building at about 12:25 PM, November 22, 1963."<sup>66</sup> If Mrs. Arnold saw Oswald on the first floor of the De-

\* In the statement of November 26, which is not signed and which the witness did not have an opportunity to see in order to verify its accuracy, the FBI agent who conducted the interview said Mrs. Arnold "believed the time [she saw Oswald] to be a few minutes before 12:15."<sup>67</sup>

**DID OSWALD SHOOT THE PRESIDENT?**

pository, near the front entrance, only minutes before the assassination, then clearly he was not, as CBS stated, "on the sixth floor" at that time.<sup>68</sup> The significance of Mrs. Arnold's comment is appreciated when placed alongside the testimony of the Commission's witness who claimed that the man he saw fire from the sixth-floor window had been there for about seven minutes before he fired.<sup>69</sup>

(When she saw Oswald) to be a few minutes before 12:15".

Mark has a real ~~hangup~~ hangup on footnotes. He thinks they lend an air of authoritativeness. Here he has one reading:



Telling immediately Mark says:

A well-known photograph taken during the assassination, which shows the persons standing at the front entrance of the Book Depository Building, may provide corroboration for Mrs. Arnold's observation.<sup>70</sup> This picture depicts an individual who bears a striking resemblance to Lee Harvey Oswald.<sup>71</sup> The Commission alleged that this individual was another employee of the company, Billy Lovelady, but it failed to resolve substantial contradictions in the evidence relating to that question.<sup>72</sup> CBS could have made a positive contribution to the fund of information now available regarding Oswald's whereabouts by interviewing Mrs. Arnold and Billy Lovelady, but neither witness appeared on the program.<sup>73</sup>



*So could Mark, if he had known about it.*

Now it happens that the FBI took pictures of Lovelady in the shirt it said he said he wore to the assassination. It has the broadest stripes in the world. It was forced to take this picture, belatedly, by Mark's enemy, the smaller man whose nose he was also going to punch but never got around to, Jones Harris. Mark knew the whole story because he had been going ~~around~~ trying to get a picture of Lovelady and, then finally given some *by*

It seems that if he had known of the existence of this picture when he was in Dallas, he would not have gone to the considerable trouble and expense of unsuccessfully trying to take a Lovelady picture. The General Services Administration charged by only ~~\$1.50~~<sup>25</sup> for the print I have. However, this

~~that~~ could have been one of those "never-before-seen" pictures Holt advertised but didn't print. The entire sequence of proper pictures is on the last page and the inside back cover of HITS BASH II. Here there can be a reason for Mark's reluctance ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> tell ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> entire story, <sup>(if he knew it, which is unlikely) for it</sup> includes the credit I gave to Jones ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> I had also used ~~it~~ <sup>these pictures</sup> on the Joe Fynes Show in late 1967.

*A Mark*

~~He~~ missed the boat in lecturing CBS on what it could have done, no doubt because his work is so "complete" Rather than not interviewing either of the Lovelady's, CBS saw them both. It dared not use what it got. <sup>A CBS producer</sup> Bob Richter had asked ~~me~~ permission to use my Lovelady material and I sent it to him. <sup>He</sup> then went to Dallas and did exactly what I alone had specified the government should have done, asked Lovelady to put on the shirt he was wearing that day, stand in the same spot in the doorway, and be photographed.

Tolling immediately Mark says:

A well-known photograph taken during the assassination, which shows the persons standing at the front entrance of the Book Depository Building, may provide corroboration for Mrs. Arnold's observation.<sup>70</sup> This picture depicts an individual who bears a striking resemblance to Lee Harvey Oswald.<sup>71</sup> The Commission alleged that this individual was another employee of the company, Billy Lovelady, but it failed to resolve substantial contradictions in the evidence relating to that question.<sup>72</sup> CBS could have made a positive contribution to the fund of information now available regarding Oswald's whereabouts by interviewing Mrs. Arnold and Billy Lovelady, but neither witness appeared on the program.<sup>73</sup>



*So could Mark, if he had known about it*

Now it happens that the FBI took pictures of Lovelady in the shirt it said he said he wore to the assassination. It has the broadest stripes in the world. It was forced to take this picture, belatedly, by Mark's enemy, the smaller man whose nose he was also going to punch but never got around to, Jones Harris. Mark knew the whole story because he had been going crazy trying to get a picture of Lovelady and, then finally given some *by* a young woman college student, who had gotten seeds of them, went all around New York making a big deal of his perspicacity is doing the impossible. Jerry Agel printed one of these, meaninglessly, in his ~~monthly~~ monthly BOOKS.

*did and it was*

Mark may have had the FBI Lovelady picture, he does cite the file in which it appears in "Rush to Judgment", typically, missing the essence. *IHSBCT* ~~that~~ could have been one of those "never-before-seen" pictures Holt advertised but didn't print. The entire sequence of proper pictures is on the last page and the inside back cover of HITSASH II. Here there can be a reason for Mark's reluctance <sup>to</sup> tell ~~the~~ the entire story, <sup>(if he knew it, which is unlikely) for it</sup> includes the credit I gave to Jones. ~~I had also used it on the Joe Pynes Show in late 1967.~~ <sup>from those pictures TV</sup>

*Mark*

He missed the boat in lecturing CBS on what it could have done, no doubt because his work is so "complete" Rather than not interviewing either of the Loveladys, CBS saw them both. It dared not use what it got. *A CBS producer* (Bob Richter had asked permission to use my Lovelady material and I sent it to him. He then went to Balks and did exactly what I alone had specified the government should have done, asked Lovelady to put on the shirt he was wearing that day, stand in the same spot in the doorway, and be photographed.

~~First~~ Mrs. Lovelady phoned me to report that the FBI had not asked her husband to wear the shirt he had on November 22, 1963 and then to say he had thereafter worn it only once because she had put it away. That once was when Richter photographed him.

*The details of her call are in photographic transcript (p. 294).*

That shirt is just as unlike the shirt on the man in the doorway in the Altgens picture ~~is~~ cited above <sup>And this</sup> incidentally, is the same picture <sup>about which Mark</sup> he had protested, "what difference does it make" <sup>proved</sup> about when I ~~made~~ its alteration by the Warren Commission, which does not have the original and never printed an uncorrupted copy.) I know. I have the pictures CBS suppressed,

*The largest black and red squares I have ever seen in a shirt.*

complete with Ben Richter in the foreground, and in full and very vivid color. It has The Baker affair, also lifted in apparent answer to CBS, is on page 90 of "A Citizens' Dissent":



*Handwritten scribble or signature, possibly 'Z...'*

... floor. If, for example, Oswald was not "emptyhanded" but, as the original reports had it, had been drinking a Coca-Cola—there was a vending machine in the lunchroom where the encounter occurred—then he almost certainly could not have left the sixth-floor window after firing the shots, hid the rifle on the sixth floor, run down to the second floor, entered the lunchroom, operated the machine, waited for the bottle to be dispensed, opened it and been "drinking a Coke" when stopped by Baker.<sup>80</sup> There is evidence that indicates that Oswald was "drinking a Coke" at that time.<sup>81</sup>

When Baker testified before the Commission on March 25, 1964, he claimed that Oswald "had nothing" in his hands at the time.<sup>82</sup> Subsequently, however, Baker was asked—for unexplained reasons—to submit a handwritten "voluntary signed statement" regarding certain aspects of his activities on November 22.<sup>83</sup> "On the second floor, where the lunch room is located," Baker wrote, "I saw a man standing in the lunch room, drinking a Coke."<sup>84</sup> The words "drinking a Coke" were subsequently scratched out and the change was initialed "MLB" by the patrolman.<sup>85</sup> If Oswald was "emptyhanded" when Baker saw him, then why should such a mistake occur in a handwritten statement so many months later?<sup>86</sup>

A reasonable answer seems to be that Oswald may have been "drinking a Coke" when stopped by Baker shortly after the shooting on November 22. CBS, however, which declared that its conclusions were undoubtedly the most "reasonable" that could be reached, declined to explore this sensitive area.<sup>87</sup>

~~Although~~ This is much less complete than my handling, from which ~~Mark~~ simply took it. <sup>Baker's</sup> I went into all the other contradictory versions of the same encounter by Baker, <sup>he</sup> never once said what the Commission wanted to use in the Report except when he testified. In every case, he said the opposite. (WHITE PAPER II 11/2/64) entire chapter called "Baker's Denial". It concludes (page 41) with the facsimile reproduction of <sup>this</sup> his handwritten

stand as. This is not Baker's handwriting, as Mark says, but is that of the FBI agent. The FBI preferred writing the statement because they gave more control over their contents statement. <sup>60</sup> ~~What was not included is all to show that~~

Because Mark didn't have space for-and just didn't dare steal all of my Baker investigation, I think it may interest the reader to know what he neither says nor implied by the phrase "for unexplained reasons" relating to Baker's handwritten statement. The Commission couldn't explain it. They would not have anyway, for that would have been fatal. However, on September 25, 1964, the date of that statement, the report was coming off the presses. <sup>The Commission</sup> therefore could not have explained what it didn't dare acknowledge had it been insensely disposed to.

Here is Marks real source on the Baker statement, from WITNESS II, which was written about the time his first book appeared and was available only a few months later. I edited it for space reasons. Mark cites nothing from what I edited out:

Dallas, Texas September 23, 1964

I, Morrison L. Baker, do hereby furnish the voluntary signed statement to Richard J. Burnett who has identified himself to me as a Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

On the second <sup>floor</sup> ~~at the floor~~ <sup>MLB</sup>, where the lunch room is located, I saw a man standing in the lunch room, <sup>MLB</sup> drinking a ~~coffee~~. He was alone in the lunch room at the time.

and correct to the best of my knowledge. I have initialled each page and each correction.

Morrison L. Baker

Witness  
Richard J. Burnett Special Agent, F.B.I., 9/23/64, Dallas  
Bobby W. Hargis 1082 Dallas Police Dept.

Again, there seem to be little need to continue this as indefinitely. I do not in any way exaggerate in calling him a crook. I might have used such a description as "wholesale", but, tolerant as I am, and having in silence accepted this for so long, I refrained, did I not?

He is not always this smooth, however, and perhaps my silence is <sup>responsible.</sup> ~~responsible~~. Perhaps, ~~perhaps~~ <sup>unintentionally,</sup> I encouraged him to carelessness, in the happy thought I'd forever be silent. In any event, on one of the other ~~occasions~~ <sup>occasions</sup> all too frequent where he had flubbed the obvious ~~again~~ he was careless. It is this one that I pushed in his face on Washington TV the night of June 4, 1968.

In the third chapter of "A Citizens' Dissent" Mark accounts what had for years been old hat, interservice rivalry. This is from page 14:

~~Let it might have been something unpleasant.~~  
 The reports of responsible journalists regarding the witnesses' reluctance to talk receive corroboration from the witnesses and from an additional and unexpected source as well. The interservice rivalry between the FBI and Secret Service was very much in evidence in the hours following the President's death. FBI agents, in an effort to trace the alleged assassination weapon, arrived at Klein's Sporting Goods in Chicago, conducted their interviews and left before the Secret Service agents located the store. When the special agents of the Secret Service called upon Klein's, they were at first unable to secure any information, for the relevant witness informed them that he had been instructed by the FBI agents not to talk to anyone.<sup>19</sup> The Secret Service agents were called upon to explain that they had priority and that the FBI agents could not have expected their injunction to apply to Secret Service interviews. Very few journalists, even if they had wished to pursue the investigation, could have been as persuasive as the somewhat beleaguered investigators from the Secret Service. Governmental initiative designed to prevent the publication of a

¶ Unlike most of the pages, which fairly crawl with unnecessary, showy footnotes, at this point there is but one in more than three pages. Footnote 19 cites the alleged source of this paragraph. It reads, "See index to Basic Source Materials in possession of Commission, National Archives".

On page 97, <sup>in the text,</sup> Mark again refers to the "index of the basic course materials relied upon by the Commission", with a footnote reading, similarly, "National Archives, Index of Basic Source materials in Possession of Commission", which does <sup>swell the force, if nothing else.</sup>

The text is snide: "Since Severeid (Mark is again after CRS, and it is Eric Severeid) is stationed in Washington, D.C., he might easily have journeyed to the National Archives and asked for the index to the basic source materials relied on by the Commission".

	<u>Report</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>City</u>
	22. FBI	McGuire	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Savannah
X	23. FBI	Murphy	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Oklahoma City
	24. FBI	Sweeney	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Mobile
	25. FBI	Twiner	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Cleveland
	26. FBI	Cameron	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Albuquerque
	27. FBI	Reid	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	El Paso
	28. FBI	O'Flaherty	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	New York
	29. FBI	Larkin	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Boston, Mass.
X	30. FBI	Brown	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Portland
X	31. FBI	Twiner	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Cleveland
	32. FBI	Lawrence	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Memphis
	33. FBI	McGinnis	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Los Angeles
X	34. FBI	Sanders	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	Knoxville
	35. FBI	Rushing, Jr.	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 1/63	St. Louis
X	36. FBI	Thompson	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Milwaukee
X	37. FBI	Hutchison	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Louisville
X	38. FBI	Carlson	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Minneapolis
	39. FBI	Freeman	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Las Vegas
X	40. FBI	Wilson	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Buffalo
	41. FBI	Fletcher	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Indianapolis
X	42. FBI	Johnson	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Jacksonville
X	43. FBI	Harris	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Charlotte
	44. FBI	Street	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Kansas City
X	45. FBI	Cooper, Jr.	Oswald, Internal Security-Russia .	12/ 2/63	Detroit

*promised and advised.*

Severeid would have wasted his time so valuable to CNS. There is  
 no ~~index~~ such index. <sup>Serious</sup> Had Mark done any work at all in the National Archives, <sup>as he</sup>  
 or <sup>as</sup> he said at attention while he was there, or understood what he saw  
 if and when he saw it - done anything but take the guided tour - he could not  
 help knowing that the greatest single <sup>barrier</sup> ~~obstacle~~ to access to the Commission's  
 basic materials is the lack of an index. To assure this problem, Howard P.  
 Willens, one of the Department of Justice's contributions to the Commission's  
 staff and the staff director, launched an economy wave. <sup>Every</sup> Every possible penny  
 was pinched when John Kennedy was <sup>run</sup> down and his successors investigated  
 how they came into power, <sup>Two</sup> ~~is~~ is what the Warren Commission really did, and  
 in so doing <sup>it</sup> legitimized the Johnson administration <sup>Willens</sup> ~~and~~ ended the proper-name  
 index that had been commenced. Only Mark's peculiar kind of ~~"~~ "thoroughness"  
 in his work and "completeness" of his examinations denied him this, the most  
 elemental knowledge required for the simplest work in that enormous literary  
 quagmire that is the Commission's files - those not still suppressed as well as  
 those that are.

That he was referring to is a list, <sup>meaningless</sup> ~~meaningless~~ gobbledegook,  
 133 pages of deception, misrepresentation, <sup>falsification</sup> ~~obfuscation~~ and obfuscation.  
 For example, the first complete page, the second, typical of too many, consists  
 entirely of listings of files described ~~without~~ without meaning or accuracy  
 as "Oswald, Internal Security@Russia". Some of these have no relationship with  
 either Oswald or Russia - probably most do - I haven't checked them all. Some  
 are on the more virulent fascists and I quote them extensively in ~~my~~  
 unpublished book COUP D'ETAT.

Had ~~Severeid~~ Severeid heeded Mark's advice and had he also read his mind  
 and understood that when Mark speaks of the ~~non-existent~~ non-existent index he ~~really~~  
 really intends the <sup>meaningless</sup> list, what would he have found? Not what  
 Mark directs him to, evidence of suppression, for that word or any substitute,  
 like the official euphemism, "withheld", does not appear once in all 133  
 pages. Somebody would still have had to tell Severeid what Mark says he

would have seen for himself. The yokels eat this kind of writing up and Mark is a specialist, but it does not help establish truth or tell the people what really happened.

~~That the suppression~~ Moreover, for a high-priced, busy man like Beversid, had Mark's recommendation been at all sensible, it would also have been <sup>Doobish</sup> ~~entirely unnecessary~~, for it is not necessary to ~~the~~ go the Archives. The government does not keep that tabular frivolity under wraps. A messenger with eight dollars, certainly less costly to CBS than its star performer's time, would have returned with a microfiche of the whole thing. For \$37.00 the government sells Xerox copies. It suits Mark's purpose to imply that even the sweat of the file clerks is ~~classified~~. <sup>secret secret</sup>

~~He~~ has a ~~thing~~ hangup on this suppression bit, too. Not because he understands it but because it is good propaganda and he once devised a way to use it to help sell "Rush to Judgment". Holt flew him around the country expensively and extensively. We have quoted his own account of his pilgrimages. At each stop he begged the faithful to join him at some distant date in a picket line around the Archives building to end this awful suppression-and until then to sign petitions. These petitions were not to be sent to the head of the Archives (the wrong person, in any event) but the "Rush to Judgment's" publisher in New York.

Once, when Mark has ~~his~~ indulged his quaint sense of <sup>decency</sup> ~~delicacy~~ almost to my face-he and Gene Jones were in Jerry William's studio at CBS, Chicago, and I, ~~at home,~~ <sup>at home,</sup> was broadcasting by phone, he wound up on this harrangue.

When he finished, I said, "Mark, when you change your ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ picketline to the FBI Building and put J. Edgar Hoover on your signs, I'll lead it with you. As you should know, the Archivist is but a custodian. The suppressions were by the agencies of origin. Most by ~~far~~ <sup>secret files are secret</sup> are classified on Hoover's order. Let me know when you want to picket Hoover so I can be there with you".

At that moment brave, radical-sounding, civil-libertarian, heroic



found he had just the courage required not to sign the Writers' and Editors Protest of the Vietnam war. At that moment also his picketline pitch and his petition-soliciting ended. <sup>was then</sup> Mark is good for clobbering the boys in gowns, not Hoover.

There there is no suppression, his lack of knowledge and his circular concept of self can find it.

So, he has enlightened the work as he alone does with this account of the consequences of interviewing rivalry at Klein's. Only one part of it was not headline at the time of the assassination. Everybody knew the FBI had closed ~~every~~ <sup>three</sup> mouths so could intimidate. It is in "Rush to Judgment". It is not uncharacteristic modesty that <sup>here</sup> ~~prompted~~ <sup>omission of</sup> the customary and often inappropriate sales-pitch reference to the earlier book. It is to hide his consummate incompetence. ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> had been to Klein's without learning or apparently even suspecting what is the key point here: that the FBI foreclosed the Secret Service in its investigation of <sup>the</sup> assassination, a field in which the Secret Service then was in charge, so it is in charge of the President's security.

It's all those nickels and dimes of all the many Americans ~~without~~ without great financial means going to pay for Mark's really expensive travel costs in his "investigation", and with his own firm belief in his own infallibility and omniscience, Mark was not about to cite his own writing as endorsement of his expensive failure.

Being Mark, he just had to cite something. Had he been Josiah Thompson, he'd just have cited the source I in every case cite when I publish. Being Mark he also has no great liking for work, even such easy work as picking up HITCHHIKER II. Not being Mark, I do not bathe the reader's eye in unnecessary footnotes. The reproduction from the suppressed files is on page 39. Here is what it looks like the e, as I edited the original six-page report down to ~~two~~ <sup>two</sup> more important excerpts:

15

At approximately 1:45 p.m., on 11-23-63, Special Agent Tucker arrived at Klein's Sporting Goods and began an interview of William J. Waldman, Vice President. Waldman advised Special Agent Tucker that the FBI had been at his place of business from approximately 10:00 p.m. on 11-22-63, until approximately 5:00 a.m. on 11-23-63 and also that he, Waldman, had given the original microfilm of records pertaining to the mail order sale of the suspected murder weapon to Special Agent Robert J. Dolan, FBI, and that Dolan had allegedly departed Chicago for Washington, D. C. on the morning of 11-23-63 apparently to hand deliver the microfilm to the FBI Laboratory for analysis.

It should be noted at this point that Waldman kept reiterating that he had allegedly been instructed by the FBI not to discuss this investigation with anyone, and it was necessary for Special Agent Tucker and subsequently also Special Agent Griffiths when he joined Special Agent Tucker at Klein's Sporting Goods to point out to Waldman that the U. S. Secret Service has primary jurisdiction in a case of this nature and we had definite interest.

(Excerpt from Secret Service Report of 11/23/63, #CO-2-34030)

Here I give merely the Secret Service identification, not that of the Commission. Here Mark not too lazy or too self-confident to bother reading the text, he'd have had to turn to only the ~~next page~~ <sup>34, the first</sup> of the chapter, to learn that this was from File 87, First folder, Document 108. Had he gotten or merely had to see this document in the archive, he could not have done so without knowing this file identification, so it is clear he did not get his <sup>information</sup> from that source. ~~Though, with an exact identification of his~~ <sup>This is</sup> straight forward incorruptibility, ~~that is what he really seeks to say in his~~ <sup>convoy</sup> report. <sup>false</sup>

<sup>Perhaps</sup> ~~It, however,~~ there are among those who will read this <sup>some</sup> who think it is nonetheless possible that Mark was just careless in all of his references to the non-existing "index" and really meant that list. Is that an applicable footnote? Is there any reference to files, or files, or anything like that, <sup>Some</sup> subject <sup>d/</sup> torture lists an acceptable footnote, a meaningful reference? For them I here reproduce the incomprehensible and utterly meaningless "description of File 87:

*Using that center*

87. Secret Service

Five volumes, submitted by letter of  
Re: Oswald;

1/ 8/64

- (a) SS Control Numbers 40 - 199
- (b) SS Control Numbers 200 - 407
- (c) SS Control Numbers 408 - 472
- (d) SS Control Numbers 474 - 599
- (e) SS Control Numbers 561 - 799

88. Secret Service

Album of Still Photographs reconstruct-

The first line of the listing of File 30 is included to show  
 neither the non-appearing index on the listing list can  
 there is no omission. ~~This cannot be his source, anyway, an index is not a source~~  
 At last, it with a source. ~~Mark does~~ have an "attribution". It is a "printer's error". It's printer  
 It takes even less chutzpah for Mark to steal what I have not yet  
 published, particularly when I ~~went New Orleans~~ <sup>went</sup> to (where he lived and regularly, in New  
 Orleans, ~~at~~ information with which people ~~it~~ <sup>would</sup> not trust him ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> information  
 his undying loyalty to Garrison leaves him either too lazy or too indifferent  
 to gather as <sup>so-called</sup> "unpaid chief investigator". Suggesting as I do here that  
 people ~~trust~~ <sup>by</sup> Mark is not just a nasty crack. ~~His~~ <sup>He</sup> writing had  
 turned Crest Peas, owner of the ~~car~~ <sup>home</sup> on Decatur Street in the French Quarter, where  
 unforgettable drunk on Decatur Street in the French Quarter of New Orleans,  
~~the~~ <sup>Regularity!</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>needed</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>did</sup> flew down to the city in which Mark lived, where it then, with  
 Garrison's investigation going on, was the ideal place to pick up other people's  
 chip and ensnare a little unjustified publicity, <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ a considerable amount  
 of worthwhile information from and through Crest, who became my very helpful  
 friend, and ~~Mark~~ <sup>Mark</sup> / ~~did~~ <sup>did</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>think</sup> ~~there~~ <sup>there</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>were</sup> investigating.  
~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~plum~~ <sup>plum</sup> for the pluckier. ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> ~~tried~~ <sup>tried</sup> it. From what Crest  
 told me, he tossed Mark out. My knowledge comes only from Crest. Mark ~~is~~  
 not bragged about this.

In early April 1968 I was again working in New Orleans. From another  
 man then visiting there, a Bobby Kennedy man who ought to out, with a little  
 effort I learned that the late Senator was afraid to speak out on his brother's  
 murder because "the case already to many guns between Bobby and the white  
 house". Mark learned this from Garrison or his office.

The first time he tried to use it was when he was my guest on that  
 three-hours of  
 Washington TV I had ~~agreed~~ <sup>ad</sup> to turn over to him before I read "A Citizens'  
 Dissent"-before it was out. He had only part of the story, he was deceiving  
 with ~~some~~ <sup>misuse</sup> misuse of that, and he was not helping our side one bit with it.  
 So, although it is not easy, I did stop him and told as much as I then thought  
 safe and proper of the story. I expected to say why Bobby could have been  
 afraid, what his situation would have been as President, and to cite the

specific predictions I had made to Bobby and to his good friend Jess Unruh, Speaker of the California Assembly, that their silence would get them killed.

Mark drank it all in, threatened my nose (why he picks on noses when it is mouths that bring him to book I will never understand), and the very next day began a nationwide swing in which he was well publicized as the source of the story, with this addition, he had, just hours before the tragedy, predicted it on Washington TV!

Mark is as quick to show his appreciation of favors as he is undeviating in ceaseless demonstrations of his usual honor. This night in Washington, June 4, was during the annual convention of the American Book-sellers' Association. The TV date was arranged for his convenience, for he was to make an ABC appearance and that coincided with publication date of his book. I conducted the in-taped interviews for the leading book-and-author radio program, "Author's Roundtable". His publisher had first agreed to purchase time on the show then he backed out. Because the show belongs to *my* friends, he was getting this exposure free. That meant two different shows on 350 radio stations, a total of 700 very good exposures, when the book was fresh. But, while pleading his cause (not for him personally, let me admit) I also declined to <sup>conduct</sup> the interview because I dislike him and feared I would be unfair. He stayed unavailable for it.

I bumped into him when the interview <sup>period</sup> had ended, offered him a ride to the TV station to show him ~~the~~ set fare, and arranged to meet at the office in which the interviews had been conducted, where the tape recorder was. When he was not there at the appointed time I left a note on the door directing <sup>The office steps</sup> him to where we were, the producer of the show, my wife and I. He never showed at either place. At the last minute we left for the TV station, where he told us we had not kept the appointment. I had earlier suggested to the producer that the interview with Mark could still be done at the TV station.

The producer set in the studio, taped the broadcast, including the

"dead air" during commercials, when that was said was not broadcast - which includes his expression of unfriendly intentions toward my nose, and my invitation that he not delay and other interesting non-broadcastable exchanges - and <sup>thus</sup> ~~know~~ the real source of this latest and boldest kleptomania.

After the show she and Mark went to an office to which, from previous experience, I could direct them for the interview. I refused to be present, again in a forced feeling of fairness. It is not ~~at~~ all easy to even want to be fair to Mark. Imagine her shock and dismay when simple, honest, honorable Mark, not having "punched my nose", punched my lines instead, going all through this same story of the guns between Bobby and the White House for all the world as though it were his <sup>e</sup> ~~dictation~~ <sup>his invention</sup> to mention ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> brought it to light, and still-as forever thereafter-with no indication of ~~any~~ <sup>its</sup> source

~~He used it from coast to coast.~~ He used it from coast to coast.

*The White House knows he has stealing a literary property, took credit by name for it and all Mark finds his own kind of honesty his own kind of reward, the kind he prefers to all other, cash and credit neither of which is his due.*

From all of this it <sup>may</sup> ~~can~~ be gathered that I am less than a fan of his. That would be correct. I dislike him. One has to really get to know Mark to know how difficult he makes it not to ~~get impossible~~ <sup>get impossible</sup> for it to be otherwise. That is, unless one knows nothing about the special field of his endeavor. *To know* ~~less~~ <sup>id</sup> with no knowledge, he comes through like a quist, intense, very serious and authoritative man of genuine integrity who has done all the work in the field and with an understandable tolerance permits the intrusions of others who would so like to emulate him. As liars and can men go, Mark is one of the most persuasive.

By now there should be no doubt about how Mark feels about me. It would simply be impossible, <sup>even</sup> for a Mark, to steal as much as he has from me without, if for no other reason to make living with himself more tolerable, generating a full-blown dislike.

So, I encourage the reader to have less concern for gift-bringing Greeks

than Mark Lane posing as ~~xxxxxx~~ my defender or saying something that on the surface seems less than unkind.

Aside from my ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ anonymous appearances in "A Citizens' Dissent", there are three references by name. The first is on page 40, in a footnote. It has for text that is a minor inaccuracy, but he is so subtle in some of his later work in the literary clinics, he may have derived some slight satisfaction from it. His purpose is to praise his own publishers as men of integrity as compared ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the one who reprinted <sup>two of my books</sup> ~~his~~ the comparison serves little purpose, for it would be difficult to find a publisher with less integrity than Dell. The Bodley Head had rejected Congressman Ford's apology for the Warren Report in favor of ~~Mark's~~ <sup>he says</sup> first book. Mark had little to petition here, ~~xxx~~ thus the challenge to The Bodley Head was easy to face. <sup>As much as possible it</sup> ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ they simply declined to publish both sides of the often-bitter controversy. <sup>One might expect a genuine principle to end the present storm of all</sup>

For example, Dell publishes two critical assessments of the Warren Report by Harold Stebbins and a book containing Stebbins for being a scavenger for having written about the case."

Lane, who submitted his book to Dell while it was in hardback and had it rejected, knows that Dell is not publisher of these books, that as the first in the field I also had most difficulty and opened it ~~xx~~ for the Johnny-come-lately's like him by being my own publisher. Dell reprinted the books in pocket editions, without changing a word, without running the risks of initial publication. <sup>One might, however, argue that genuine press freedom requires preservation of all sides, including one's opponents. One might say that nothing to do with a scavenger's habit is it not a lesson able to be attributed for one carrying "suppression"?</sup> The reference to "The Scavengers" is cute, like so much of the smoothie

Lane. That epithet was addressed to him, by name, by Governor Connally, who as he used the word spoke loosely and unfairly. Had Connally changed his <sup>long-</sup> ~~long-~~ consistent practice, comforting for a politician in Lyndon Johnson's stable, of saying that he was told or <sup>what</sup> ~~was~~ expected of him without <sup>first</sup> ~~stating out what~~ ~~xxxxxx~~, as by no ~~one~~ should be without doubt, he could have made a credible case against Lane.

*Side*

*One might, however, argue that genuine press freedom requires preservation of all sides, including one's opponents. One might say that nothing to do with a scavenger's habit is it not a lesson able to be attributed for one carrying "suppression"?*

*Knowing what he has talking about*

Book's "scavenger" is not the most fitting of available epithets, but it was addressed to ~~me~~ <sup>Mark</sup>. The cowardly authors of that literary ass-kissing were afraid to title their book simply "The Scavengers", although this is the way it is referred to, so they added "and the Critics of the Warren Report", making a long title with no subtitle. The very first page of the book begins with direct quotation of Conally calling Lane by name and no one else a "literary scavenger". It is an authentic <sup>but unwarranted</sup> compliment to Mark that these real-live jackals devote a quarter of their book to him. I am not flattered that they give me less than half this attention ~~and are less afraid~~ that part was largely out-of-context quotations of what I had said of the record. This <sup>is</sup> a compliment, but they had to stop. But Mark no longer has his knees free.

First he aims then sneakily on page 108, pretending attack on the former Commission lawyer Joseph A. Ball, big-shoed stuffed-shirt California lawyer. He emphasizes the misspelling of my name from <sup>an unachieved</sup> radio broadcast that was later printed, so though this is Ball's personal error. The half-buttocks apologizes the unbrave Ball that he spell my name correctly. So Mark is using using me first to make petty attack on Ball. This <sup>is</sup> again pretending, he steals the "criticism of ~~Ball's~~ USI Whitehouse correspondent Harrison Smith, that there is somehow something disreputable in a writer owning and living on a farm. It requires less than careful reading to understand that Lane is not really trying to be nice to me <sup>as he writes Ball:</sup>

"I'd like to compare the integrity of the men of the Commission and staff with the integrity of the men that are now writing: Mark Lane; Epstein; Weisburg [*sic*], the chicken farmer from Maryland; Leo Sauvage, the Frenchman."<sup>4</sup> He added, "It seems to me that we start out with a presumption in our favor because the integrity of the men of the Commission must count for something."<sup>5</sup> He said that "some of these people who cast doubts are beneath contempt."<sup>6</sup> He did not mean Harold Weisberg, he said: "Weisburg [*sic*], the chicken farmer, isn't really dishonest; he reasons within the limits of his very limited ability. A few years ago, he suffered a misfortune in which all of his chickens were killed by a sonic boom."<sup>7</sup> Thus far Ball had sought to establish but two points: Weisberg was a chicken farmer and the Commission members and staff were men of integrity.<sup>8</sup> Weisberg raised geese. Low-flying helicopters disturbed them, but it is unlikely that they, the helicopters, ever got up enough speed to break the sound barrier.

There is something clean and honest, something not at all like Mark, when he stands foursquare with the Merriman Smiths, the Joe Balls, the scavenging authors of "The Scavengers", ~~and~~ <sup>and like theirs</sup> his <sup>method, technique</sup> and approach of the Warren Report. Constitutionally, Mark is on the other side. He didn't denied him his natural position.

Mark really wants the reader to believe that Joe Ball is right when he refers to ~~xxxix~~ "the limits of his very limited ability". It is precisely this, no doubt, that ~~compels~~ <sup>not</sup> Ball to confront me in person or in writing, that persuaded him to write crawling letters asking that I not consider him an enemy; precisely this "limited ability" that led me to get Mark, with all his staff and financial assistance, all his underwritten travel and investigative expenses, all his great international exposure, which is an effective way of bringing witnesses forward, and all of his unlimited talents (so many of which have here ~~been~~ <sup>been</sup> delineated), could not find and had to steal from me to use.

Gratuitously, because, after all, does Mark not know everything there is to know about ~~xxxxxxx~~ everything? ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> "corrects" Ball to say "I ~~xxxxx~~ haven't raised chickens but I've raised geese." This is false. I had raised both, geese as a hobby. To develop a real appreciation of the wonderful, human-like qualities of geese it is helpful, to know a Mark Lane. As a chicken raiser, I was officially the best in the country, in competition. Mark is neither that good a liar or that good a crook.

My five winning poultry were ruined by both sonic booms and low-flying military helicopters. This is established in precedent federal-court case in which the decision was affirmed by the Supreme Court and in which, for the first time, the property-owners' rights to his air space is ~~established~~ <sup>established</sup>. ~~The~~ <sup>The</sup> childishness of these two so-called lawyers is lined by their total lack of their own profession and the basic decisions in it.

Mark here thinks he is writing on the Warren Report, where ~~at~~ his

*aside from common law.*



school-boy <sup>ish</sup> fingers - ~~and~~ <sup>not to dignify him</sup> casual gauderies will be ignored because the eminent lawyers will ignore him in any event, or perhaps this has become the way of his life, if it was not <sup>to begin with</sup> ~~distorted~~.

If it is necessary <sup>for</sup> ~~for~~ those read re ~~know~~ <sup>nothing</sup> about aviation, slow-flying helicopters have no capability of <sup>creating</sup> ~~creating~~ sonic booms and Joe Bell didn't say or even suggest anything like it. He was, if anything, less uninformed than his <sup>juvenile-thinking</sup> ~~juvenile-thinking~~ <sup>gandy</sup> critic.

Mark's left-handed ~~misuse~~ <sup>misuse</sup> of the fact that after a career in writing, investigating and intelligence I had gone into semi-retirement on a ~~farm~~ <sup>farm</sup> near Washington and was in a different field of writing at the time of the assassination, like that of Herriman Smith, is his own confession of frustration that there is nothing he can do or say about <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ record.

For all his considerable help from a <sup>me from</sup> ~~large~~ number of people, for all the <sup>very</sup> ~~very~~ important financial ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> personal assistance he had, he has been able to do no <sup>really</sup> ~~really~~ basic work in the field, to bring <sup>NEW</sup> ~~no~~ major facts to light. <sup>Despite</sup> ~~all~~ of his <sup>propaganda</sup> ~~work~~, <sup>his work,</sup> ~~late~~ as he did it, he does not have a decent proportion of the content of my first book <sup>already</sup> ~~and~~ that was ~~written~~ <sup>written</sup> before he ~~began~~ <sup>began</sup> his and was published without ~~the~~ <sup>change</sup> ~~change~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>while</sup> ~~while~~ his underwent and required to be publishable endless revisions by himself and professionals. Need I suggest that since then I have published three others books and prepared two more while Mark has been resting on the empty laurels and the rewards of <sup>abundant</sup> ~~plagiarism~~ <sup>propaganda and</sup> ~~plagiarism~~.

So, not being <sup>serious</sup> ~~able~~ enough to attempt any criticism of me or knowledgeable enough in the field to find serious error by me, he resorts to <sup>apropos</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~gentle~~ <sup>gentle</sup> ~~room~~ <sup>journalism</sup> ~~journalism~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~which~~ <sup>ambulance</sup> ~~chases~~ <sup>bring</sup> ~~bring~~ <sup>with</sup> ~~with~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>desirable</sup> ~~desirable~~ prerequisites.

So fearful is he that someone might learn the name of a book other than his that were it not for the requirements of the direct quotation that ~~it~~ <sup>one of the</sup> ~~served~~ <sup>served</sup> this self-demeaning purpose, <sup>The single reference to the title of the</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> of the four books I had published before he could ~~bring~~ <sup>bring</sup> ~~xx~~ <sup>labor</sup> like the mountain

one of the

to bring forth his second house <sup>not</sup> publisher in both <sup>of his</sup> ~~of his~~. For <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>mainly used</sup> purposes, ~~the~~ <sup>contents</sup> of my books were sufficient. This is from page 162:

One of the early books on the subject was originally self-published.<sup>9</sup> Of it, Kaplan wrote: "We may pass over *Whitewash* by Harold Weisberg, in just a sentence. It is the most strident, bitter and generally irrationally biased of all the attacks on the Commission. Out of charity, we shall mention it no further."<sup>7</sup> It is true that one may hardly read Weisberg's work and escape his rather unique style. Yet he did uncover evidence of importance, and so long as Kaplan's credentials as a critic of belles-lettres are in doubt, and so long as he pretended to examine the evidence referred to by the critics, his summary dismissal of *Whitewash* was irresponsible.<sup>8</sup> The writings of both men reveal that while of the two Weisberg was alone knowledgeable, both men seemed inspired by a passion they found difficult to contain. Indeed, if Kaplan's sharp words—"most strident, bitter and generally irrationally biased of all"—were turned about toward the Commission's defenders, his contribution might not be considered ineligible.

Many of Kaplan's transgressions regarding the books that he did review fall into the area of his misunderstanding of the evidence relating to the origin of the shots and the meaning of the medal of evidence. Here he is not original among other Commission defenders, and his position is analyzed, together with those of his colleagues, at a later point in this book.<sup>11</sup>†

He charges that less than a tenth of the assertions in *Rush to Judgment* "stand up to careful scrutiny."<sup>12</sup> Three examples that he adduces in support of that conclusion are, first: "Thus, Lane does not

\* Curiously, Weisberg later was to indulge in that same form of criticism.<sup>9</sup> 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."<sup>10</sup> Surely Weisberg would be the first to agree that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Then there is the footnote at the bottom of the page!

Kaplan would be rejected by decent barnyard society almost as rapidly as Mark. <sup>He</sup> ~~is~~ is of evil intent, not just ignorant and impelled to be a sycophant.

Kaplan is like Mark. He must torture his imagination to invent excuses for his inability to answer ~~my~~ Mark's and his refusal to accept my challenge to a confrontation, or the writing of either and in any medium of his choice. Kaplan was too yellow to even write and decline.

But when Mark, who never really stopped revising his book and then <sup>and repaired</sup> required extensive editing before his magnum opus could be considered publishable, then he additionally required the generous assistance of three of <sup>of letters</sup> the most prominent men in the world, including the unstinting use of their names

or research and reputations -who cannot write a book by himself and then has to steal to paper over his own incompetences <sup>he</sup> talks about the "unique style" of anyone else, it is like a whore talking about love.

The footnote is Mark at his self-revelatory best, which is good enough for the first book-burning storm-troopers to come down the street. It <sup>of</sup> requires an exception/perversion, a new hypothesis of improbity, to conceive and then ban such malevolent misrepresentation.

Kepler's criticism, whether or not valid, was of a book, a literary work <sup>he</sup> whether or not on his own <sup>he</sup> is a writer, Mark is a lawyer, and whether or not he is a good one (which should not be assessed from his writing, where he displays a contempt for the law and a talent for all the abuses of <sup>its</sup> ~~its~~ practice), he seems to have passed the bar examinations. Therefore, he should have some concepts of the requirements of judicial and semi-judicial proceedings, of which the investigation of the murder of the President was one.

The partial, out of context quotation from PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE: Suppressed WILHELM RESSAS EMPIRE PICTURES (and isn't it strange that with all his talk of suppression <sup>of the suppressed pictures</sup> ~~as brought none to light?~~) employ some of the words I there used, omits the important ones, ~~by saying that~~ the use of which would have ended his slender <sup>not really writing but</sup> and fails to mention what I referred to was an FBI report, supposedly impartial and factual, that was an apparent paraphrase of <sup>STUAP</sup> ~~it~~ Red it by the CIA, hence was third-hand to begin with.

Perhaps the answer lies in that thinly-covered ego of Marks, in that he was piqued by another demonstration of his failure to come out of the slit trench with gold teeth, <sup>of</sup> his endless incompetence.

In any event, this is the story of Norman Sisiles, <sup>which I told as completely</sup> ~~about which, beginning~~ ~~and that part of that part,~~ ~~by Larry, a young Canadian, has written a~~ ~~book.~~ <sup>as then possible in PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE WPS-17 (circled it around in a book).</sup>

book. How Mark knew about Sisiles. In that hoked-up so-called list of

witnesses with which he pads "Rush to Judgment", he has Similes' name  
 So little did he think of his own exhibit that he expunged <sup>Similes</sup> ~~the~~ his own  
 index. <sup>(RTS 472)</sup> So little did he know of Similes and whether or not he could in  
 fact qualify as a witness that he never ~~tried~~ tried to find out. For all that  
 "thoroughness," all that unique or ploteness of his work that is the only  
 "definitive" work-these are the words of his publisher, let me remind you-  
 for all that time he pretends he spent in the Archives, how he missed the  
 fantastic indictment of the government in what happened to Similes and winds  
 up with a cheap skate slender Mark will perhaps find a way of talking himself.  
 After that follows I doubt the reader will have any interest. To me it is  
 in sterial. I know the quality of his work and character.

<sup>a Consideration</sup>  
 Similes was in Dallas -at Ruby's joint, at the assassination-he  
 # even got <sup>personal pictures</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>with Johnson</sup> pictures of the President. He saw the assassination. He got  
 pictures of it. He made an eyewitness broadcast, immediately, from  
 Dallas to his home-town ~~Canadian~~ radio station that my colleague Gary now  
 has. He was stoped en route home in Chicago by the Associated Press, which  
 developed his negatives, never printing ~~one~~ one, and with the perception only  
 the Warren Commission and Mark ever laid claim to, knew without doubt ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~no~~  
 vital intelligence lay obscured invisibly in ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~tiny~~ negatives that would  
 be brought out on enlargement.

When Similes got home a man claiming to represent a newspaper  
 came and borrowed his negatives. They have not been seen since. There  
 would seem to be a reasonable assumption that this man could have ~~been~~  
<sup>as Gary believes.</sup> been SLB or FBI. In any event, Similes was thereafter restricted to what  
 he had had printed and to the quality and size of his prints. His  
 description of what he says he ~~had~~ had on film is consistent with what is  
 known of the assassination.

The federal spooks, having gotten Similes' negatives, then decided,  
 Mark-like, to assassinate his character. For all the world as though the  
 # genius who in Chicago tossed out valuable pictures of the news-story of  
 his lifetime was about to confess it-any more than Mark confesses his

(RTS 401)

non-stop departures from the intellectual straight and narrow the CIA traced him down to Tokyo, where he was covering the Olympics. But they reported to the FBI we cannot know, for as I once wrote, if the CIA provided day-by-day yesterday's unrefrigerated milkshake, it would still be top secret.

The FBI took this second-hand account and embellished it with the kind of writing in which Lark is expert. There was no defamation if found inappropriate, as though it could possibly be true, in quotation marks, that quote the FBI man, one Ray Jefferies, as saying "by virtue of his thirty years experience, he could 'read negatives as well as prints'". It takes not much of a lawyer and not much of an FBI or CIA agent to know this cannot possibly be either truthful or justifiable language as it relates to evidence.

Meanwhile, the FBI loses political edge that ~~xxxxxx~~ Similes did have assassination pictures because Jefferies saw and described them, two showing the car at the moment of the assassination!

Because federal authority could not tolerate pictures of the assassination, particularly, as even Lark, little as he knows about the photographic evidence, both knows and has said, the necessary steps were taken with Similes, first with his negatives and then with his reputation. Eventually the FBI also got prints of the pictures that were about to be published and never turned them over to the Warren Commission.

By pleasant coincidence, the very day of this writing, I had my first communication from Gary Lurr other than by letter. He phoned me from his Canadian home, Canada's mail having for some time been ended by a strike, to report that Similes has four of his assassination pictures remaining, that he has agreed for us to have their use, and that they show, among other things, exactly the kind of background at the scene of the assassination we have so long searched for. This is the remaining pictures, we can know

nothing of those goes forever, with Mark's hearty endorsement, or that might be invisible. When a print is enlarged that could be clear beginning with the negative.

that I actually said of this treatment of evidence by the FBI is that it was "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." The reader can compare this unedited quote with <sup>the crudely-</sup> ~~Mark's~~ <sup>butchered</sup> ~~deliberately~~, to misrepresent, <sup>it. The reader need</sup> ~~also~~ <sup>not</sup> miss the context.

It seems as though there is nothing of which Mark is not capable in an effort to seize for himself what his work has not earned for him? No vilification, no theft, no slander, no distortion or misrepresentation, no cheap device that will get him publicity regardless of the cost to others or to the purpose he merely pretends to serve, ~~also~~ <sup>bothers him at all.</sup>

~~His ego is insane. For minor but characteristic~~ <sup>Proof is</sup> ~~example, on page 119,~~

How it is not at all likely that Mark did not read the text <sup>of</sup>

There is a long chapter of PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE (114) <sup>con Similas.</sup> ~~9,000 or 10,000 words~~ <sup>(500000 evidence, each document)</sup> ~~The appendix of untouched, complete~~ <sup>consists of such things as</sup> ~~reproduced documents~~ <sup>which Mark never found or published</sup>

~~touches in any way~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~FBI reports, J. Edgar Hoover's letters~~ <sup>on this</sup> ~~single subject~~ <sup>more than three times the extent of the documentation</sup>

he publishes for the backstopping of his entire book, ~~I~~ <sup>It is not likely</sup> ~~because it begins with~~ <sup>he</sup> ~~page he~~ <sup>mixes</sup> ~~with the appendix of the Carolyn Arnold~~ ~~Kennedy~~ ~~FBI reports.~~

~~His ego is insane. For minor but characteristic~~ <sup>example, on page 119:</sup>

"Although CBS charged...that I did not 'always allow facts to get in the way of my theories', the network was unable to substantiate that allegation with a single example."

They can now, Mark; they can now!

*doctored version of FBI report*

*Norman Similas and his pictures*

*include both of Mark's appendices, which are largely stove-piped, none of it was ever before known or published*

*Mark missed this opportunity*

This shadow of a human <sup>in</sup> with the form of Man he desecrates! This small shouting "genius" <sup>is</sup> mind ~~writing himself~~ The pimple on the belly calling himself penis! Oh, this wretched, miserable abasement of the human spirit, this treachery of the intellect, this total <sup>abandonment</sup> abdication of decency! *Unprincipled wretch!*

Sylvia <sup>W</sup>heagher labored and sweated, wrote as he can never dream with ~~all~~ his thefts, and without his dicer's good fortune could find no publisher, but turned out a book that is a glory to the mind and a tribute to the species. She was suppressed. He mentions her twice, once (p. 183) to defend himself from the foul-mouthing of Larry Schiller and Richard Lewis, and once <sup>(p. 252)</sup> among the scant total of six he acknowledges by name to be working in the field. Not once does he allow she birthed such a monumental work! <sup>(But NO TITLES). THAT'S COMPETITION - WOULD COST HIM MONEY!</sup> And she is one of the two of the three who wrote books to be mentioned. Maggie Fields also is unpublished, and Penn Jones, author of two, had to print his own. But it is, to this Galiben's nightmare ~~case~~ of a human being, he alone suppressed <sup>yes</sup> who ~~is~~ he alone <sup>whom</sup> like ~~max~~ not even Job suffered.

It is of <sup>less</sup> ~~no personal~~ consequence to me that he so maligned decency and truth -and fact - about me and <sup>stole</sup> ~~to steal~~ from me. ~~But is is of consequence~~ <sup>than</sup> that he bastardized the noble and unacknowledged significant labor and accomplishments of those many who did and do what he failed. He is so far removed from the reality of the quest for the recapture of our national honor, the return of freedom, that he does not know most of their names. *Kurung*

*his own suffers him:* Those few he acknowledges did nobly. Today some have withdrawn, which pleases him more for it makes more of himself.

Dick Sprague, who so magnificently and diligently took up where I had scarcely begun in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH and located hundreds of suppressed *of which the Commission in San perhaps 590,* pictures of the assassination, <sup>is</sup> without mention. To his last day Mark will not have contributed as much. *in person.*

Gary Murr did write his *Smiles'* book, did locate ~~the~~ pictures, <sup>Mark</sup> includes the defamation, ignores the fact.

And entire team of brilliant young student -researchers and a free-  
lence writer all of whose names I do not know, working in the San Francisco

Bay area, incredibly excellent people and minds, performing superbly and  
cooperatively *(a curse to Mark unless it is re-writing)* ~~(a cuss word to Mark)~~, are without existence to him though he  
knows ~~them personally~~ <sup>deeply, personally</sup> and is ~~deeply~~ <sup>personally</sup> indebted to some, ~~personally~~ <sup>personally</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> ~~existence~~ <sup>existence</sup> when he has himself to glorify.

In Los Angeles, ~~a~~ <sup>them - active</sup> smaller band but a ~~fine~~ <sup>fine</sup> one - including those  
who helped with the publicity that is like blood to him? He never heard  
of them! *Only their sponsorship, their help, he knows - and pockets.*

There are so many more he cannot acknowledge, working hard and well,  
Possibly most of them he really never heard of, but had, he, ~~he~~ would be  
silent, for the more of them, the smaller in his own eyes he is and he fears  
it would in his book diminish him. One I must mention by name, for he, too,  
arranged publicity and for Mark to be paid for it. Gary Schoener, who takes  
to

time from his doctoral studies at Mayo Hospital ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~conducted~~ <sup>conducted</sup>  
important investigations by himself ( he has just been beaten to within ~~an~~ <sup>breath</sup>  
~~inch~~ <sup>inch</sup> of his life for unknown reasons), who gave Mark <sup>written</sup> reports of his personal  
investigation to carry to Jim Garrison, whose office never heard of ~~the~~  
them and does not have them, finds no mention.

Only that corporal's guard he fears ignoring does he ~~ack~~ <sup>ack</sup> knowledge.

And on the other side, where he is without adequate response, he

fails to find word for mention of the largest single story ever done by the  
Associated Press, the most hurtful, dishonest attack on all of us. <sup>As if from its numerous reading columns, it poisoned the minds of most medical editors</sup>

largest news service, the most dishonest writing, not for such a book?

Bernard Gavzer and Sid <sup>M</sup>oody, the pen prostitutes who did it -no mention?

In this kind of book?

Here is a measure of the author and the work.



Here also is a measure of the hazard he presents the ultimate discovery and establishment and acceptance - of truth.

The CBS "specials" were dramatic, spectacular and overdone and excessive. They were obvious, too obvious. By the time the CBS "conclusions", as prefabricated as those of the government, reached the tube, the evidence, as distorted as that of the government, <sup>nonetheless</sup> had already convinced a large part of the audience that CBS was wrong. CBS proved the shooting could not have been done by one man then said otherwise. It told its audience if ~~it~~ didn't believe the impossible it was wrong, if it thought there was something unusual about the extra couple of killings, it was belmy. It was hard to believe. *CBS. Many didn't*

Effective as the medium is, it is also transitory. There is no possibility of persuading the average person of reasonable intelligence that the Warren Report is right. CBS said it is right because it is wrong, which does not encourage confidence in either CBS or the government. Without total fabrication, and the time for that on TV is not yet here, intelligent people cannot really be persuaded that the Report is right.

This is the task CBS undertook. Its success was limited, as any number of polls showed.

Mark tackled CBS because it was easy. CBS did not do a convincing job because that really isn't possible.

~~Mark did not do a convincing job because it was easy. CBS did not do a convincing job because that really isn't possible.~~ *only proving the critics wrong* With the Associated Press, which had *seen when, on his work he had the best and all the words.* a different approach, Mark would not cross swords or words. He could not, dared not. Herein lies the vulnerability he rubs off on everyone, particularly Jim Garrison, because the printed word permanently freezes every mistake, lie, distortion, misrepresentation, *and is seen over and over again*

CBS and AP, and others, had this in common: they focused on Mark. If Mark says this is because he is more famous, he is kidding ~~you~~. The criticism of <sup>him</sup> ~~he~~ was largely wrong, but too much was valid. His carelessness,

and it is a kindness to so describe his endless liberties was fact, is transmitted to all who are on the same side.

~~The Holt ad said Mark had no "theories" about the assassination.~~

Mark says he has no "assassination theories". This is a new development, for in the past he has had them all, <sup>whoever and</sup> whatever ones were at the moment he espoused them popular. He had a "Triple Underpass Tehory", and was confident the shooting came from there. He had a <sup>Through - The wood -</sup> "Jack Ruby <sup>sniped the</sup> Theory", and was convinced Ruby fired a rifle from the ~~the~~ railroad tracks, <sup>What Espine called "The Dunderbus Theory" before he</sup> ~~and was convinced Ruby fired a rifle from the the railroad tracks,~~ <sup>skipped the</sup> ~~students who heard him in his many college appearances still recall the numerous, contradictory theories he has ~~enough~~ <sup>pressed. Some still have their notes.</sup> ~~up them.~~~~

*I will pressy down believe.*

The FBI has a goodly supply of tapes of his speeches.

Some day there will be a day of reckon<sup>g</sup>. Some day there will be a really definitive job of tabulating Mark against Mark against Mark, and the tabulators will really be aiming at ~~Jim Garrison~~ and the rest of us.

As~~so~~ soon as Mark got to New Orleans, he dropped that bull about all the new evidence that didn't exist and the old evidence that, with him, also didn't exist, and made no bones about it, <sup>suddenly</sup> all he knew he got from Jim Garrison, <sup>Time</sup> after time he bragged about this. He knew all Garrison had. <sup>He there.</sup> Garrison had no secret from him. With his new book to sell, he pushed this line hard, exploiting the ~~genuine~~ popularity Garrison enjoys, trying to rub it <sup>off</sup> on the sale of his books.

On the Washington TV show we did~~nt~~ together in ~~June~~ <sup>June</sup> he was very forthright about this. He really knows nothing about the New Orleans evidence on his own. He knows what Garrison knows. <sup>Said</sup> His great and good pal has told him. In short, what he is saying is that everything he says is Garrison talking. Jim will be <sup>Like Garrison, like him. He speaks in Garrison's name.</sup> lucky to survive it. He knows what Mark tells him he has said, he knows what Mark says that he can hear and read, which is not ~~much~~ <sup>enough</sup> of what Mark says ~~and~~ <sup>does</sup>.

Every major attack launched on the critics is focused on Mark. His is because he is the most vulnerable one. The standard technique of all

our enemies is this -and I know, for it is the way I'm attacked:

"Lane and Weisberg say", and the "Roberts and the "bodys and Gavzers and the Sparrows -all of them - quote Lane. Never me. I do not and have not said these things attributed to me. Lane does, and I am hoist on his petard.

In all of Charles Roberts' book, there is no single case where he has a genuine error of my own to throw at me. It is only by falsely bracketing me with Lane and Epstein that he can mention my name at all.

Sparrow, eminent British scholar, warden of All Souls and all that learned jazz, can do nothing else. I've challenged him <sup>privately</sup>, and he cannot.

<sup>Gavzer, Moody-</sup>  
Salinger, Bickel, Kaplan <sup>not one can do otherwise.</sup> Where Schiller and Warren tried hard, there was but a single error they could pretend to attribute to me. They could not. They were wrong. In all the many letters I receive, not a single person was persuaded by such transparent junk.

These professional excusers, whose careers are their excuses and whose excuses are their careers, may pretend otherwise, but when it comes to work like Sylvia Meagher's and mine, there is no genuine claim of error. That is attributed by ~~me~~ <sup>most of all</sup> association with Mark, who is not my associate, <sup>with Epstein</sup>, who is not really a critic. A little thought by those familiar with the field will show the universality of this truth. The solid works are not attacked. Their authors, perhaps, but never face to face. The attack on these works is based on Lane's and Epstein's. The only exception is by misquotation. Moddy and Gavzer are as expert at this as any, yet Mark does ~~that~~ <sup>THIS</sup> will be the new way of going after Garrison.

Lane has made it too attractive. The more he barnstorms, caring about nothing but his personal publicity and the sale of his books, no matter how humbly he pretends to sitting at Garrison's feet, he is convincing everybody that he speaks for the New Orleans District Attorney, that everything he says is what he says for Garrison.

mention them once in his book. They misquote me and I challenged them. I

TRP  
78I

had a press conference in New York October 31, 1967, ~~shortly~~ after their semi-official apology appeared. Both attended. The ~~AP~~ did not carry a word and never intended to. Neither Moody nor Gavzer asked a single question. Neither had ever a single wise crack. Both spent their time with ~~their~~ lipbuttoned and ~~their~~ pencils down.

It is futility to challenge the literary yellow-bellies of the yellow press. Not one will or ever has debated me, except for the single lesson ~~given~~ Charles Roberts learned when he was the close to silent partner of Louis Nizer on that WOR special. If he had a single debate after that, I am unaware of it. When his publisher advertised he was "versus" all of us, I replied that I had been ~~gutting~~ trying to very hard to get him versus me but couldn't. Perhaps, with his high dedication to profit, if not principle, the publisher might use his influence to arrange it, preferably in the auditorium of the National Press Club, before his peers, where Roberts could really expose me, tear me up, show how wrong and terrible I am.

There was no debate, no answer, no chance of it. Roberts knows who and what he is, what his role, and so did his publisher. The pretense to the contrary is for the suckers, who are also the victims. This is no game these people play. It is a deadly serious, systematic campaign to corrupt the public mind, to rewrite history, to write that history yet to be lived the way the rewriters want.

The Committee that arranges such debates for the National Press Club asked me six months before this writing if I would debate there. I agreed,

*on any combination*  
against anyone they could get. They have yet to arrange it. *No candidates - free*

*to free. Only behind the back.*

I tell this not in boast but in characterization of the other side.

It uses its power, its influence, its control over all the organs of news dissemination, opinion forming, to control the news, form opinion, not to establish truth or give the people a chance to decide for themselves what is true.

~~When~~ <sup>On</sup> the day the role is read, it will be read by those who control every place it appears. We will have no more chance to answer, to tell the truth and have it heard, then than we do now. Most of the available opportunities now go to Mark, who uses them to plug himself and his close association with Garrison. Every one of these, ultimately, will be a stone around Garrison's neck. Because Garrison, despite the contrary propaganda, is not a self-seeker, has no ambition for high public office, it is not Garrison personally they will damage. <sup>It</sup> is all of us, meaning not only those of us working in the field but all the people, for right or wrong and I am satisfied he is right. Garrison really seeks only the truth, a free present and a free future for the country.

Everybody but Mark will pay for his transgressions. Most of all may the case Garrison seeks to get into court suffer. He will have no more chance to be heard <sup>through the media</sup> than the rest of us now do. And ~~can~~ <sup>will</sup> he spend his days and nights answering charges and still be the district attorney with a case in court? So he doesn't answer the charges, or he doesn't try. What, then, will happen to the work we have done, the truth we want to establish? Will any of us be believed?

Mark will ruin us all. He will not care. He is and will be <sup>well off,</sup> famous, shooting his mouth off ~~about how great~~ and telling the world how great he -alone -is.

He began by saying he was the works and was rushing back to the United States to save that hick Garrison, to give him the pitch - to run the show. One meeting with Garrison, a truly imposing man, a brilliant writer, an intellectual, gave Mark the real score. So he made a quick, ~~humble~~ switch, pretending humility, gratitude for the <sup>h</sup> chance to associate with ~~a~~ ~~great~~ like Garrison (meanwhile getting what he could), and now goes around saying it.

He can switch again. Given the opportunity, he will. Mark is the man who would rather switch than fight.

One part of Mark will not switch. It will not fight, either. It is his unchanging character. He is a man without morality, the living embodiment of the old attitude toward newspapers: if the tycoon is caught in the wrong <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ only fear is that his name be spelled correctly.

Mark is a man possessed of limitless greed. He wants everything - credit, meaning that of others; sales, meaning of all the books on the subject; attention, meaning all the (paid) speeches to be made, <sup>all the publicity.</sup> While persuading everyone in New Orleans that he was running around the country making speeches in defense of Garrison, he was careful to get his four-figure <sup>figure</sup> fee for each speech. Help Garrison? When and as long as it <sup>it</sup> ~~it~~ pays.

Mark is a man always on somebody's back. ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> began with the Citizens' Committee. When it served his <sup>purpose</sup> ~~purpose~~, he dumped them. When he needed them, he went back, where he could, ~~write~~ ~~write~~ ~~write~~ When he writes books, he helps himself to the material, of others. Even where he could use a fair amount without trouble by merely citing his source, his <sup>growing</sup> ~~growing~~ vanity and frustration over his inner knowledge that he is a genuine failure will not let him. <sup>P</sup> Even in "A Citizen's Dissent", where he had a real chance to get whatever word he has about Garrison to those who read it, he has eight of the most casual references, not all honest, and most where Garrison's back is just <sup>used</sup> ~~used~~ <sup>to take the</sup> ~~like, taking~~ the first as a random selection:

<sup>Mort Schl.</sup>  
He says his good friend and benefactor was ~~first~~ <sup>first</sup> fired by the radio station for which he worked <sup>after</sup> ~~after~~ he played recordings of exclusive interviews <sup>with</sup> ~~with~~ Jim Garrison". Notice he is careful not to say because he aired Jim, for that was not the real reason. He used dirty writing to say it where he doesn't, really. <sup>But</sup> ~~But~~ there is not one reader in a hundred who will not take it this way.

Mort is a great and very brave guy. Not always wise, not always right, not always fair, and often, unnecessarily, insulting and overbearing.

*But really, quite a guy.*

*on his K L F C show*

I sat with him for three hours. It was stimulating, swinging, and sometimes startling, the things he just blurted out. I have been on that station, ~~KAS~~ for upwards of three hours at a time with at least a half-dozen different men who have shows there. Not one asked me in advance what I would say. Not one told me in advance what I might not. Not one did I meet in advance or speak to before air time. Not one, may I also add, regardless of his beliefs, was in any way unfair to me.

Now I was in Los Angeles in November 1967 when Garrison addressed the Southern California radio-TV group at its annual gathering. I was in the audience and familiar with much of the speech before it was delivered. It was, without doubt, the most vigorous attack I have ~~we~~ ever heard on the federal government by anyone, private or official.

*major*  
No ~~paper~~ paper in the country carried it. UPI ordered a story and killed it on the desk. The explanation: we'd lose every source we have in Washington if we carried that.

The speech was recorded. That station, KLAC, played it, word for word.

So, aside from the inherent dishonesty of such a foul attack on the radio station whose owners have given this subject probably more time than any other in the country, it is deliberately dishonest to say they were trying to suppress Harrison. Mark <sup>is</sup> is probably the trickiest writing I have ever seen. That of the authors of the Warren Report is radiant decency compared with it. He knows and uses every rotten trick. I think this is a fair example.

He is not here seeking to help or befriend Garrison. He serves a selfish motive, no other, and he is ~~surely~~ unconcerned about the consequences. Let someone else pay for them. Mark never does, anyway.

*Through Mark and his enormous vulnerability will be the new way of getting at Garrison and the rest of us. to pm 28 E*

Were his indictment of CBS not corrupted by his personalization, if it had been less ~~calculated~~ <sup>calculated</sup> to present himself in the heroic Horstie posture - had it been possible for him to conceive he was not at the bridge alone (if, indeed, he is Horstie and there he is there is a bridge), at least historically it would be credited *and might today be believed.*

Of all the few of us who at least say we seek to establish the truth of the JFK assassination and its official investigation, the one with by far the least complaint against the media is Mark. They have made him a wealthy man, given him a fame he could not in any other way have attained - certainly not under his own steam or merit. His exposure, despite his contrary representation, has rarely ~~if ever~~ been couched by any authors on ~~about~~ <sup>other</sup> any subject. If there is any one author who has little just cause for complaint, he is the one. *On this subject, there is no question at all. He has had much more exposure and attention than all the rest combined.*

The most diligent study between his lines will in no way indicate that there is anyone else in the entire world who has worked in this field who has in any way had any problem telling his message to the people. No one else has written anything that radio or TV would give no time to - or that warranted time. The truth is that he has chiselled in on others, pulling strings and using influence to get what attention was available for him-

self and his own work, at their cost. Then the man who on the one hand boasts of almost 200 appearances in a very short interval claims there is an organized conspiracy to silence him, he makes <sup>conviction of evidence</sup> anything he says incredible.

"A Citizen's Dissent" succeeds in more than one impossibility. Mark has done more than defame the sycophants of the book-publishing world, more than libel the cowardly grocers and real-estateniks dominating the ~~press~~ media. He has laid for them a defense against the truly awful thing they have done. They did abandon their sacred obligations. They did try and suppress any airing of this, the vital, survival issue of the democratic society. They did forget that in the United States the concept of a free *press*

*much*

*INSERT  
→ 78-44*



is something more than a license to print money. They failed, utterly and miserably, when freedom demanded adherence to the tradition of Fenger and Deane, to the belief of Jefferson, to the practise of ~~that of~~ Thoreau.

At some time in the future of the country, there will be scholars who will examine this era. What will they comprehend when they check this self-glorification hippodrome into a "J'Accuse"?

I am told that Viking, which has close to a corner on book-publishing cowardice, gave Mark a 14-page, single-spaced critique of the book in the form in which it was submitted to them (and this the man who, with all to be said on this subject, had to work that knee in with that snide comment on what he called my "unique" style!). I know that he did not live up to his contract with Grove. It is not just that his agent told me, dependable as that intelligence would seem to be. Publication date was advertised as March 15, 1965. "A Citizens' Dissent" specifies that long after this, Mark was still conducting interviews for the book. How, then, can he be believed when he says anything about book-publishers?

When he acknowledges that OR gave him ten hours of time on two nights, at a time of their broadcasting day when <sup>Maximum-power/air-channel</sup> their signal covers the eastern half of the United States and penetrates deep into the Canadian northland and down into the Antilles, and when they have, as I know they most assuredly did, given up 16 hours of commercial revenue to a single debate on this issue, albeit contended by only Louis Wizer and Charles Roberts, without corruption from our side, without the <sup>pollution</sup> ~~contamination~~ of Mark's special kind of misinformation, and he then protests that they are suppressors, what rational man giving his <sup>allegations impartial</sup> ~~participations intelligent~~ consideration can believe them?

<sup>this and should</sup>  
This ~~makes~~ everything he says questionable. He demands that he not be believed. His own book, to the most casual consideration by an unfettered

intelligence, says he is a false seer.

Some day there will be real scholars, /ot Epsteins, young men and women with a love of country and dedication to society that <sup>will</sup> house them in garrets in preference to Westablishment bagnios, looking back and asking what happened to our country, what happened to freedom, man's dignity, society, when John Kennedy was murdered. They cannot know without knowing what the intellectual eunuchs of the bordello press did, and did not know. <sup>and do.</sup>

<sup>This</sup> They cannot learn from "A Citizen's Dissent".

This is the facet of tragedy that is dark. <sup>He</sup> has taken a vital part of the whole, the enabling part, and ~~xxxxx~~ raped it. He is like a man who knows sex, but not love.

Without the almost total abdication of the press in a country where the majority believe their press is free, those unnecessary tragedies in the wake of the greatest could not have been. Only worked out and broken down <sup>writing</sup> ~~press~~ whores could bed with the Warren Report, ~~and~~ It cannot withstand analysis by open minds possessed of no other fact but willing to function as minds, not sex organs. To ~~read~~ read the Warren Report with care is not to believe it.

The press- the book-publisher ~~and~~ magazine, newspaper, the radio and TV chip-cashers- stuffed it down the American throat and with it ~~xxxxx~~ remade the present, rewrote history - suspended the country midway <sup>it</sup> between Hitler 1934 and Orwell 1984. They failed as never before.

It is the tradition of the society that the press is watchdog over government. Though by now they should know better, the people expect it. <sup>innocently</sup> Too many assume that because a dogcatcher may be hounded out of office for real or fancied transgressions, the same is true of the federal government. The press, without criticism or time for it, lauded the Warren Report, Too many people believed what the press told them to believe.

The Associated Press, which served many if not most of the media, did not

<sup>INDEPENDENT</sup> write its own story. It put the first chapter of the Report on the wire as its story, <sup>the government and media.</sup> Thus, the federal government was the press that sat in judgement on the federal government.

~~Let the Lord watch the city, the watchmen waketh in vain!~~

When the press in the United States makes ~~it~~ itself handmaiden of government, it is deeply subversive. If the people ~~know~~ <sup>speaks</sup> the press ~~speaks~~ for the government, as in those countries ridiculed for it, the people can ~~evaluate~~ evaluate what they are told, accordingly. If they believe the press speaks only for itself, not for the government, they ~~are~~ are deceived. Such a press is more the enemy of truth than a captive one, for it uses freedom as a cloak to hide servility.

With few honorable exceptions, our press has been more corrupt than ~~if~~ if were part of government on this issue. A captive press could not have hurt truth, justice and the national honor nearly as much.

History, freedom, honor, justice, truth, all require the evil story of the self-subverted press be told. Though Mark is the ~~one~~ one with least complaint against it, for it has made him rich and famous-it is not his merit, for that he lacks; not his <sup>Solution</sup> labor, for he did not and he does <sup>not</sup> ~~not~~; not his integrity-that he never had - had he done an honest job (particularly because the lazy rascal would do not original work on the case) it could have been important.

He could not be Irma Latouche. <sup>He</sup> can be nothing but a whoring whore. <sup>brought the fact to light</sup> Had he not pretended that he alone ~~did the work~~ when he produced least, duplicating what was then available or lifting it, and if he did not actually say he was the only ~~one~~ suppressed, for he mentions no ~~such~~ other, had he not lied and stolen, twisted, distorted, quoted out of context, fabricated - in short, prayed religion like the Warren "expert" - he could have done something worthwhile.

He may now persuade those who read his book without the knowledge to comprehend what he has done. But he will ~~not~~ achieve the opposite effect with those who check him <sup>out</sup>. These will be ~~his~~ our enemies of the present and scholars of the future. <sup>He</sup> will thereby be responsible for ~~the~~ opposite of what he vindicating the villain.

His dishonesty is greater than that of the Warren "report, for he is the self-annointed god who says he teaches piety to the Pope.

(and writing about)  
 Most of the few of us investigating the Kennedy assassination and its official ~~xxx~~ accounting have done so with <sup>out</sup> reward or its prospect, save the satisfaction of ~~x~~ men blessed with the opportunity of assuming and discharging the responsibilities of manhood in a democratic society, and the expressions of gratitude of fellow citizens who feel and communicate it. Most, in greater or lesser degree, have recognized some listed of ~~the~~ Mark's/sins against decency and honor. ~~xxxx~~ All, in public, including me, have been silent, perhaps for different, even conflicting reasons. Perhaps all feared that saying what at some time had to be said might ~~interfere with~~ impair the already-slim prospects of establishing and achieving acceptance of the truth each sought. But <sup>what</sup> Mark is had been no secret.

*Except* *Keep* *but*  
 Lest the Lord ~~watch~~ the city, the watchman waketh <sup>in</sup> vain.

Those who seek truth must tell it, as it is given to mortals to conceive and communicate it. Men who seek honor must be men of honor.

Those who would serve justice must be just.

There is, indeed, a time and a place for everything, including propegrandists. Their place is with the hucksters, purveying deodorants and mouthwash, not the hall of justice, the field of honor, the bed of love.

The finks of the eastern intellectual community, co-assassins because of their complicity in the assassination of truth, like Mark, or perhaps he, like they, fault my writing. To him it is a "rather unique style". To them it is "strident"; or "bitter" or, as one <sup>example</sup> parasite put it "turgid". These are the forms of men with water for blood, mirrors for eyes and ice for hearts. They clamor for calm and dispassion when their President is murdered, bow east and sal~~am~~ thrice when ordered to believe what cannot be, and find themselves absolved. They cannot abide passionate writing

for without it they cannot feel it. If they could understand it they will not. Not understanding or refusing to or to feel, they fault it.

But I feel it and I write as I feel. Others may disagree, as is their right, but to me the creed of the writer is to write ~~what~~<sup>as</sup> he feels, not as he is ordered or as he knows is expected.

If it is a bar to publication, then I forgo publication, or, when I can, do it myself.

No infidel guards my temple!

So, I know there are those who will wail and rend garments (always those of others), and decry that I do not call a whore a lover, a sow's ear a purse, a devil a saint, a crook a cardinal.

Whores are whores, and nothing else; pigs are pigs; devils devils and <sup>lane</sup> Mark is exactly what I have called him.

To those who in advance I know will lament as the faint are wont, I say that I ~~have~~<sup>have</sup> confronted <sup>him</sup> months ago, in writing, and without denial or comment, without ~~page~~ protest.

It is not whores who call themselves lovers, ~~stripes~~ or pigs or devils who claim to be what they are not. It is those who approve ~~the~~ crookedness and make it acceptable and profitable, those who lie with whores, live with pigs, worship devils.

On February 20, <sup>1966</sup> I wrote Holt, Rinehart and Winston, saying what I here say. They have been silent. Several times thereafter I saw Mark, and he was silent. The morning after his flaunting of his contempt of everything men of principle live by to my face in Washington the night of June 4, after I reminded him that, as I ~~told~~<sup>wrote</sup> him more than two years earlier, <sup>thru my to my face</sup> I could not abide and ~~then~~ to his face warned him I would not, I also wrote him an indictment no man can live with in silence, an abridgement but no dilution of the foregoing.

He was and has been silent, save for the unended thefts. ~~XXXX~~ Silence has its own eloquence.

Therefore I speak!

Here are those letters;