

29 Aug. 1966

Joe Dolan, telephone call-in program, KEWB, Oakland

Caller: ... Almost every theory that comes up from critics seems more plausible than the Warren commission's conclusions. I have started to compare the evidence presented by Lane with the Warren commission report itself and everywhere you look, you know, Lane's conclusions are right: that the Warren commission changed the testimony of one witness after another, changed evidence, the FBI was wrong in one case, wrong in another. Today I read two book reviews of Lane's book, one in the New York Times (the Sunday Times) and the other was in the National Observer, the Wall Street Journal's weekly newspaper. These people didn't appear to have read the same books I read, because they glossed over all the points that Lane raised about the bullet .. and all of the other substantive points that Lane makes which seem irrefutable .. In both of these reviews /they/ say that these are subjects of some question but on the whole they can't do anything to the conclusions that the commission reached, they haven't come up with any substantive evidence to contradict the commission. I can't see where they could have read the Lane book and any of the other books and come up with this opinion.

Dolan: Well, I quite agree with you, and one that you apparently missed .. /is in/ "Books Today" and is found in the Chicago Tribune, .. a review by Jon Waltz, who is a professor at Northwestern University and the co-author of the book "The Trial of Jack Ruby". .. In this review by Waltz he says such scurrilous things and makes such ad hominem attacks on Mark Lane - in other words, he attacks Mark Lane on irrelevancies like the shape of his ears or the color of his socks - that Mark Lane is going to sue Mr. Waltz. But my point is that this review was published in the Chicago Tribune and must have hit hundreds of thousands of people in the midwest. The only view that these people of the Chicago Tribune and in the midwest may ever get of Mark Lane is this highly distorted and defamatory review in the Chicago Tribune, which is such a gross injustice I quail before this kind of reporting. As I say, and as you said, he doesn't tackle Mark Lane's arguments; he makes remarks about Mark Lane's nose and the size of his ears.

Caller: All the critics seem to do that; no one has come forward and defended the commission with any kind of specific information.

Dolan: No.

Caller: They have been dealing with generalities.