

JUL 11 1966

Warren Report Provides Publishers With Windfall

By INEZ ROBB

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy has been an unexpected windfall to only one sector of the international economy: the publishing business.

Both at home and abroad a steady stream of books, challenging the conclusions of the Warren Commission, tumble from the presses. So far, all the critical volumes have vehemently disputed the findings of the commission that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone and was the sole assassin.

The favorite dissent in Europe, Latin America and Asia (as well as in certain home-grown factions) hinges on the "conspiracy theory." Europeans and Asians, so much of whose history has been conspiratorial, will not be persuaded that President Kennedy was not the victim of a domestic and/or political conspiracy of the right or the left, of capital or labor, or of whites, blacks, reds or yellows.

Now it is quite possible that at sometime some investigator will be able to prove that the young President was the victim of a conspiracy, describe the conspiracy and name the conspirators. But no one has done so to date.

Or an investigator may be able to prove the pet dissent of American critics of the Warren Report. This questions that Oswald did the deed alone or even that he did it at all. Implicit in this theory is the belief not in a widespread conspiracy, as favored by foreigners, but in the complicity of two or three persons, particularly the conviction that at least two persons fired the lethal shots.

However, no one to date has been able to name any individual in cahoots with Oswald. Or to point a finger at anyone in place of Oswald.

In the United States this summer there has been a race on to get into print with a brace of books critical of the Warren Report. Viking Press has hit the

stands first with "Inquest" by Edward Jay Epstein. Now, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., has upped the publication of "Rush to Judgment" by Mark Lane from its original publication date of Sept. 8 to Aug. 15.

No critical judgment of either book is implied here. But I do make a judgment on a letter addressed to me (and no doubt thousands of other newspapermen and women) by Arthur A. Cohen, vice-president and editor-in-chief of Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

It is obviously not so much a letter as a press release. And it outdoes in overripe, overwrought prose any other press release that I recall in a lifetime in the newspaper business.

The opening paragraph of Mr. Cohen's letter reads: "Some books are so horrible — horrible by virtue of the directness and savagery with which they assail commonly-accepted opinion — that we feel obligated to ignore them.

"At our peril, however, we ignore books whose horror consists in the devastation they do to popular historical conviction.

"When the issue of such books is the procedure and methods by which a Presidential Commission of Inquiry, presided over by the nation's highest judicial officer, inquires into the murder of its President, it is a matter, indeed, which, however horrible to consider, must be considered.

"Mark Lane's . . . 'Rush to Judgment,' a critique of the Warren Commission's inquiry . . . is such a horrifying book. . . 'Rush to Judgment' persuades me that we know terrifyingly little about what actually transpired on Nov. 22, 1963, in Dallas." And so on.

I have not seen "Rush to Judgment." So I cannot tell if it is as horrible as its editor says.

But I have been exposed to Mr. Cohen's prose which is, in my judgment, inflammatory, irresponsible and in extremely bad taste.

Mr. Lane's book may be truly horrifying, but surely not half so much so as Mr. Cohen's letter, its overtones and its "terrifying" commercial sales pitch.