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'

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 remaking 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