

Without specifying the time, but continuing to poor-mouth, Mark says, "I had but one copy of the manuscript ... and I was possessed of neither the time nor the funds to have other copies made." What happened to all that volunteer help he had? Or to the copies he mimeographed at close to that very time?

Norton: As he knows, publishers frequently give lies instead of reasons. I also had my experience with Norton, with the President and with the executive vice-president, who is also editor-in-chief. They volunteered that they just did not like Mark's book. They did not like the approach or the writing. Rather than suppressing the subject because it was too hot, they offered me a contract if I would agree to make WHITEWASH even hotter. They paid my expenses for a trip to New York to consult with them about this, which I believe is unique in my dealings with ten times the publishers against whom Mark complains, and I rejected their offer because I believe it required of me that I charge the government was part of a conspiracy to kill its head. Again, the opposite of Mark's version.

However, as Mark knows, for it is his book, there is more than reasonable ground for objecting to the conclusion of his book. This cannot in any way honestly be described by his words, "I agreed that the facts could not be altered to provide a nicer book." This is plain deception. What is lacking in the ending of Rush to Judgment is facts. It is a bitter, biased, distorted and deliberately incomplete presentation of Mark's own hatred of the chairman and general counsel and carefully eliminates what he wants ignored, particularly about the rules of evidence. It is so undisguised that prior to the appearance of a long article on it in Newsweek, one of his closest associates was quoted to me by a trade editor, who is also a close friend of his publisher, that the intent of this ending was to convince Earl Warren and everyone else that there was nothing left for the chief justice but suicide. The book is so totally aimed at the chairman and general counsel that Mark has edited even what he presents as verbatim reproduction of the questionings to eliminate the lawyers' names, which in every case appear in the printed transcripts he "quotes".