Dear David,

-71

## 11/9/92

My respinse to yournote asking what I think about the cover is delayed by its getting lost in New Work, witness postage cancelltions of the 3rf and 5th., and by my having a fever, quite rure for me. Much of the time I have not felt even like reading. Perhaps it will recept today/

The part of your note that I can make out says you do not like this cover. I agree.

If she title remains what it appears to be, then the word whitewash should be in quotes in ductes of underscorede or in italics. I think it would be more appropriately a subtitle, and in genral that the combination of title and subtitle should say much more.

If what appears to be the subtitle remains I think "Warren Report" should be substitute for Warren "Commission."

Both tate and principle are involved in my not liking the use of JFK's pacture as most of the cover. All the bad books have done this because they need it for exploitation and commercialization. I think much better is what - did me my covers, superimposed their titles and subtitle on the title or sover of the Warren Report.

This use also can be alleged to amount to a deception because the book is not about JFK.

I am not suggesting that akk exploitations are in bdd tastem or unjustified. A reference to the original books, as for example their ope ing the subject up, would not be in bad taste.

If you want to continue to use the words you now have in the title and subtitle, I hink they sould be reversed. "The "eport on the Warren Report" is, I think, a better and more gmaningful title that "The Complete Whitewash." (There should be some indication of condensation not to be deceptive.)

I had not given this any though before getting the copy of the cover and your note and perhaps I'm not now in the best condition to give it thought.

I return your note so you can know what you said.

est to you all

-fe

Harback dust jackets and paperback vovers wan be descriptive and can sell booksyitness the enclosed. And, nots authors' names?



