

May 14, 1971

The Editor  
New York Times Sunday Book Review  
New York Times  
New York City, New York

Dear Sir;

I had the funny feeling that I wasn't finding out anything about the book FRAME-UP by Harold Weisberg when I read the review of it by John Kaplan in the May 2 Sunday New York Times Book Review. I presumed he didn't read it, so I did.

Indeed, Mr. Kaplan has overlooked the central issue of FRAME-UP. Which is: Martin Luther King's assassination was the result of conspiracy.

Instead of reviewing for the public the evidence FRAME-UP establishes to prove its conspiracy thesis, Kaplan attempts to discredit the book on these extraneous issues: 1. FRAME-UP is part of the continuing literature on conspiracy in our assassinations. 2. It attacks important men and institutions who looked no further than James Earl Ray for their solution of the crime. Some of these "authorities" did the same for their investigation of the John F. Kennedy death. 3. Its author, Harold Weisberg, is not a lawyer. 4. FRAME-UP is irrelevant because Ray is technically guilty according to his plea whether or not he fired the shot that killed King.

The Kaplan approach clearly defeats itself. What does his quibble matter when the assassinations of peace-makers go on, when the Department of Justice has so inverted the use of conspiracy charges as to render them meaningless, and when Kaplan himself, who teaches the law, is indifferent to the final question of whether our legal system functions or not. He wrote, "In a trial, so far as we can tell, neither Ray nor the prosecution would have any interest in litigating the guilt of other possible co-conspirators unknown to us." The prosecution--in this case, a few Memphis judges with the help of the FBI--may not be interested in preventing the assassination of future black leaders. But please, Mr. Kaplan, society's interest is other, and higher.

The strength of this book lies in its exposure of mal-functioning, mal-practicing and official obfuscation in the case on its three fronts: in Memphis where the crime and the mini-trial took place; in London where Ray the stories of Ray's capture and extradition contain more myth than truth; in Washington where the Justice Department impedes access to information that ought to be available to the public.

(cont.)

The evidence for this presented in FRAME-UP is admirable. But Weisberg has done more. What he has searched out and consolidated, if presented at a real trial, would prove that Ray could not have killed King, but was a decoy; there is a conspiracy.

What Kaplan has done by ignoring the substance of FRAME -UP is to suppress in turn the factual evidence which was originally, according to Weisberg, suppressed by the official investigation and the Memphis guilty-plea trial where no cross-examination took place.

I object to this kind of double entente. Will the New York Times make it a tripple? If not, it will instigate a new review.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Carol Jackson  
337 West 71 Street  
New York City, N. Y. 10023