

1/17/72

Mr. John Leonard, Editor  
New York Times Sunday Book Review  
230 W. 43 St.,  
New York, N.Y. 10036

Dear Mr. Leonard,

Because you have not responded to any of my letters, there can only have been that you would not want to feel obligated to, I want to be certain you are not witness of the relevant statement of Times policy with regard to your own review of the Garrison's book that was entirely altered after the first edition.

The relevant editing after your review

"Our book reviewers are granted full freedom to write whatever they wish about books and authors they are dealing with, but we do not permit personalized editorials in the book column...the book column are not intended for that kind of editorializing."

It would seem that when you at least promised Kaplan to do, what he was given to understand was reported of him, what you might without presuming have expected of him from his record, or what was done in your name, whichever formulation you find least uncomfortable, is in the clearest possible violation of the statement of Times policy, designed to justify the total corruption of a review of a book as a political maneuver that by eliminating all that was favorable.

What Kaplan did and what you published is exactly what the Times says is impermissible in the book column. I want to ask you make an exception of me and my book.

What was promised from your review of the Garrison book was "nothing editing", this policy statement says. That hardly explains the change in headline. But if that was only routine editing, how can you explain publishing something Kaplan wrote about me, for it was all personalized, or about the book, for that was all editorializing?

It seems all to me that the Times has a special policy for this subject and that the book reviewers have a special one for me.

In this regard, I am glad to confess, that your job seems more to you than your personal integrity or your apparently misrepresented concern for a decent society. This would be a greater tragedy than so dishonest and libelous a personal attack as you published in the cheap's clothing of a "review".

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg