6/4/71

Mr. Herb Brubaker
NBC News
4001 Nebraska Ave., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Herb,

Missed "First Tuesday" this week because my wife fell, requiring a trip to the hospital from which we didn't return until 11 p.m. I understand there was a sequence with Congressman Rooney on the FBI in which he said he had seen the FBI dossier on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I'd appreciate a transcript of his segment if you can get it for me. This is the first public confession of what I report in FRAME-UP, that the FBI did flash this on the Hill. I'd like to have it for my files.

Perhaps you have noticed what I regard as a campaign against me and this book by the New York Times. Although it seems pretty clear that despite the noble public statements NBC is not likely to air any of this, I fill you in.

The review was assigned to one John Kaplan, who just happens to have a book on pot to promote. This is the second recent case in which the Sunday Times Book Review has assigned a review to a bitter enemy and a partisan. Kaplan has been a blind, unthinking and unknowing partisan of the Warren Report without really knowing what it says. What emerged is not in any sense a review, is a vicious attack on me, and the content of the book remains a secret to the reader. An anti-fan of the radical right sent me an advance copy. Before checking my own files, for I knew I had had a hassle with Kaplan in early 1967 (he blinked-never answering the challenge following a similar disreputable thing in The American Scholar), I was astounded that the Times would make such an assignment or that he would accept it.

He co-authored The Trial of Jack Ruby, which says what I prove about the adversary system of justice in these sensational crimes (and comparing the Times' 1965 story with my book is informative, for it shows the bias against me as few things can). In it his sycophancy is unhidden. He is all for the Warren Report, which he quotes inaccurately. When I first saw this we had had no dispute and I wrote offering to provide corrections. Never answered, but neither unfriendliness nor unkindness on my part.

The background that should have disqualified him includes having been law clark for Tom Clark, whose son was Attorney General during the period covered by FRAME-UP, service in the Criminal Division, which did the dirty-work over which I sued and which I report, other DJ employment as a U.S. attorney and, what I didn't discover until a British correspondent saw his "review", work for the USIA, for which he did a scholarly justification on the Angela Davis case.

I wrote John Leonard, the section's editor, immediately. I asked this correspondent to send Leonard that USIA thing and he says he did. A young man who have read the book and then saw the "review" phoned Leonard also immediately, was told he had just read the letter I had sent, and that somehow Leonard had to make this good, that he had had no knowledge of Kaplan's background.

Making this good consisted in ignoring my letter and printing one, under the title of my first book, WHITEWASH, from Geoffrey Wolff that calls me a liar but is false.

There is considerable background on this if you are interested, and I have it all in contemporaneous notes for a book I then planned and in letters.

My radical-right guy again accomodated with an advance copy, I again wrote Leonard, including an original carbon of a letter that proves Wolff lied hence defamed, and the young man of friendly disposition, again phoned Leonard. He had also been in touch with me by phone. He is in the electronic media and is seriously disturbed by this entire flap, apparently in part because of the high esteem in which he had held the Times. He had asked for and had copies of my letters.

How come, he asked Leonard, when you had such a letter as the author sent you and with what you told me. He also reminded Leonard that Leonard has solicited a letter from him which could help with rectification. Leonard confessed he had had many letters. But his explanation for using Wolff's alone when he had mine immediately feeds dark thoughts: they had it set in type! Which can only mean before publication of Kaplan's "review".

This past Tuesday Leonard told him that on receipt of my first letter he had written me. I have not received any letter from the Times, and they do have a printed return address on their envelopes. No phone calls, either. And it is not almost five weeks.

So, we have that of which I accused Leonard in my last letter, the press as an arm of government, to me the most genuinely subversive thing in our society.

And a strange pertinence in the almost total suppression of the content of this book by all the major media: Kleindienst as coming dispenser of justice.

On Tuesday, June 15, at 2 p.m., I am scheduled to represent myself in Judge Gesell's court in a Justice motion to dismiss one of my suits, this one for pictures of official evidence before the Warren Commission - of the bullet-holes and alleged bullet-holes in JFK's clothing. I think the Archivist has commited perjury in an affidavit Justice filed and, without denial since, I have so alleged in unanswered papers filed in court. Of course this is not news, as I have come to understand. Not being a lawyer, I do not know what my chances will be, but unless my wife is still confined to bed then, I'll be there.

I am sincerely sorry that, after we had several long chats about this suit, Carl Stern never found time to come here and see what I have, which shows pretty clearly why I am refused copies of official evidence, in violation of everything in law and regulation. If I get these pictures and the press pays any attention to them, the Warren Report will itself require a public autopsy. My offer to Stern stands, subject only to preservation of my confidence and my literary rights to what I have done.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg