

8/26/71

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

Dear Mr. Leonard,

As you better than anyone else know, the Times can easily kill a book. This is now the clear intent of your reaching across the country to select a blind partisan and a man involved in government propaganda to axe my FRAME-UP when you had so many competent reviewers at your elbow and when this book does precisely that for which the Times made editorial appeal. And when you wait five months for any gesture at rectifying damage and relieving libel, as you do by withholding any response until your August 29 issue, you merely prove your murderous intent.

But in the lengthy selection of some of my detailed refutation of Kaplan's propaganda it demeaned the Times to print at all, most of all guised as a "review", and his entirely non-responsive non-sequitur, you have not retracted the libel, not undone the damage and not established your own integrity in this matter.

On previous occasion when, perhaps, as is not true in this case, you inadvertently selected a disqualified reviewer who then vented personal spleen, you accompanied what you printed with what amounted to apology and retraction. In this case you avoid that, as you avoid retraction of the libelous lie and defamation by Geoffrey Wolff.

The only purpose served by a five-month delay in doing anything, no matter how inadequate, was to assure the literary bleeding to death of my book. You had the letter you now excerpt as soon as you printed your assassination. And in all this time, you were not manly enough to respond to a single one of my letters.

Only the perceptive reader, especially after the long delay you arranged, will perceive that Kaplan's letter proves everything I allege. How you as an editor, however, can be without nausea when he says that my letter, only that part of the one you excerpted, "proves inadequately" what Kaplan "had to say" when it lists only a few of the shocking facts he ignored and misrepresented I'd like to know. And I think you should realize that in doing this you are compounding the damage done and I think intended, making it seem that my letter proves Kaplan's defamations right when the opposite is obvious to you.

The irrelevancy about refighting the Warren Commission battles -what Kaplan actually does, not I - is of his origin, not mine and is not responsive to my detailed documentation. Whether or not there is whatever to the partisan government propagandist Kaplan whatever he might mean by "substantial evidence" to connect these assassinations, there are abundant similarities, sufficient set forth in FRAME-UP and two this day unrefuted and undenied by anyone, including Kaplan. But an obvious one is the involvement of his former associates in the Department of Justice in both and the fact that in both cases the "investigations" were by the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover, were of the murders of men he disliked, and solved nothing. I challenge you, personally, to prove that FRAME-UP does not prove beyond doubt FBI suppression of exculpatory evidence and the gross misrepresentation of the rest. This is not "substantial", to you or Kaplan, especially when I proved it in a court of law and report it, although you and Kaplan suppressed it, in this book, with facsimiles?