

of Mr. Weisberg's evidence as "newspaper stories." It is difficult to conceive of a more dishonest review or a worse choice of reviewers.

Mr. Kaplan's statement that "Frame-Up" does not deserve newspaper review space takes on added significance when one observes what was said about the book in the few reviews it received before the Times effectively discouraged others from reviewing it:

Barry Farber: "The next time anybody tries to dismiss Harold Weisberg as a chicken farmer I will remind him that Paul Revere was a coppersmith."

Saturday Review: "Weisberg is an indefatigable researcher... when all has been said, Weisberg remains invaluable. He has pursued the facts... And they are facts that lay claim to the conscience of America."

Publishers' Weekly: "This review can barely suggest the detailed number of Weisberg's charges, speculations, freshly documented evidence and revelations about the King murder. In two areas he is pure TNT: his attack on Ray's lawyer, Percy Foreman, and Bradford Huie... and his sensational head-on assault on J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI and the government itself for what he claims was the suppressing of official evidence indicating Ray was not alone in the King assassination. Crank or supersleuth, Weisberg, for all his turgid writing has brought forth a blistering book."

Chicago Sun-Times: "Weisberg has dug up much material, some of it properly designated as suppressed, that must give any reasonable and unprejudiced person pause."

As a student of assassination literature I was familiar with John Kaplan's partisan background, and I was shocked to see that he was the man chosen to review "Frame-Up." I phoned you on May 5 to make known my distress. You were good enough to speak to me. You seemed greatly disturbed about what you had learned about Mr. Kaplan. You told me that you had just received a letter from Mr. Weisberg detailing Mr. Kaplan's complex conflicts of interest, and this was the first you had learned of them. You told me that you had not assigned the book, but rather that it had been assigned by "another editor." At that time you personally solicited a letter from me. You assured me that you would personally see to it that it arrived in the hands of the editor of the letters section. When I asked you if there was still time to write a letter in order to have it printed you replied that there was because "we'll have to do something with the author's letter." My letter was mailed on May 10, 1971. It was addressed to the Editor of the Times Book Review, and it was accompanied with a covering letter to you. In that covering letter I thanked you for your concern in asking me to write it. I never received a reply or an acknowledgement. Neither did Mr. Weisberg receive a reply or an acknowledgement to his first letter of April 30, 1971. He wrote you again on May 25, puzzled by your silence — no reply. He asked that you return to him the copy of the Kaplan article on Angela Davis which had been sent you — no reply, and it was not returned. On May 3, 1971 Mr. Weisberg's publisher sent a letter objecting to Kaplan's review — no reply, no acknowledgement. You received many other letters, many of which I have copies. None were replied to. None were acknowledged.

On May 30, 1971 the reason for your silence became apparent. On