

that date the Times ran its first and only letter in response to Kaplan's review. It was from Geoffrey Wolff, and it took issue with a footnote from "Frame-Up" which Kaplan had mentioned in his review. That footnote, referring to the Washington Post, said "I know that its book reviewer was ordered not to review 'Whitewash' after he had read it and decided on a favorable review." Said Wolff of this footnote dealing with an admittedly "tangential" subject: "I was the Post's book reviewer when 'Whitewash'... was published. The above-quoted sentence — which contains four falsehoods — goes a long way toward explaining why Weisberg's serial revelations and zealous certitudes have been so skeptically received by serious men. (1) I did not decide on a "favorable review" of "Whitewash," (2) I did not plan any review of "Whitewash" because (3) I never read more than a few pages of the thing. Thus (4) I was never "ordered not to review it.""etc.

When before in the history of the Times Book Review has a letter such as this one been printed without sending a copy to the accused party first so that he can reply? Had you sent that letter to Mr. Weisberg in advance of publication you would have known that it was Wolff, not Weisberg, who was being less than completely truthful. For during the period when Mr. Weisberg was negotiating possible syndication of "Whitewash" with the Post he took detailed notes. They are on paper which is unquestionably several years old they are typed on a typewriter that no longer exists. On the morning of May 14, 1966 Mr. Weisberg payed two visits to Wolff's office. On the first he was not in. On the second: "it developed he had no copy of the book but had just been told about it by Bradlee. He'll do a review if the Post doesn't syndicate, for they never review books they syndicate." Other notes continue: "Bumped into Wolff 23 a.m. He has read the book, impressed, interested, and much better written than you had led me to believe." Wolff never reviewed "Whitewash" because J. Russell Wiggins, then Editor, ordered him to review no books on the JFK assassination because he was not a lawyer. Mr. Weisberg argued with Wolff that this amounted to a policy decision against "Whitewash" since subsequent books would doubtless be reviewed through Book Week. Wolff agreed, but was helpless to do anything. On August 28, 1966, following the Book Week review of "Rush to Judgement" Mr. Weisberg wrote to Wolff. The letter began: When I spoke to Mr. Wiggins in May, I told him the one I had a right to expect of the Washington Post is fairness. When I spoke to you a month ago and you told me the policy was to review none of the books, I told you you would review all but mine, through Book Week." Mr. Weisberg's third letter to you dated May 30 included all of this. Included was an original carbon of his August 28, 1966 letter to Wolff. He offered you complete access to his files so that you could determine the authenticity of his notes. He asked that you send Mr. Wolff a copy of the 1966 letter for comment, and that you return the original. He received no reply, and the carbon was not returned. Two subsequent letters to you, one reiterating the request for the return of the carbon and the Kaplan USIA piece, were similarly ignored.

Had you taken Mr. Weisberg up on his offer to examine his files you might have gained some insight into why Geoffrey Wolff wrote that letter. Wolff had planned to review "Frame-Up" for Newsweek. When Mr. Weisberg heard a rumor that some funny business was going on at Newsweek he wrote to his publisher inquiring about it. The response