

12/15/72

Re: 12/21/72

JERRY POLICOFF

HAROLD,

As you may or may not  
know PAUL KRASSNER IS PUBLISHING  
MY ~~NEW~~ NYT ARTICLE IN THE REALIST,  
AND IT IS DUE OUT ANY DAY.

ALTHOUGH I DOUBT THAT  
YOU WILL BELIEVE IT WAS AN  
ACCIDENT, KRASSNER TELLS ME  
THAT THE PRINTER LEFT OUT  
THE FOOTNOTE (\*\*\*) ON PAGE  
26 (as well as another  
footnote elsewhere dealing  
with A.M. ROSENTHAL'S PRAISE  
OF THE CBS DOCUMENTARY).

KRASSNER SAYS HE WILL  
INCLUDE THE NOTES IN HIS  
NEXT ISSUE EXPLAINING THE  
PRINTER'S ERROR.

parently... his evidence is exiguous at best." The review continued: "Mr. Weisberg's grasp of law is, to say the least, somewhat shaky (he is described elsewhere as a chicken farmer)\*\*. Whether or not Ray fired the fatal bullet or merely acted as a decoy does not influence the propriety of his guilty plea. In either case, he would be a murderer... A review such as this in which nothing favorable is said obviously prompts questions as to why one might wish to read or, for that matter, to devote newspaper review space to the book... Finally, one might ask if 'Frame-Up' tells us anything significant about the Martin Luther King assassination. Regrettably, the answer is no..."

Kaplan's review was nothing short of a personal attack upon Harold Weisberg which totally ignored the contents of "Frame-Up," and falsely implied that "newspaper stories" were the basis of his "exiguous" evidence.

An article on the front page of The Wall Street Journal, "HOW BOOK REVIEWS MAKE OR BREAK BOOKS -- OR HAVE NO IMPACT" described The New York Times Book Review as "generally considered the most prestigious and influential review medium."<sup>51</sup> The article described how a particularly poor review there can discourage further reviews and cut-off bookstore orders. "Frame-Up" received no further reviews, and for all practical purposes the book was soon dead.

The Times capsule biography of the reviewer said that "John Kaplan teaches at Stanford Law School and is author of 'Marijuana: The New Prohibition.'" It was inadequate, to say the least.

---

From 1957 to 1961 Kaplan served the Justice Department (against which Weisberg obtained the Summary Judgment not mentioned in the Times review), first as a lawyer with the Criminal Division, then as a special prosecutor in Chicago, and finally as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in San Francisco. He wrote an article, "THE ASSASSINS," which appeared in the Spring 1967 American Scholar. The assassins John Kaplan was talking about were the critics of the Warren Report whom he characterized as "revisionists," "perverse," and "silly." He was also critical of Life's call for a new investigation and the Times call for answers to unanswered questions. These, according to Kaplan, "contributed relatively little in the way of enlightenment."<sup>52</sup> In

---

\*\*In addition to having been a newspaper reporter, an intelligence analyst for the Office of Strategic Services, and a Senate Investigator, Weisberg had also once owned a poultry farm.