69-01 35th Avenue
Jackson Heights, NY 11377

George Palmer
Assistant to the Managing Editor
The New York Times
229 West 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036

June 11, 1971

Dear Mr. Palmer:

Your June 9 reply to my June 4 inquiry about John Leonard's review of "Heritage of Stone" intrigues me. It is the kind of answer I expected, but it is hardly a believable one. Does routine editing extend to changing the title from "Who Killed John F. Kennedy" to "The Shaw-Garrison Affair?"

At any rate, I enclose a copy of John Kaplan's recent review of Harold Weisberg's "Frame-Up," and I ask you, if editorializing is not permitted in New York Times Book reviews, why this one-sided editorial attack was permitted?

Examples of "non-editorializing" follow:

"The silly season apparently is over so far as the critics of the Warren Commission are concerned."

"Now Harold Weisberg, the author of no less than six books on the assassination of John F. Kennedy, hopes to repeat the triumph of his "Whitewash" series with "Frame-Up," an investigation into the assassination of Martin Luther King..."

"A trial is a circumscribed adversary inquiry into legal guilt, not an undergraduate paper where one tells all he has learned about a subject in six weeks."

"Whether James Earl Ray was pressured by others into his plea of guilty...or whether he simply misestimated the odds when he compromised his case out to avoid a death penalty, we do not know. In any event, his trial would not have been the enlightening event that many had expected."

"Mr. Weisberg's grasp of the law is, to say the least, somewhat shaky (he is described elsewhere as a chicken farmer.)"

Kaplan's review was nothing short of an editorial from beginning to end. Is it possible that this slipped past the eagle eyes at the Times who are ever wary to reset type from one edition to the next to insure that no editorializing occurs in the Book Review?

I hope that you respond to this letter as quickly as you responded to my last one.

Sincerely

Jerry Policoff