

Editor, New York Sunday Times  
Book Review  
New York Times,  
Times Square,  
New York,

Dear Sir,

Only enshrined ignorance, venality or unabashed sycophancy can explain  
*in the issue of May 21*  
The appearance of the work of fiction about another *S/T* pretended as a review of  
*titled*  
the ~~pretended book~~ mislabelled "The Truth About The Association".

It is as irresponsible as any of the many shameful abdications of the  
intellectual community and because it is in the Times perhaps the least  
excuseable. The unidentified author certainly has not done the research ~~that~~  
~~is~~ *for* required of any honorable review. How, then, can he justify the expression  
of the slanderous opinions? Is it the business of the New York Times to print  
propaganda? Are you in the habit of soliciting opinion from those unqualified  
to express it? Is it your custom to so abuse the trust of your readers?

Your anonymous reviewer, if that is what he is, either didn't read the  
Roberts slop or didn't understand it, ~~else he'd never have said it~~ and he ~~couldn't~~  
certainly doesn't know either Roberts or his history, else he'd never have  
praised that fink for his "willingness to confront the critics head-on with  
facts based on his own experience and the Commission's hearings". The Roberts  
opening is that he cannot trust even his own observations, perhaps the only  
reputable statement in his work. He has ~~little more~~ *the* association with those  
hearings ~~that~~ the garlic wafted over the soup, as I told him to his face on the  
one occasion he has dared to get in the same studio with me. Then he had a famous  
champion, who also will not repeat.

Since appearance of that printed slime I have in every way possible  
attempted to get him "head-on", with or without the equally ignorant and dishonest  
Salinger. They will insult, but they will not confront. Roberts's publisher is  
not so anxious to sell the book that he can *or will* arrange it. I've invited Salinger,  
who I find to be less than plucky, to moderate this "head-on" confrontation.

Can I load it more in their favor? Individually or together they will not do it. So much for his "willingness to confront the critics head on."

Actually, Roberts mentions me and my book but little, never accurately. I challenge you and your reviewer to ~~disprove~~ disprove this. Let me make it easy. The references are pages 23, 65, 82, 84, 88, 101 and 127. You will find that in some cases what I <sup>actually</sup> said bears no resemblance to Roberts's representation of it. You will find that in not a single case has he given the part of my work he pretended <sup>to</sup> be quoting or referring to. And you will find that in almost all cases he says "Lane and Weisberg say" and then proceeds to ignore Weisberg and simulate answering Lane.

His is a slight book in every sense. You can check this for yourself. I do challenge you to.

And while you are at it, why not make a personal effort to see how willing Roberts is to get really "head-on" with me. I tell you as I told him and Salinger, I'll make it easy for them. I'll agree to restrict debate to their writing, on which, if it is genuinely theirs, they without doubt are most expert.

Let us see who writes with honor and accuracy, who respects the traditions of the American press and writers, who knows what he writes about - and who is the scavenger!

who will get  
"head-on" with  
whom