April 19, 1967

Program Director, New and
Special Events
WMAL-TV
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

Recently you aired Mr. Charles Roberts, whose name is signed to a book pretending to tell the "Truth" about the Kennedy assassination and which consists of a careful culling of parts of a number of books, including mine, to which he thereafter does not address himself and pretends to quote evidence that in his view disproves these books. Mr. Roberts' quotations from the Commission's evidence is unusually selective, to the point of dishonesty. It is misrepresentative and often the opposite of what the credible and best evidence really is. Those not familiar with this evidence have no way of knowing what Mr. Roberts has done.

I am writing to request that because this is damaging to me- if you read the beginning of his book you will know this is the intent- that I be given an equal opportunity to refute Mr. Roberts. If I may, I suggest that I will take his broadcast, which I did not hear because I was away, and address it point by point, or, what I would prefer, would be to read his book and present the truth, cited only from the misrepresented evidence.

You can thereby follow me and see that I do not in any way misrepresent what he says. I dare Mr. Roberts to do this with my books, and with me present to answer him. If you will examine the references to me in his book - that is, in the text-not the blurbing, advertising and promotions- you will see that in no case has he shown what I said is wrong. In fact, in almost every case he does not say what I said. His technique is to try and tar me with his Lane or Epstein brushes. Had he done what the course of honor required of him, since his book was done considerably after my second one appeared, with free copies available to him early in December, he would have seen what I have to say about the work of Lane and Epstein and known how dishonest what he did really is.

In some cases his error is so gross it cannot be considered accidental as, for example, in his partial quotation of Tomlinson, the hospital engineer who actually said, in effect, that if he testified to what the Commission's lawyer was trying to get him to say (and the meaning Mr. Roberts put on it) he'd not be able to sleep nights! In answer to Mr. Roberts partial quotation that says exactly the opposite, I would read his words. Likewise with the cab driver, Whaley, and for as long as you desire of permit.

While you are in no way responsible for the abuse of your trust, and that of your listeners, and those of us Roberts assails, I hope you will give me the opportunity for reply at a mutually agreeable date.

Sincerely,