The Warden's Lodgings, All Souls College,

Oxford, ENGLAND.

1st February, 1968.

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Arthur Crook has shown me your letter to him of 25th January.

You will not wish or expect me to answer the extravagant charges you make against me in your letter, but I should like to set you right on one or two points where I think there has been a misunderstanding.

First, Mr. Crook would, I know, have been only too pleased to print without delay the first letter you addressed to him, and I myself was very anxious that he should print it; but it was addressed to the <u>Sunday Times</u>, and this not only caused delay, but also made it impossible to print it in the form in which it was written. Your second letter likewise was not in a form suitable for publication, and the suggestion that Mr. Crook should himself re-write your first letter imposed on him a responsibility quite outside the scope of his editorial office. All he could do was to ask you to send him a letter, addressed to the Editor of the <u>Literary Supplement</u>, in a publishable form; in view of the delay (for which you alone were responsible) it does not seem unreasonable that he should have asked you to do it "promptly".

What I want to emphasize is that I genuinely regret that, through your bungling, no letter from you has appeared in the Literary Supplement.

Second, about the letter from Mr. Roche. Like you, I think that the main argument in Mr. Roche's letter is, to say the least, a very weak one; but Mr. Crook had to print it, if he printed it at all, as it stood; to criticise him for his "uncritical printing" of it seems hardly fair.

Finally, you suggest in your letter of January 25th, and also in one of your previous letters, that I "arranged for" your first book "not to be published by a house that had given it editorial approval back in 1965". I really think there must be some misunderstanding here, and I should like to clear it up. What was the "house" in question? I have no recollection of being consulted about the publication by any publisher of any of your books. Had I been consulted, I don't suppose that I should have encouraged the project, particularly if I had read any of your writings, which at that date I believe I had not; on the other hand, I would not have been at pains to prevent it. I should be grateful if you would refresh my memory by telling me the name of the publisher concerned.

Yours faithfully,

H. Weisberg, Esq., Rt. 7, Frederick, MD. 21701

1						÷						
			ł									
				x								
0.9964		Υ.										
											*	
							a S					
					÷	ł						
	ų								ж.			
			112									
			-			First fold	→				tan.	
	IMPERI	Form approved by the Postmaster General, No. 71995/2E	AN AIR LETTER SHOULD N IF IT DOES IT V OR SENT BY		J. Sparrow, All Souls College, Oxford, England.	↑ 8	MD.	Ø	H. Wesiberg. Bsg	3	AIR LETTERFE	BT AIR MALL
	IMPERIAL AIR MAIL Aerogrammes	ostmaster General, No.	ER SHOULD NOT CONTAIN ANY ENCLOSURE: T DOES IT WILL BE SURCHARGED OR SENT BY ORDINARY MAIL,		¢	Second fold here ->	MD. 21701. U. S.A.	4	Eso			and the second se
		71995/2E	GED									1 0 5 T A
									5	5	I DAR	C 22