

Dear Friend:



Thanks very much for your interesting letter. We welcome news, comments and suggestions from our readers and we are very glad to hear from you.



We will publish part of your letter in our "Report From The Readers" if space permits and you have no objection.

Cordially,

Jim Fullin

Editor

0111022

CLARK PUBLISHING COMPANY

• HIGHLAND HOUSE, HIGHLAND PARK, ILLINOIS 60035

1187 Agincourt Road,
Ottawa 5, Ontario,
Canada.

March 9, 1969

The Editor,
FATE Magazine,
Clark Publishing Co.,
500 Hyacinth Place,
Highland Park, Illinois 60035,
U.S.A.

Dear Sir:

I have remained silent long enough about the review of my book "Science, the Public and the UFO" which you published in FATE (Jan. '69). I think that the whole question of the purpose of book reviewing is at issue in my case. Normally an author sits back and accepts the bad with the good because he is as aware as anyone that not all will appreciate his work.

However, when a reviewer such as Jerome Clark sets out with an axe in such a devastating manner, apparently intent on crucifying an author, evidently in the hope that no one will buy his book, the author surely has the right to defend himself. Or do only reviewers have rights?

It has been brought to my attention that severe criticism of Clark's review was sent to you immediately following the publication of your January issue. As you have not seen fit to publish this criticism in "Report from the Readers" it seems that you are taking sides by allowing only Jerome Clark to express his view. I am forced into testing you, in my own defence.

As a modest man, I am the first to admit that my book may not be a particularly good one, however, a great many people claim it is one of the better volumes and reviews in other worthy publications have stated so. It seems, then, that just because Clark thinks my book is "objectionable" and "just plain dull", among many other things, does not necessarily mean that it really is. Many have stated that they couldn't put it down until they finished it because it was so absorbing. So we do have different views.