

9 November 1966

Dear Harold,

Your letter to Murphy at UCLA constitutes a clear and irrefutable case against university support of the Liebler "investigation." I do hope that the university takes account of the very cogent points you have made.

I have re-read my letter to the Saturday Review, as you suggested; but I remain completely mystified by your reproach. I don't even know whether I have committed a sin of omission or commission. Whatever it is that provoked you to feel that I have in some way done you an injustice, please believe me when I say that if I did, it was absolutely unintentional and unpremeditated. Is it perhaps my phrase near the bottom of page 1—"a fact not mentioned in any of the books reviewed by Judge Fein"—? I know that you rightly criticize the "painful and expensive reconstructions" (page 185 of your book) but I don't find a specific reference to photo no. 3 in the Bantam edition of the WR. If it is mentioned in your book, then of course I apologize very sincerely for my carelessness, but, I repeat, it was inadvertent, believe me.

Your comments on the Metromedia show are disappointing; Sauvage, too, regards it in a very negative light, although not for the same reasons you mentioned.

As ever,