

NEW ADDRESS: Rt/7, Frederick, Md. 21701

1/2/68

Dear Dave,

Your performance belies your protest. It is that of a native hater for Liebelar. I shall not waste no time in dignifying your pseudocarcious tripe, a not too skillfull blending of distortion, misrepresentation, deliberately misplaced emphasis and outright lies.

If this is the way you want to spend your time, that is your affair. I will not.

Your protestation that you have no connection with Liebelar, has an oddly hollow ring when you go so far out of your way to defend ~~me~~ him and the entirely indefensible things he has done, the things I specified. Strange how in all that hogwash, all that time on the phone, you were without even indirect criticism of his "failures"-as though you were using his phone, or he were an extension, or might listen to a tape of it.

Some of it, even for you, is really ridiculous. For example, comparing 18.3 and 24 when the proper comparison, if you think a 10% error is not a reasonable allowance in such a "reconstruction", is between 16 and 24 or ~~18.3/16~~ 24 vs 18.5/16.

You must now had Liebelar's blessing in mind when you fabricated this one: "Here you have built your whole case against your favorite bete-noir, Liebelar, on a premeditated phoney reconstruction, only to find your case is false". whichever reference this is, it is a deliberate lie. You know better whether you refer to the Barrett report or his cute "if locating of Altgens (moorman to you).

The rest of it is little better and a credit to neither your intelligence nor your integrity. Some of it borders on the indecent, as when you pretend that you unfairly paraphrase the Barrett Report whereas you reproduce most of it and all that is applicable in facsimile and at that point in the book.

Your reference to "the way the controversy has evolved" is really more accurately put "the way I am trying to create a controversy where none exists". Liebelar should find a few extra good for that.

Your entire behavior is consistent with that of a provocateur or a running dog, not scholarship. What you are a close student of, the phrase you use, was already clear to me from some of your writings and the credits.

If your problem is not dishonesty then it is psychiatric and I will waste no more time with you. Next time you feel the urge to write or phone, cut out a few more paper mache trees for "salger blaze" instead.

Sincerely,