

20754

- 10/29/66

Dear Mr. Price,

The HCR paper you so kindly provided has arrived and, as soon as she finishes the few remaining pages of the chapter she is now typing, my wife will try it. In case there is a difference in shade, etc., on reproduction, she will wait for a clean break, such as a new chapter. This is really very kind of you. I hope that it works, that it saves her time, for copies are essential. I am quite anxious for your lawyer, for example, to read it.

The enclosed carbon of a letter to Bobby Kennedy (I regret the poor legibility, but I am using the carbons my wife discards, for although we have sold many books, so little of the money has come in that I can't write every cent for the printer, who has advanced the cost of the fourth printing although I have just finished paying him for the second) is presently for your personal information only. I believe it is important to preserve the reputations of all concerned, from the late President down, but the time has come, as I tell him and as you will understand when you see WHITWASH II. I have a somewhat clearer copy that I am keeping. It will eventually be yours, as will everything else your archive may want.

If my judgment means anything to you, WHITWASH II is entirely overwhelming. There can be no possible doubt that the whitewashing was a deliberate design. The book proves over their own names who did it, how they did it, when they did it, who helped, who failed to deter, and a large degree of the blame and was silent.

This has been neither an easy nor a pleasant thing. I have aged terribly, if not in looks, certainly in how I feel.

I have changed my mind about whether your archive should have some of the documents in the archive. I told you not to buy them. I still say not to, but now only for the present, until we know more about them and until more is released. (As my attention to my new book, the entire situation of this archive may change. It is now a national disgrace. The cheap hipodroming of Mark Lane in an effort to a) make himself a hero and b) sell his book, succeeding on both counts, is not helpful. While there is no doubt that the classification of some of these documents is disgraceful, there is also no doubt that some must for the immediate future be classified. In any event, Lane's hands would be much cleaner and his motives less suspect if he had begun to make use of what is available and worse, if he had the slightest understanding of what he has, to my knowledge and as a matter of public record, examined. His incompetence is absolutely staggering. This will also become clear. My position on the archive will in part be clear, in abbreviated form if CBS TV uses what they termed of me Thursday without appreciable editing. I also address myself to it in the Epilogue of the new book. So my opinion of what the Yale archive should have will have to await developments. But there are some documents I have already examined I think it should have, even though in duplication of the national archive. I have bought a considerable number that will eventually be yours should you want them. I would like to consider it feasible to use these as a separate book, a sort of appendix-book, with a coupon in the sequel for ordering. They are in themselves a kind of separate history.

I have launched a subsidiary project that I think may be a worthwhile addition to your archive, as a commentary on our time and as a perhaps bitter testimonial to the abandonment of simple decency, honor and ethics where both the late President and the presidency are involved against cross mercenary instincts. You must know if you have, as I believe you have, read the other books, that there has been open plagiarism. I am doing nothing about it and intend to do nothing about it. As you know, this is not to my financial interest. I think it is, at least now and for the present, something I must impose upon myself because of the subject matter.

The most blatant is the New York Review-Avon-Popkin transparency that began as a "review" and ends as a so-called book. I will have for your archive the bid to me to sue ~~Avon~~ in time for Avon to use this as part of their advertising and promotion. I have gone through the book enough to show that where I, for special purpose I felt necessary for my work but not appropriate for Popkins, used broad, general footnotes, he used the same and I think in his case inapplicable footnotes. Where I used partial quotation, omitting the beginning and the end, he made the same omissions and used exactly what I used, neither more nor less. Where I, inadvertently, used one page too few in a footnote, lo and behold, he does also.

A young man who I have never met and who was unemployed when he wrote and asked for a copy of WHITEWASH he could not pay for has agreed to make a careful comparison, ~~among~~ something I have not been able to do. What I know and repeat above was obvious to me on a fast reading of his book. I think if he will, now that he has a job, albeit not a good one, this young man can do what I want. I am impressed with his reading and commentary on my book (which I am also saving for you). He has not read it; he has studied it. Incidentally, he has checked almost all my references and quotations. Except for a few minor typographical errors, they all check out. If and when he completes this, I think it might be a good thing to put aside for your archive if you want it, not as an indulgence of my vanity but as one of the unfortunately many evidences of the abdication of the intellectual community at a time when, in my opinion at least, our country required their services.

In this connection, I have challenged Judge Fein to debate me in the pages of the Saturday Review or elsewhere, including on radio, either his review (if that is what it is), my book, the Report, the Commission's evidence, or any combination, with or without the assistance to him of Norman Cousins. To date I have had but a card, their formal acknowledgement of receipt. He made no reference to a single fact in my book, took out of context a few comments, and as you know, I have relatively few comments, twisted them into meanings other than the obvious intended ones (like eliminating my concern for the upholding of the law and making it seem I was concerned about only the Texas officials), and was so reduced he ever added quotes together.

Nesley Liebeler is assuming a new importance. He and Arnold Specter alone of the former staff seek to defend themselves. They pretend to be defending the Commission, but they are not. I address myself to both in the sequel, forcefully and I think devastatingly and overwhelmingly. This was done before Liebeler began sounding off. His success is materially assisted by Lane's dishonesty. Liebeler so described Lane, and Lane has declined to rebate him, saying instead he is filing a slander action. This he appears not to have done. Meanwhile, Liebeler has gotten UCLA to support him with both manpower and funds, is now hiding behind their prestige, and has launched a successful (temporarily) diversion. I have written the President of UCLA, commented briefly on this over the radio, and issued a few challenges to him, too. Fortunately he seems to be a quite egotistical man. He wrote me in July, I responded with a very polite challenge, and he has been silent. I gave him every reference to him in WHITEWASH and solicited his comment, especially about his handling of the important photographic evidence, and he has reneged. I shall not let him get away with it. But unlike those people on the west coast who are worried about his temporary success, I am hopeful that he will continue to sound off. Every lie he tells brings the truth that much closer and makes it that much more certain.

When he and I tangle, I'd like a complete record to work from. I now have enough, but can there be too much? I have enough from just the Commission's record. It will shock you, as it will all decent and honorable people

But if you can send me, marking whatever you may want returned, every quotation from any of the Commission's apologists who think they are defending it but are too blind, to emotionally involved or too stupid to realize that the only real defense is the unalloyed truth, it can be very helpful. This is especially true of its former assistant counsel. I do not get the New York Times except when I go to Washington. - now have no time to read the paper. My already overburdened wife clips what she thinks will interest me and I put aside what I do not read immediately to read later. This is the only way I can get as much done as I do.

Today I got back my tape of the Burke show. The people in California who were to make a 1 7/8 copy for me either didn't or forgot to include it. - in any event, I cannot put this one on my machine, which takes only a 3" reel, and I do not have time to listen to it. So, if you'd like to borrow it to make a copy, please let me know and I'll send it to you.

The MetroMedia people in Washington are being very nice about the coming special. They are going to trouble and expense to publicize it, in a very dignified way. This includes a preview for the press 7:30 11/4/66, my suggestion that they readily adopted. I will be there for questions after the show is over, if the press wants it, and there will be free copies of my book for those desiring them. I understand the LA station KTTV, is carrying it, but only two hours of it. In Washington it will be aired an hour earlier than in New York, 6-11. The preview will break in DC for refreshments. The hour was selected for those who have a full day's work to do before they stand. I do not know who all will be there, but I have arranged for a few, including representatives of the Baltimore Sunpapers (both) and the Saturday Evening Post.

Yale's Professor Alexander Dinkel is now also on record with a startling piece of dishonesty in Commentary (to which I sadly sent a copy of WHITEFASH, of which there is as far as I have gone no reflection in his article). I shall also challenge him to debate, and will this leave the record that he declined or the record of the debate, in whatever form it takes.

Those people who think they can defend Earl Warren with lies are his worst enemies. That is the one one they can ruin him, or at least fail in any defense. They are also stupid in not realizing that the last word has not been written and in soot deeply committing themselves on the basis of this false assumption and abysmal ignorance of the very complicated subject.

This is already too long, an imposition on your time and more than I intended to spend this way. - began intending to thank you and then wandered in an effort to inform you.

Meanwhile, my wife is now using the HCR paper. It seems, from the first sheet, as though it will save her time and provide us with a copy for you and your lawyer, who I am anxious to have read it as fast as possible. There will be about 80 pages to Xerox to give you a complete set. Perhaps we can make the arrangements for that down here. It will also give her a complete set for indexing without disturbing the original or delaying the legal reading. Again, thanks. she is not correcting the typographical errors of the second and third pages, to save time.

NBC is telecasting an already taped Epstein-Lane anniversary program on The Inquiring Mind 11/20/66. If you have time to listen to it and can make a 1 7/8 or 3 3/4 tape for me I'd appreciate it, for I do not know if it will be telecast here and I am awaiting instruction to take my recorder in for repairs. It is not recording well but plays back okay. Again thanks, Sincerely,