

11/3/66

Dear Mr. Price,

Thanks for the copy of your letter to Liebeler and for writing it. Our minds are in track. He hasn't answered my challenge of July 19, nor has he or the President of UCLA answered my criticism-complaint. Liebeler is the first fox hired to guard the chicken house!

Meanwhile, taxpayers are paying part of the cost of his book and lending the prestige of a public institution to it. He says both sides are now needed? Isn't that what the Report was to give - what we paid him to do?

The effrontery of a man who presumes to sit in judgement on himself! The gall of having his students, who he will grade, evaluate his performance. Picture of a kid who finds what I have and says what I have!

I told UCLA it is not Lane and Epstein who persuade Liebeler to this project. Lane doesn't mention Liebeler, and Epstein makes him just short of Christ-like. It is WHITEWASH. He ordered a copy, daring to demand it free but promising to pay if I wouldn't give it to him. He said he had "scanned" it and found some of the references to him something less than complimentary. My reply was to give him every citation, to ask him to read it carefully and to then comment. I especially asked him to examine what I had on his handling of the photographic witnesses. He has been totally silent and hasn't paid the five bucks, either.

I suggested to UCLA that if they really want both sides I'll be happy to send them a question a week, coming entirely from the official record and from Liebeler's part in it. This can then be read before the student body and Liebeler can reply. I also suggested that honest confession is not over-advertised. Silence. Why not? If he hasn't been able to answer me in three and a half months, fears mentioning the name of my book, why should he rush into a debate with me. Frankly, I'd rather needle and worry him for a while, for when my new book is available there will be no point in him engaging in any debate. His record is as bad as the worst, and this is his present great apprehension.

I have also agreed to go to his stamping grounds and debate him when Calif., people asked me if I would and they said they'd provide plane tickets. This came about when Lane declined to meet him. Liebeler then bewailed Lane's failure to file the promised slander action (Lane will be a damned fool if he does, for he cannot win it). In my letter to UCLA I recalled this and Liebeler's comment in his letter to me to suggest that if he so yearns for a slander suit, why does he not file one against me. Again, silence. But I build a record. It takes work and time I do not have, but every phoney gets his chance - and remains silent.

I have rich new material that I cannot now go into, for yesterday's developments, a coming press conference late Friday night after the press preview of the Metromedia show in Washington that runs for three hours plus a snack break beginning at 7:30 and other things I'm into, keep me too busy. But we move forward. Yesterday's shameful commemoration of the coming anniversary by further deception and diversion is but a reflection of the applied public pressure, and that is very good.

Thanks and sincerely,

Harold Weisberg