

1/31/67

Dear Jack,

I'm told you heard the WOR tape in which Sauvage and I faced Nizer and Charles Roberts of Newsweek. I do not know if you know that behind our backs Nizer demanded half of the scheduled two hours on the ground that "other side" had never been heard and had actually been granted a half hour that, as usual, he extended and wasn't cut short until I complained.

Sauvage and I learned about this just before the taping began. I was promised an equal opportunity to answer and never got it. Had I not insisted, in a way I do not like to and as you should recall from my long silent sit alongside Curtis and Vince, in a way I ordinarily would not, I've have had no chance at all. That would have been a show in which Nizer slaughtered the critics.

He is a remarkable man, so honest in his recognition of his own dishonesty he is entirely unashamed at having it proged to his face, and so unblushing about it that he does not bother to reply when it is made explicit. He is selling his own book, the appearance of which just happens to coincide with his sudden recognition of the need of the government for his stalwart support. It took but three years for him to come to this recognition.

And he is the smoothest liar I've ever met, the slipperiest debator who slides off the subject whenever he cannot address it so unobtrusively it generally escapes notice. He has mastered all the dirty tricks of the courtroom and exploits them out of the discipline of the courtroom, where there is no law to restrain him and no judge to deter him. He is content to manufacture evidence with the twist of the tongue, a few slanders at those who disagree with him sliding out simultaneously and with quiet peity. He is a real performer.

Possibly there is no connection, but I'm inclined to believe that either directly or indirectly I was tossed off the scheduled Metromedia taping of "The Majority Report" that is being done tonight as a consequence of the dent I made in his reputation on WOR and his recognition of the fact that I do fight and on fact.

This show was originally asked for by the Commission's lawyers. I alone of the minority side demanded to confront them, and expected to, alone, December 6. It was on my return from this that I was last on your show. No one was there and I wasn't informed of it in advance. Those lawyers, save for two unimportant ones, will not debate me. You know of Specter. Liebler fled me the entire month of December. December 5, when I was at WNEW, they asked me if I would debate Nizer and Melin and Alfrede Scobey and I agreed, if there was a real moderator, not a boob like Bishop, to hold Nizer to the point and in line, and if I got paid anything he got. On their assurance I agreed and everything I've done since then has been built around this. Two weeks ago they told me they were horning Lane in, and there was nothing I could do except to ask them to control his upstaging. So, I suspect Nizer will have another field day tonight when they tape that show, save perhaps for a few debating points Lane may score. Unless Nizer is too overconfident and too careless, having learned two weeks ago what can happen.

Would you be interested in a debate between Nizer and me if he will undertake it? You know enough about the subject to know much of the time when he is inventing, lying and slandering, and you certainly are no Martha Dean. I'd be very happy to do it. Aside from what you always do and what I'm confident you would in

this case automatically do, keep the show on the subject and the discussion on the point, there is but one thing I'd like you to consider: keeping each appearance of each voice short. We could take each point by itself. I'll let him pick the points, if he wants.

The sort of things I'd like to avoid is the full stuff that comes out when there are lengthy scholarly dissertations, such as on the first show I was on with you and Curtis and Vince, the fillibuster Nizer ~~has~~ did on Dean, and the cheap personal thing Lane is reported to be doing in answer to the scurrility in last Sunday's World Journal Tribune's libels by Lewis, of Capitol Records, to say he sleeps with his secretary. This is not that kind of a subject and that sort of thing does not contribute to public understanding. (By the way, neither Schiller nor Limestone of Capital have replied to my letter of three weeks ago and the WJT has not answered my challenge to let me answer what little so-called "fact" coming in the Commission lawyer part of the record there is. Nor has a radio station that gave me 20 minutes to answer it accepted my challenge to answer it sentence by sentence as they play it.)

For your information, I've drafted but haven't yet read and corrected about 8,000 words on Manchester, almost entirely on his second Look serialization. It is almost 100% inaccurate in dealing with the assassination itself, in the most exquisitely fine detail, such as what Oswald was wearing, when they got up, what they talked about that morning, whether Marina ignored him and went back to sleep, what the evening paper printed, etc. I'm thinking of another book, MANCHESTER MACHIAVELLI: THE UNINTENDED UNOFFICIAL WHITEWASH. You may recall I have been predicting from the beginning that the Kennedys would disassociate themselves from Manchester's work, and not over the slush. He miscast himself in an insane, medieval way. Have you any opinion on whether or not it would be a suitable book subject today?

Meanwhile, WHITEWASH III is about a month behind schedule as I willingly accept what exposures are possible and continue, fruitfully, my search of the archive. WHITEWASH III will be so big it cannot be profitable, but I think it will be interesting and worthwhile.

If you like the debate idea, Doubleday is Nizer's publisher. I'll be in New York and New England next week, ending in Burlington, Vt., addressing a history honors course (that's the way to sell books) Thursday night.

Sincerely,