

A BIT OF SCHATZIANA

Mr. Shad Polier, son-in-law of Dr. Stephen Wise told me the following story at the dinner of the American Jewish Congress held on November 10, 1954 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

Albert Schatz and his two lawyers came to him for help in settling their problem. Apparently when Schatz' family decided that Schatz should sue me and the Rutgers Foundation they were told of a Mr. Lieber who is good at organizing that sort of thing. It was Mr. Lieber who advised them to engage Mr. Eisenberg, an attorney in Newark, New Jersey. The agreement that these two gentlemen made with Schatz was that they were to receive 40% of the lump sum that is to be paid to him by the Rutgers Foundation and $33\frac{1}{2}\%$ of all future royalties. When the case was settled to the satisfaction of these gentlemen, apparently Mr. Lieber felt that they are entitled to 40% also of the future royalties. He therefore refused to release the funds to Schatz unless he agreed upon such a change. Schatz, on the other hand, refused to pay Lieber even the amount he was entitled to. They came to Mr. Polier for advice. He engaged Schatz several times in conversation and carried away a very profound impression that he was "a first class psychopath". He also carried away the impression that Mr. Lieber is just the sort of a person that would engage in things of that nature. However, his impression of Eisenberg was a very favorable one, as a person who will honestly try to adhere to the agreement which he undertakes to fulfill.

Finally, after a couple years of bickering they settled the case, whereby Eisenberg was permitted to retain whatever he originally agreed upon, while Leiber was forced to give up some of the funds to Schatz.

I wonder whether the reason why Lieber agreed to that may not have been due to the fact the he probably retained many of the mud-slinging documents which he preserved for future use and whether he has not somewhat more directly concerned with the recent Marcus case.