Dear Sylvia,

This hasty acknowledgement of your note of the 9th is a sincere compliment, not a subtle wise-crack, for your mind has served you ever so much better than mine, this being the first time you have had cause to tell me what have long been telling myself, that I've forgotten more than I retain.

It is inevitable, the mess is that complex and needlessly complicated. This was SOP of the FRI, to flood the Commission with endless trivis whenever asked for anything. It is for this reason, for example, that I early fixed on the bit of IHO's pubic hair and its pointless analysis, all scientific as all get-out.

To this, of course, we need add the deliberate obfuscations of those stalwart pillars of society, the Commission lawyers.

As I just wrote you, there is more to this 133 A and B buisness, and thanks to my early interest, I have been able to carry it somewhat forward, though I'll have to let putting all I have together until I return to AGENT OSWAID. It is ever so much more scandalous than the existing record, including what have in WW, reflects.

I think Roberts' involvement with that is largely responsible for the misdirection of the second Times "investigation" I was able to trigger by letting Salisbury read the mss of the first two books. This was initiated as soon as he saw the ms of II. Roberts was sent to the Archives. He couldn't even find what I cited by file number, from the reports to me from inside the Times. Handler was opposed on principle. Etc.

Little things are sometimes so meaningful.

Sincerely.