## 8/23/73

## Dear iir. whitron,

 letter of the 21 st was written the next day. Its Inst peragreph loes not reiloct the
 on your wart $2: 3$ poscible. hals way be nccidentol, lut there ane too meny of these in the past for $n 0$ to leave those of the present moomrected, rogniless of the tine they waste.

I ant not now nor have I introduced any now conditions. - have severtil tines
 told lis. tiontelia of tham.
 Kr. Hacrue didi not; timon issue ma a oncok for the sum he computed for the ante of tivose books that wero my moperby and then and there direet that shipmont be mado is bacenae he electod to semerate thrse thtnge and aucit a setilerunt with $i_{2 \%}$. Handiton on those things othere than tho renatinloza. On the other hand, Ifelt that botil our interests were sorved by settling that we could and reducing the problowe. I feel tiat I made a very considerable ancriftioe to thto ond in the ugnoment on the ruanduers we did reach. I will not comproniae it firthor. If you mest to by tifle socond paracrpeh, I do not und will not acoagt it. ly ingovious comosponkance on tivis is, I belifeve, unequivocul. It

 why I vould not accopst less than so small a pwort of that I arpent to get for thoch-boois that wero sold when thoy were wy property.

 and I hrd better to thet T went to How York for in Fiay, tum all or thise condid business over to a Imryer. it that ise the lost thing I Mont, I goo no ral vibemntive if you intended trickery. When ir. Hontella's letter conolndos pe f.t doos, the tmolcome poisibility is not eassily ifnored. I would apmoceiato mome emplientnoes fror yot. If you inhorit this mess, I have to learn by the lesmons of it, I intend no personel tiffront, but I alac condt intond to be treated thbs way if you तid intend what socmus not hupossible. Thus, in fuitinoss to both of us, I oeek omplicitnesse

The "within a week" foroast in your lotter of the 17th hes pressect with no nome
 ho could not give mo anu thon toid him ho could not. Nonotholese he eent mo so.cthing else. As you kuou, bocause I sent you a oerbon, I too d han this me not what is rocuinud
 should be obrious it moduction of tims avidenoe vare as annla as you seen to believe or to have bem led to belfove, d2l, this tillo moult not hava alspsed. It ghould also be obsious thint at this gtate it ghould not bo nucossamy tor dawic to meet with you "and personally rotriave all the portinmt finfozution fron his fiferei fif he tas, ss 1 know ho cannot have beon, folly informative with 4n. Hessiltom or with Dution Before
 is no: procuced you have nax gume for soncurthe I an trying to bo hotpinl to you tuk to Dutton and tarjing to be hunout wikle you to the oud that thice be reacived without thes nasty potontial it has. I havo $i 0$ dustre to hut, Dutton. But I elec hove no snturtion
 you, At has to be trallulant, tron mepatitivo, unasaciluble proofo I. to have, lind iff its is not producol, then am her no tunstioning of the Iogitimow of whet, I have asker, which is consideruble logs than I om I bolievo reunenably and 2ngithnataly ant enc orpect.
 have to sock reatitubion. Inewtitalive there willi be a mocalution of all of thes and at


Finje doos nsither of us any ford.
 uncound peres aw to sion s rolage for thuth. I will if you will name to hoid them for a Littcles whi? and provide ne inth that I hove nover gutton, an astinate of thetr
 thes eest to you.


 besis. Nrd I do bolicve wh witll both be bottore off for it in the cnid.

## isinceroly,

Iharoic Neisberts

