

1/14/69

Dear Steve,

Before anything else, let me tell you we did insure the package that didn't reach you, in about March, and I have taken it up with the Post Office. If it does not now turn up on a tracing, or if it turns up damaged, we will be repaid.

Your letter of 1/12 and enclosure are important, as I will explain. But first I tell you I intended being neither insulting nor patronizing. I told you what I thought you should be told. I took the time hoping you would or at least might benefit from it, assuming part of the responsibility myself, as I should have, for I did err in judgement, and I'm not kissing your ass over it. Cut that supersensitivity stuff out and set your maturity, not your years. You are unusually well-endowed for your chronological years, but you still have had just so much experience in life. Some of the things you have and have not done are not easily explained this way, but I am neither vindictive in telling you this nor just picking on you. Example: the arrangements you didn't make for me before I went out last time. I went there for no selfish purpose, without possibility of it, and at with what for me are great costs in time and money. Example, the fiasco at Santa Barbara, of which the account I have had since my return are not consistent with what you told me. Let us drop this childishness and proceed with what might be constructive in purpose and possibly in end.

Your people have still not told me everything possible on Hepburn. I learned from Ray, by phone, of the Jaffe discussions. As I asked Maggie, I should have all of this. It is now too late, and there is much too much I will not be able to get done that is essential before I have to go to N.C., now scheduled for first Sunday morning flight. Anything else you send me, please to Louis, no drop, at the office. There is now no time for the indirection which, in any event, is not necessary. I will be busy from mid-day Thursday through Friday with Houme, who is arguing the pic-X-rays case in D.C.

Lamarre-SF: Does this indicate to you he returned to the US or that he didn't leave? Do you see significance if it is a return, after the preludes to his departure, which I have reason to believe was before he had expected, unless it was to be in France for Ames? Hoch has been silent, so I assume he has nothing on this.

Rose's mistrust could be genuine or a common ploy, I do not know which and I do continue my mistrust of him for the reasons already given. The best that can be said is that he was a disaster. I still await that memo. Louis told me he would tell you to send it. To N.C. c/o him now. He sure had a hell of a lot to do with the Frenchman he now does not trust.

Vesjoly is the name I could not recall. Thanks to Maggie!

Here is the \$5.00 you asked for. What is it for?

Thanks, but I have the NYTimes 1/1 piece on "Warewell".

Briefly, on Palmer: I loaned him a copy of the Alysia film many months ago. He has had a chain of excuses for not returning it. He has been living beyond the potential income of his writing. Example: he spent more on fare alone on one trip than the gross maximum income of his "Confidential" piece, for their top is \$200.00. Even with other uses, if there is any value to his time, that, on this one foray, which also served to introduce him, took more than he could expect, and these are but part of his costs. In New Orleans, he asked that modest quarters be arranged for him, and they were. He immediately moved into swank ones and then started spending money on expensive extra furnishings. This could not be justified on the