Dear Gary, 11/14/69

With luck I'll be able to answer your 11/10 before lunch, then will resume correcting COUP add. Check on Betzner, Nichols enclosures.

It is true that I been been feeling better for a while. But the past several days nove not been as good. I do not know whether this relates to the discontinuance of the equanil or not, but I took three yesterday, and ~~if~~ if I hadn't been determined, I'd have had two attacks of the hyperventilation bit. Today not bad. As you once said, it seems to be free-floating. I can relate this with nothing. Perhaps I'll have to keep a blood-level of the equanil for a while, so I'll go back on it. I hate to depend on a drug, as with my back I got rid of the brace, and that slight cost now is a real one.

Sorry you cannot~~t~~ tell me about Brener, the book, etc. My interests here are counterintelligence, nothing else. Presume your source is Mary. Moo thinks Rick Townley may have had something to do with it. The book itself interests me not at all. Some of the quotes had to comefrom inside the office. If this means Box, then he had funny ideas before dismissal. If Gurvich, not as much as he could and should have had, because he had the intent in time to reall collect things and, I believe, the thing that in particular made me thing of Tom dated to after his departure. But if you cannot tell me, it'll have to wait. I tell you, however, that I am more concerned about "security" and "counter-intelligence", to use words not really applicable to us, than I have ever been. We are fewer now and we are closer to nitty-gritty in many areas.

On Davison I said nobody, not nobody but. I am disappointed that you still have this immature attitude, that you do not really understand the need for care, which means not only that Mary is, in your opinion, trustworthy. There is just no reason to use any means of communication when it is not essential in any tender area. I cannot force you or Paul on this, but I sure as hell can get good and disgusted at all the time I can waste trying to keep you from these self-destructive, childish indulgences, which are really too much like that business of Hal flashing the letter. This is an emotional thing with you. You like her so you want to give her everything -even after you know that she has not sent what she was asked for-and some of it after many months. I do not make this as an accusation, but I suggest that you go back over your letters about how she works. I have no reason to mistrust Mary. I like her. Shall I run off a list of others of whom this was once also true? I haven't even asked her, "do you know anything about Aleksei Davison?", although it might be a good idea if you do. If she says no, and asks why, just say ~~xx~~ he was in the Embassy in Moscow when LHO was in the USSR. If she says yes, she can also tell you what. But there is nothing you can expect her to contribute to this for she cannot keep up with the work she is into now. Therefore, there is no reason to do what amounts of advertise what may be a deeply significant lead. Unless I have your assurance that you will not give anyone else antyhing I send you, I'm going to have to stop it, for this is one more worry I am not going to assume, especially now. I have enough without it. There also remains the special interpretations those people give their stuff. How far to the right is Mary is I neither know nor care, but a few of the cracks she made about liberals make me wonder. My experience with people in that spectrum is that they convert things to fit these political preconceptions. This may not be true of her. When I learn it I will be happier. Until I do I will be alert. There are other little things, too, like her wanting what I had on Shaw-Lawrence-rentals. I sent it, with a few line missing. She had that one (and copied and sent me the page I had inadvertently omitted), thatked me for the pages she ~~xxx~~ did not have, but sent nothing except the phone-book check. Now this is inconsistent with what you wrote ~~xxx~~ me, with anything but the holding of a suspicion. I am satisfied she knows more of the N.O. end of it.

She and Arch told me many interesting things. I told them which interested me and asked for some. To date, nothing, and I strongly urge you not to remind her, as you say you will. In fact, if you mention any of this to anyone, the extra thickness a foresighted nature gave your skull will be inadequate. ~~Ixxxxx~~ I trust you because I believe there is ample reason to. This means ~~in~~ in every way, including judgement and maturity....Play it cool and let us see what happens. I've offered them access to everything. I let them have what I shouldn't have, the prints from the film. You took so much of your stuff there and left it for copying. (I hope this included nothing I sent you, regardless of how innocent). I have yet to see a thing, and if you were given anything, you have yet to report it. Except a heavy dose of stardust.

You fool yourself if you think your complaint about interferences with your mail will either accomplish any good are worry anybody else. Making the kind if bargain you report and apparently depend uppn is like cohabitating with an octopus. You have yet to comment, but I think there is sufficient indication that somewhere along the line it is a possibility if not a probability. Currently.

Basically you are right about not spreading our beliefs about Dave, yet there are times, as~~i~~ in response to a letter I just got~~f~~ from Edelman, where some of it is necessary. I'll send you a copy. I have dropped it with Paul, who is the likely offender, as I have stopped sending him anything I consider sensitive where he is not involved and working on it. (Yet you would put Mary in a position to make an accidental slip, for no constructive purpose?)

You tell me what I told you a year ago about Fred. What you quote may be just twisting, but some of it may not have happened, I doxnot now recall. I do know it is not likely exactly what Bradley said, but it may have been. It is anything but what he told me. What did Fred expect him to get from me? a magic wand? A case against Mark? For your information, there is no information I have any reason to believe Bradley has that would interest me, and I spent no time "trying to pump him for information". He promised to send me some things on the minuteman type fighting him, but I've not gotten it. He asked me to get him Roger's testimony, and I got it and sent it to him, with neither acknowledgement of repayment yet. I spent much time with him, drove him many miles, had him to supper, provided him with transportation to Baltimore, etc. and, if he listens to me, saved him much money. The business of the books is close to accurate. I asked him about you writing a book, knowing you have no such plans, because he had indicated that and I wanted to know why he indicated it. He said he misspoken himself, or something like that. I may well have asked him if he knew Lifton, but I do not remember it. He also denied knowing Steve Burton, which I know is a lie. I felt him out my way and still decided to help him. I did get for Gene the assurance N.O. had no interest in him, and he said he appreciated it. Something wrong with that? He had asked me this when he phoned me and I got the answer. So far as calling him collect, what is wrong with that? Neither the phone call nor any of the other costs, though minor (which are still major for me) were not for me but for him. He said he wanted to see Jim, that he had written often and goten no response, and I did it for him. I did not offer to go to N.O. for him, and I did not ~~thinkxxxxxxly~~ hint that I needed the money. I said it was impossible for me to go there because I am entirely without funds. I also said that if the time casme when he might want me to go there I might do it, but I did not visualize this. I told him that after the election, I would see if I could help him get what he wants, and I also told him Jim was not about to give him what could hurt Mark or Turner. Fred is really a bastard or reall sick-or both. "All Gene got was Hall's son's name...for all this time and expense. I'm sorry I encouraged Gene to see Harold." Why did he give this "encouragement" and why was I not alerted to it? Want did he expect to get from me (and he got much more that he can use and wanted-or at least said he did. All that time and expense means a bus trip from Chile, nothing more, for he was there on McIntire business. I told him Bud would tell him nothing and knew nothing he could tell him.

It would be good to know what the next line means or can mean: "Mary on the other hand has given Gene more stuff on the phone than Harold did in person". Perhaps this accounts for Gene's knowing many things I did not want anyone to know and told few people, of whom Mary is not one. On the other hand, it could be him and Fred throwing dust.

If here becomes important for me to know your interpretation of "Before Gene got there Harold was kind enough to check with New Orleans (unknown to Gene at the time) to see if they still had any interest in Gene". Do you read any meaning other than the one above into it? The sentence that follows the one on Mary indicates the opposite meaning, "I certainly wouldn't have sent Gene to Harold if I thought Harold would inform N.O. between Gene's first call and when Gene arrived". After your comment, I'll explain, if you'd like and remind me. But to answer your next question, I talked to no one about it and I wrote nothing to anyone you didn't get, I think to you on some and you and Paul on some. Your sentence I agree with: "Something seems very wrong here".

Please explain this sentence:"As I said, I told Fred in my letter to him that I could see reasons why you would not want Dave to have this stuff" What is "this stuff" and why is this a topic between you and Fred? I am baffled that, unless this is from the remote past, there should be anything like that in correspondence with any of those at best nuts. Having confronted Lifton's lies, is there any need for any further correspondence dealing with me? If I do not misunderstand this, it troubles me. I grant you it is now significant that we know the extent of their espionage and piecings together, but what a toll on your time it seems to be, and what strange things it gets you into....Why this closeness between Bradley and that bunch? Why should Fred have sent him to me (as I believe you told me you did).

Sylvia: agreed. Macnhester: what is Dave's interest here? Makes little sense to me. Suggest also you say nothing to Fred about having raised Bradley matter with me. Unless you want to pursue second interpretation above....Psychological comparison and interpretation: also agreed. You may recall I'd indicated this belief to you and explained it not quite the same way, from the other side.

Take you you came out of the accident intact and with a still-running car.

Postscript on Dave and his methods; probable. Until I see this great new important thing he has, I'm more likely to consider it also of such origin. You here use language I have long suspected is valid:"If I were to assess it all now, I would say that Dave actively attempts in a conscious fashion to do intelligence work on the rest of us and in my case, at least, to get unpublished stuff". As you also know, yours is not the only case. But, assume this to be true, for it is an obvious possibility. Without going into the reasons why, which are not central, does this not also suggest to you a general validity to what I have been trying to get you to understand? For this rest of this, two things must be true: this is wrong;it is a danger. Anyone in contact with him can, therefore, make an innocent slip. If you do not come to understand the basic needs of working where this exists-and it is folly to assume it is limited to him- you will come to be very sorry, and others will with you. And those who, recognizing he is contantly prying and harrenguing, still trust him, will also. When it is too late.

Your final paragraph on Mary does not stand. I met her and Arch in the summer, at least three months before you gave her this stack to copy. (It was wrong to carry all that with you, as it was wrong to give it without advance assurances of trustworthiness you lacked.) This is ample time to have sent me anything at all, even a volume of stuff. I will not ask again and I ask you to neither ask nor remind. More than anything else, I want accurate readings....Gary, I fear you are in this out of context, which can be fatal. This is a very serious business that represents great hazard to the most influenctial people in the world whose lack

of scruple and complete dedication you do not have to have explained to you. I also suggest Agnew's last night's speech, a gutteral echo of the 1930s, is neither an accident nor in a vacuum. I will not expand on this for it should not be necessary. Instead I ask you to think, to try and place all of what we do in such a context, this kind of environment, with two particular things in mind: what the consequences can be to us and the importance of success to the country. Now these are not only the rottenest people in control of the country and its enormous power, they are also desparate.

We have assumed and bear great burdens. Please stop adding to them needlessly. Mary tells me she and Arch are interested only in collecting all they can for their grandchildren, nothing else. I want nothing of mine to be added to such a futility. I'l work with people who want a decent world for their grandchildren, for people who want the truth now. But I have yet to be persuaded that for all the enormity of their work it isn't all on tangeants, on what will not stack up, on what is central and can help disclose and establish truth. I am looking forward to some indication you haven't just been swept off your feet. These people had my work and my address and never made any effort to get in touch with me, yet they are engaged on so enormous a project. Perhaps it is natural for them, but it is not the way I would have done were the positions reversed, nor is it what you would have. There is too much that requires answer where there is no real answer, too much that is neither what it appears to be or really satisfactory. As you have seen, even though they wouldn't ask me for it when I told them what I had that you asked me to send, I sent it. If they are completely open about this, they had it and didn't understand it at best. On the other hand, they also had what they knew I had worked on and made no gesture of helping me, for they did not know what I had. I did offer them access to my material, but notice they did not accept it when they were in a position to. The fact is, Bud had told them in advance I'd help them take them through the Archives, etc., but they neither wanted nor accepted this and didn't even phone me. The only reason we met is because Bud arranged it. I repeat, all of this and more may be no more than the kind of people they are. Now I want proof, for I did ask them for things they didn't send. The duplicate of the one page (and Mary should have suspected I had that) is all I have from them but the most effusive (and excessive) praise.

This has already taken too much time. I close with the encourangement that you think about and then apply a real, meaningful, non-emotional "need-to-know" basis for your generosity (which may include other people's materials?) and then only with dependable people, people of established, real dependability. I am unkind enough to remind you of your initial appraisal of Fred. We all have this problem. All of us are the kind who want to lead and have led open lives. This makes us marks for the other kind. How many more Liftons, Boxleys, Fredis, Jaffe's, Burtons and others do you need to learn? Were it a hot iron, one would suffice. I've made the same mistakes, but earlier, when it meant less. Profit from my burns, if not your own.

Sincerely,

November 10, 1969

Journal Of Experimental Research In Personality

Editor:
I. E. FARBER
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Box 4348
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Associate Editor:
BERTRAM D. COHEN
Department of Psychology
Rutgers University
New Brunswick
New Jersey 08903

Associate Editor:
DAVID T. LYKKEN
Box 392, Mayo
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis,
Minnesota 55455

Publishers:
ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.
111 Fifth Avenue
New York
New York 10003

Dear Harold,
From your recent letters I would guess that you are feeling a bit better. That is good to hear if I am wight. Enclosed are letters to Betzner, Nichols, a carbon of the affidavit, and a xerox of it. You can file the xerox away and keep the carbon around in hopes of executing a similar one yourself. While Hugh Jr. is a fine fellow, Hugh THE is an SOB, and that is why my letter to him father is worded in the way it is. I am apprehensive about his pulling out of the agreement with me if anything new develops, and yet at the same time want to make every effort## to get you copies of the photos. The fact that Nichol's man is doing the work should play into eufr favor since it will be no more trouble for Betzner.
On the subject of the Brener thing, I can't tell you how I know, but I am almost certain that Bethell had little to do with that book and am very certain that he did not write it. This is something which I am dying to discuss with you but which I must hold in confidence. I have all of the archives stuff on HL Hunt and Rothermel as far as the name files go, and sent it to both you and Paul. There were only a few meaningless pages, and I have since found a few others by accident on my own. That they have a copy of the Panel report in the archives is interesting. Glad to hear that things with Roffman are going so well. He is near enough to the archives to help a lot and seems to have done a lot of careful work.
Progress on Davisson interesting. Can I send this stuff to Mary. She may be able to help out and will keep it in confidence. I sent you that clipping on the Cuban rags to riches story just in case you had a file on him. I do not.
That envelope you mailed back to me, which arrived late, and was twice post marked in Mlps. intests me also. They are not likely to do much with my mail anymore because of that big runin I had with them out here when I put them on the hot seat and they made a bargain that I would let them off, but if there was any more tampering with my mail I would bring the wrath of god down on them. I think that it suddenly becomes very important to keep our concerns about Dave's possible connections entirely to ourselves. Paul, and perhaps Hal, will brush them off in the same manner as they initially did the Turner questions, and then the suspicion may leak out. Right now Dave and Fred are carelessly giving me many details which we might not get otherwise.

Fred sent me a bizarre reply to my last letter. He seems pretty far gone. The letter did contain the following passages, which may be a total distortion, but are still worth noting:
"Talked to Gene the other day and he said he had a visit with Harold that was unproductive. Harold, according to Gene, spent most of the time pumping him for information, inc [sic ?]... If Gene had heard of any new books being prepared on the case. Asked Gene if he knew Lifton and you. Asked if you were working on a book.
Before Gene got there Harold was kind enough to check with New Orleans (unknown to Gene at the time) to see if they still had any interest in Gene. And later Harold called Gene (collect) at his motel to say that Jim would be glad to talk to Gene if Gene would go down to the office. Harold offered to go to N.O. and see what he could do for Gene, hinting, that he needed money to do this.
All Gene got was Hall's son's name...for all this time and expense. I'm sorry I encouraged Gene to see Harold. Mary on the other hand was given Gene more stuff on the phone than Harold did in person. I certainly wouldn't have sent Gene to Harold if I thought Harold would inform N.O. between Gene's first call and when Gene arrived. Gene also saw Bud and that was a zero also."

Any or all of this could be distortion except for the deal about you checking with New Orleans. Did you? If so, who did you tell about it, and when? How could Gene or Fred have known about this? Please fill me in. Did you tell Gene, or do they have another source. Something seems very wrong here. Fred's grandiosity is very pathological and frightening at this stage.
Agreed on Dave. As I said, I told Fred in my letter to him that I could see reasons why you would not want Dave to have this stuff. On Sylvia I think that the present circumstance has indicated what I was afraid of before--that she is not trustworthy, despite her reputation to

the contrary, where N.O. or Dave are concerned. With Lifton all I am yet convinced of is that he has done considerable flirting with the other side, has been willing to identify with them or ally with them at times (perhaps hoping for fame or favor with them), and that he is very crazy and capable of anything. Much of the type of sabotage he engages in is extremely common among paranoids or paranoid schizophrenics, and there is nothing he has done which could not be explained by mental illness. What concerns me most,however, is his sources of information. As we have discussed in the past, sometimes mentally ill people can do more sabotage than agents or establishment people who are trying to. On Liebeler, I strongly suspect that L gave Dave things from things Dave has said on the phone, and the hatred stuff just doesn't wash with me anymore than it seemed to have with Bill O'Connell.

From everything I have been told by Dave, Fred, and a relative of Dave's (correction--friend of a relative) who approached me at Ithaca College, it seems that Dave's "evidence" or gem of info points to LBJ plus Rusk or Dulles meeting in Dallas or something like that prior to the assassination. He told Vince specifically that he had evidence of meetings, etc., between LBJ and Dulles. Connally figures in importantly from what I have heard. Mary, naturally, mentioned nothing that would even hint at it, so these are just impressions from what Dave has blabbed to others including me. He feels that the military did the job under political orders, which is the opposite ### of our approach in some respects. Mary says that what Dave has could fit on a page, is small, and clear cut. Since Fred says that Dave's great fear of me has to do with my knowledge of the archives in addition to the rest of the case, and according to other things said, one might suppose that whatever he has came from the archives. But, there is some real doubt that Fred has been shown anything of importance, and so the impression may be misleading. There is a large likelihood thatit is something he got or stole from Liebeler in my mind. If it is from a public source then he would have been far more insecure over the years of someone discovering it. Therefore, what worries me the most, based on my hypothesis of what it is, is the possibility that it is a fake or plant. Our best hope is that Mary, Paul, and Sylvia will get to read the manuscript when it is done, and that the publisher, if he finds one, will scrutinize it very carefully. This latter we can pount on given that his gem involves LBJ who could sue them into oblivion now that he is not President. This all makes me uneasy, but there is nothing we could do. I hate to trust to fate, but we will just have to pray that he does us no damage. Mary cannot and should not be approached to violate confidence, even though our purpose is to try to help guard against disaster and we would not only never consider any theft of his work, but would be afraid of being accused of it. All I know on the subject of Dave I have told you. I could tell you something more, but I doubt if I could write it down--we would have to discuss him and I could probably answer some questions you have--although all definite info I have you already have.

Mary's opinion of Dave is that he is a bit way out but bright, that he has done some crazy things and used bad judgement in his relationships with L and KT (who she is very suspicious of). She feels that his gem of info is great, but that he seems to have absolutely nothing else. She feels that he is essentially milking others for the info which will appear in his book, and that his secret info, with the exception of his one big item, isn't worth anything. The Powell thing is an example we know of. She does not completely trust him since I showed her how he cheated her with the archives stuff. But she feels that it is important for his gem of info to come out and therefore is helping. She does have doubts that he will ever publish and compares him to Marguerite in that regard. She feels that he wants his book to be a great historical event and hopes for money and fame from it. I agree with her general opinions, although I have a much lower ### opinion of Dave than she does, and it gets lower by the month. On Dave's relationship with me, there was little or no pretense of trust, because much of our interchange had to do with you or N.O. in those long arguments. He had hoped to get things from me, probably from your work or mine or both, but couldn't get anythign of yours, and little of mine (unless he would be specific about what he wanted).

On Sue, she is very far to the right, and perhaps as far to the right as anyone I have met. The misunderstanding of Bud's notes, while it caused an excessive reastion on her part, is not the reason for the current problem. I would breach a confidence to tell you what the cause is, but Mary provided me with documentation as to Bud's acknowledgment that he had done what he had, and it involves something which would have caused a breach in anyone's relationship with Bud had it occurred elsewhere, and furthermore has zero relationship to politics. This is something Bud did, and essentially acknowledged having done, which Mary and Sue are keeping from Arch at Mary's admonition so that Arch won't sour on Bud and then cut off communication. When she first told me she realized that she would have to document it and she did. If Arch ever found out that would be the end of any dealings between Bud and Dallas. It did not endear Bud to Mary but she is still willing to cooperate. Your letter to Mary was good in that you elliptically answered her suspicions of another phase of Bud's life without pinpointing me as the source

on that. But those suspicions, similar to my initial ones, developed after the incident which caused all the trouble. I do wonder, as you do, about the fact that Mary has sent nothing, and agree on the two-way street idea. If nothing has come within another month then I will broach the subject and ask for an honest discussion of why.
On Mark on your book understood.
On keeping things open with Fred and Dave, it has been the only way for us to be aware of all that has happened, on breaches in confidence, which, while they are water under the bridge, can be prevented in the future. Dave and Fred are so way out that they continually give info as to stuff they have which they shouldn't.
In my mind there is no justification for Sylvia's breach of confidence, and as I told you a long while ago, I have never trusted her with regard to Dave or N.O. since the N.O. thing started. She is just too emotionally involved, for some strange reason. Dave does put quite ## a bit of interest in Manchester, and all of that stuff FRed wrote me is wild, but it could be Fred's craziness just as well as Dave's, believe me. The two of them exchange# crazy iddas and suspicions and rave day in and day out, and the particular source of anything could be either one.
Thanks for advice on Harper. Will write him soon.
Already proceeded with Betzner before I had time to read your letter, and did as you advised anyway. (I typed it last night but had to wait until today to get the affidavit notarized.)
I will ask Dave for the original work, and will send Mary a copy of that letter.
On the thing# about Nichols, if you didn't tell Sylvia then I would suspect that one of the SF people leaked it. I doubt that if that info came from some other source he would tell me of it in that manner, but anything is possible. From all of my dealings with him, and his claims it appears that someone in SF has just been too cordial and too careless with him. Bear in mind a fascinating thing he wrote me during the great debate: that it is n't that he doesn't trust me to keep confidence, but that he worries abou t the possibility that I might either slip sometime, or tell someone something because I don't think any harm could come of it or that it is that important, or because I think that the other person might be able to make more use of it than Dave. That is not a direct quote, but conveys the meaning. In psychology we focus on things like this because they often tell more of the story than the words themselves. Sometimes the general mental set is more important than the content. For instance, I once used a lie detector aparatus in a mock murder investigation to show its usefulness if handled correctly. Before ######## asking questions, I gave a word association list. In other words, I asked the guy to give a word for each one I gave him (i.e. Bread? food; letuce? vegetable). The murder was done with a poker from a fireplace. When I came to the word poker, he said fireplace rather than card game which just about everyone says. This was the tip off. All the other suspects said card game to that one. While it wouldn't have proved anything in the legal sense, it was a red hot cue. Well, when Dave gave those descriptions of how confidence hauld be violated by a well-meaning person, I immediately wondered whether he had been speaking from successful attempts of his own to get material of yours.
I do have PMIII and thank# you for the copy. I just haven't had time to go over it. When I do I will make comments.

Well, I'd better close and write to Mary. As soon as I can get caught up I will start doing memos and send them to you.

PS: Things have been a little tough lately. I was involved in a car accident, but after over a week of anxiety and concern, things all worked out and there are no problems. Concern abbut the injured on through concern about loss of license, etc. (I would have to quit my job if I did) turned out all to be unfounded, although at the time I had every reason to worry given my lack of knowledge about these things. It was not my fault, but that is not always easy to prove. In this case the other party took full# #responsibility.

11/10/69 afternoon

I just got your mailing of 11/6, etc., and will answer them here.

The Snyder thing is interesting. I have no suggestions but think that you may be on to something of importance.
Had I had more time, I would have clarified the item abou tthe Nichols quote--or at least I think I would have had I rewritten that awkward paragraph. Basically what I wanted to indicate was that Dave could have had complete and accurate knowledge of it, and that his description of

it was off beam beaause he was trying to do something crazy with it. In other words, the reason he brought it up to me was a far-fetched attemp to have you doing bad things to Fred, and this required an off-beat description of the whole thing. But I think it is a big mistake to assume that he does not have an accurate description of it. I know nothing more than I have told you about this though, but was just afraid that I had communicated a false impression.

Bear in mind that with regard to Dave 90% of my correspondence with him has been with regard to arguments about you or N.O. and that he got up tight after the first few letters. I haven't heard from him in a long while, except for that one phone call, and it has been months since he stopped writing and phoning. If I were to assess it all now, I would say that Dave actively attempts in a conscious fashion to do intelligence work on the rest of us and in my case at least, to get your unpublished stuff. He is good at haranging and good at trying to pry things loose, but at least at this distance and with his propensity to loose control if approached in the right way, looses his credibility easily. Out there, he probably managed to keep cool when dealing with Paul, etc. Part of the the thing with me is that he starts raving as soon as someone says something good about you. We has known those guys for a long while and the subject is probably not brought into the conversation.

With Mary, while I have faith in her judgment and do feel that she can be trusted, I too am now uneasy about her failure to send things. Bear in mind one possible explanation which I hope and expect is the correct one, at least since I went to Dallas: She is busy copying the many items I gave her so that she can get them back to me. She is afraid of losing some or getting them mixed up, and tried very hard (to the point of exhaustion) to get them all copied while I was there. She has also been very active lately, and was before I got there. Bradley visited, Boxley drops by a lot, she went to N.O. and saw Joe Marcello ### to whom she was introduced by a friend of a friend who I think her husband met, or through some odd channel.

Well, I'd better close.

Larry