Dear Mr. Bair,

Your letter of the 12th is polite, smooth, professionally lawyerlike, but not really responsive to mine of the 8th.

I would be interested, for one example, in your explanation of the ultimate division as something not subject to the interpretation of fraud. This you do not address at all.

You say "I think I can understand how you may have misinterpreted my intentions" (as John did also). Can you also understand how it seems to me that this "misinterpretation" was not unintended?

You can do better. I look forward to it.

Sincerely,

Marold Weisberg