

November 27, 1927.

Mr. William Randolph Hearst,
#137 Riverside Drive,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Hearst:

Thank you for sending me Mr. Rossi's letter. Mr. Bohn, our nice old Mr. Baldwin and the younger watchman have been added to Mr. Slatterly's "activitys", and I impressed it on every one that while heading up to Mr. Slatterly they were to obey and be polite to all in authority, especially Mr. Rossi. I've noticed a decided betterment in Bohn's manner and Mr. Slatterly thinks he may be better, ("duly squelched"), than some stranger would be.

As to Addisison and the others, using Mr. Slatterly as a go-between with Mr. Rossi seems to be working out well - I have warned both men that no quarrels or misunderstandings will be allowed.

Tuesday I am to see the man you mentioned, Murphy in Los Angeles, and will report. Slatterly says he has no difficulty in getting along with Addison and that the man is certainly devoted to his animals and most conscientious as regards them. He will have no chance to put any of his expensive ideas into practice as requisitions will go through Mr. Slatterly, who is warned. I am sorry about the saddle, which was an office slip - someone should have gone out with him to buy it. There was only the one bought and it cost \$97.00 instead of \$35.00 to \$50.00, the price of a good ordinary ranch saddle.

Mr. Slatterly will head up the household as one of his "activitys" from the first of the month on. Again I am glad to assure you that the house is running competently and quietly - and I have seen nothing done or left undone that you would be likely to disapprove of.

It is regrettable that with all his very likeable and able qualities Mr. Rossi should have the "inexactitude" - side. I find that in nearly all cases of animosity except as regards Mrs. O'Brien, Mr. Rossi has first been over friendly and confidential, realizes he has been so, and tries to get rid of his imagined "enemy" by the small methods you know of. But it keeps him constantly plotting and building up these

"revenges" in his mind and it is bad for him and the conduct of the work, and is certainly growing beyond just "inexactitudes".

I was sure you understood the general situation - otherwise I could not have let it go on. I do not think from what I have run into that the "confidences" referred to cover things more serious than the "guests' portions" taken down with them, but it all makes the wrong atmosphere. I regret to trouble you at all with what are really my "activitys" but the situation evidently needs this much explanation.

Yours very truly, .