

RESEARCH CORPORATION
405 LEXINGTON AVENUE
NEW YORK 17

Feb. 25, 1964

Dear Grole,

Thanks for your letter of the third, addressed to home. The slowness in response is not due to lack of thought and very real interest, but due to a flood of other things always happening to disturb trains of thought, if any, and privacy. By virtue of a reasonably interesting session, in spots, at the new campus of the U of Cal, San Diego, I have some of the kind of contemplative time available that it's almost impossible to realize either in the office or at home.

Very almost as well-qualified in the area of the problem you have stated as I am in astronomy, I don't hesitate to assert an expert opinion. Disagreeing with you completely, I am convinced that the matter is solvable and that your premises, on which your statement is based, are fallacious.

Neither citizenship nor geographic preferences or prejudices is a valid major consideration. What you are considering is a very basic and long-term relationship between two individuals and the factors in this antedated by a period of time approximating the span of more or less human life on this planet and/or national and/or regional developments of the herd instincts.

So - the only guide there is, to my way of thinking, a mutually reached conclusion between two individuals that there is reasonable probability of enjoying and surviving their own close contact as much as 24 hours a day on a repetitive basis. To do this, each must have his own interests and, if not already in the picture, mutual interests which can be shared must have basis for development. In none of this does nationality or geographic preference have more than trivial, incidental place.

Next question? I suspect it's that of developing a social situation which would provide maximum exposure to other individuals, one or more of whom might appear to have the characteristics to fit these requirements of mutuality. There's no doubt that there are reasonable numbers, in Australia and other countries as well as the States, of attractive, intelligent

RESEARCH CORPORATION
405 LEXINGTON AVENUE
NEW YORK 17

gals who would fit, and some who would fit ideally (or nearly so), I'm willing to bet that the wives of various of your associates and friends at CSIRO and otherwise around Habart would really take off on providing such exposure if there were the slightest hint that you were thinking along these lines. As a matter of fact, I'd be surprised if some of them might not have tried it already, as most wives seem to be automatically match makers for unattached friends and acquaintances. And, of course the same thing applies to this country. While we have never discussed any such thought, I know you well enough to be sure she has at least speculated on your state of singleness and possible attacks on it via unmarried or widowed friends in our circles.

And so, my friend, you haven't an unsolvable problem on any of the scores you cite. Your only problem would lie in possibly missing the most nearly ideal one among the individuals in whom you would be interested and who would be interested in you. There are quite a few unattached gals who want very much to be attached and given a shot at a prospect can be both ruthless and deceptive in pursuit (not necessarily obvious) of marriage itself with only incidental regard to the needs and interests of the party of the second part and with no thought for the underlying basics necessary to insure close and comfortable companionship from there on.

My, how I've gone on. I hope it's not all obscure or confusing, and that it won't seem gratuitous to you. I think you know that I'm deeply interested in you as an individual as well as a scientist, and I count you among the few very good friends I have with whom a regrettably large proportion of contact is on paper rather than direct.

Continuing very best wishes, Grate, and please don't hesitate to tell me off if I'm way out in left field in writing such an epistle to you.

Hap