



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
KINGSTON, ONTARIO

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

20 Oct. 70

Dear Sylvia -

Thanks for sending me a copy of your excellent letter to Paul. From what I hear concerning his responses to criticism, his failure to regard points of the most material bearing, I gather that he is impervious to any influence that might drive him from his present course. It is very sad — worse, really.

Enclosed are my three letters to him. These and other things that I have seen are sufficient to put any sane man soundly down, but....

I welcome your comments, if you care to make any, but do not feel obliged to comment if you are busy with other things.

You may transmit copies of my letters to anyone you wish, provided that they are

familiar with the contents of Hoch's memo.
If you do pass them on, please tell me
to whom you send them.

The second of the three letters may be
flawed, for it deals with matters of photography
about which I do not have special knowledge.
I may have to revise my thinking about it later,
but presently it expresses what I think is
the case.

Read the third letter first, for it contains
information which I think you will regard
important. I don't know why I didn't set
forth this matter fully and in lucid form
before, since it is very important — I suppose
it's because until I recently "re-thought" it,
I did not think that it constituted the
absolutely solid proof that I like. I know
now that it does, that it is solid and irrefutable.

If it is possible for you to do so without
going to great trouble, please keep me
informed about this recent Hoch business.
Regretably, we shall all have to answer for
it in some way, and it's good to have the
answers ready before the questions are asked.

Still,

Dick