

2537 Regent St., Apt. 202
Berkeley, Calif. 94704
April 27, 1969

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street
New York, N.Y. 10014

Dear Sylvia,

Thanks for sending me the excellent letters you and Harold wrote in response to Epstein's NYT article. I don't know if Ed's intentions were as bad as some would think, but I really thought he was too clever to come up with such transparent nonsense about the "irrelevant" single-bullet theory. As we all - including Epstein - know, your and Harold's letters only start to list the problems with the CBS version of the shooting.

Because of CBS' presentation, many people believe that they claimed that a single blurred frame indicates a shot. As the critics immediately noticed, there are many blurred frames. The "signature" of a shot, as claimed by Alvarez, is a series of frames (some blurred, some not) showing oscillatory motion of the camera. The CBS conclusion rests on two further claims, which I do not consider proven: that any shot would produce such an oscillation, and that it is unlikely that some disturbance other than a shot would produce that characteristic pattern. Alvarez' analysis is clever, and completely honest, but (in my opinion) far from as conclusive as CBS suggested. (Tink Thompson has a long correspondence with Alvarez and me on this matter; perhaps he has already shown it to you. I am very busy with physics at the moment, but in a week or two I can provide any further information you would like on this analysis. I had hoped that noone was taking it seriously any more.)

Enclosed: memo on an ambiguous but interesting peculiarity in the first FBI report on Oswald's notebook.

I hope you will accept the pressure of other business as an excuse for not giving my opinions of the Garrison fiasco. You are certainly in a position to say "I told you so," but I really don't feel that I understand what happened. The "explanation" in Epstein's book is quite unpersuasive.

It was a pleasure to hear from you again.

Sincerely,

Paul

Paul L. Hoch