

November 21, 1970

Dear Sylvia,

Thanks for your letter of November 16. Since Dick sent you his letter of November 5, I am enclosing my reply.

It is certainly true that I, along with many other critics, have no publications to my credit; I did appear on the radio once on S.F., opposing the 4-part CBS report. As you know, I have made the results of my research widely available, and some of it has been used and generously credited by you, Harold, and others. I have also made research aids such as the CD indexes available at cost, at considerable expenditure of my time and effort, to anyone who is interested. So anyone who now thinks that I was looking around for a way to prove the Warren Report right - despite my memos and other work with the obviously opposite intent - is certainly entitled to be surprised. When Alvarez suggested the jet recoil hypothesis to me, I would certainly not have been justified in showing no interest in checking it out, just because I know that the Commission's case is wrong in so many other areas. He did the first calculations and firing tests himself; I repeated the calculations for my own benefit and arranged to repeat the tests with photographs because I was not inclined to credit his explanation otherwise. I don't think I would have been morally or intellectually justified in pretending to be uninterested or too busy to follow the matter up. (In the high-energy physics business, I and others generally will go to the trouble of making our own data available to competing groups with contrary interpretations.) I would have been quite eager to prove Alvarez wrong, and remain so; the more I work on this the more I feel that his hypothesis is probably right, although he is far from proving it, and my opinions regarding publication remain negative.

Sincerely,

*Paul*

P.S.- I had, of course, no intention of causing my critic friends to spend unnecessary time in correspondence and argument. Perhaps you could look at the current situation in another light: nothing has been published, and nothing has been submitted for publication. The hypothesis has been discussed widely, and the arguments against it have been consolidated and made generally available. Alvarez knows what arguments can be raised and cannot try to publish an unreasonable interpretation of the evidence without foreknowledge of the reaction he can expect and the weaknesses in the case. It could be worse, couldn't it? Even Garrison's book could have been worse - it is just a joke, not a disaster.