

October 29, 1970

Dear Sylvia,

I am enclosing a supplementary draft report on the melon tests, and an explanatory memo. If it does not at least weaken the doubts expressed in your letter of September 29 about my commitment to justice, truth, and goodness in general, I guess I will have to consider myself hopelessly beyond redemption. There is nothing to be gained by a debate about my motives, especially since my eloquence is no match for yours.

As I read over your letters, I see that most of your points are touched on in the enclosures. If I have not responded to the factual questions you raised adequately, please let me know. Some additional points:

Your letter of 9/29, second paragraph: is it really all that inconceivable that everyone missed the significance of the backward motion? I certainly find that implausible, and I think I made that clear in my original draft report (pages 19-22). But they did miss a lot; and, in my experience, much of what was suppressed left traces in memos, etc.: e.g., the Hosty name in the notebook. Is it inconceivable that nobody found the "L.H." letter in the Militant? I think it isn't. But I agree that if the head snap had been noticed it would have been swept under the rug as fast as possible.

Your letter of 8/31, page 3, end of third paragraph: I should have said that the forward motion is obviously not inconsistent with a rear shot.

Same page, third paragraph: good point; see pages 13-14 of the Supplement. I will try to get good estimates from a doctor.

Same page, back to end of second paragraph: if there is both a forward jet and a backward one at the same time, the net recoil is backward or forward, depending on which jet is bigger (has greater momentum); one would not see two distinguishable motions if the jets start at the same time.

Sincerely,

*Paul*

Paul L. Hoch