

1735 Highland Place, Apt. 25
Berkeley, Ca. 94709
September 25, 1970

Dear Sylvia,

If the draft ~~report~~ report on the melon recoil experiment really did leave you thinking that I generally accepted the conclusions of the Warren Commission and rejected a conspiracy hypothesis, my writing skills must be even more deficient than I had feared. I am now ~~was~~ working on a major revision of that paper, which will spell out the distinction between what has been proved (that the laws of Newtonian mechanics do not imply that the backward motion itself means the shot came from the front) and my own opinion (that there is no persuasive ~~evidence~~ evidence of a shot from the front). I would welcome your assessment of the medical evidence on this point. I will respond to the specific comments in your letter of August 31 (except for the personal insults) when I send you this revised version. Don't worry, I do know the difference between a head and a melon.

I appreciate your observation that the publication of an analysis of any single point, ~~no~~ no matter how important, carries the implication that the Commission can be vindicated ~~just~~ by the fact that the critics were wrong on that point - regardless of any disclaimers in the paper itself. If this were my work alone, I would write it up ~~for~~ for the critics, but not try to get it published. This is, however, mainly Alvarez' work - certainly his idea - and he thinks it should be published. Any article he submits would be in his ~~name~~ name alone. At this time I don't see how any reasonably short article could present the results in such a way that they would not be massively distorted by the press ("Nobel Laureate Confirms Warren Report"), and I will emphatically present my views to him. I do thank you for your comments and am taking them very seriously.

Please feel free to discuss the work with Tink and any other of the mentioned critics. (I didn't send a copy to Thomas Stamm, whom I don't know.) You know that I try to avoid being paranoid about "confidential" work. I am enclosing a rather disorganized 3-page memo on the Odie information I mentioned. I hope you will agree that if it is not just a string of near-coincidences, its value could be lost if Garrison, say, were to get it and make it public in his inimitable fashion. Also, some of the cited sources are not public. As you know, information put out on the grapevine can get around pretty fast. After I let the Davison story out, a completely unprepared "investigator" talked to Davison, getting next to nothing from him but probably guaranteeing that nobody else could ~~talk~~ talk ~~to~~ to him ~~profitably~~ profitably.

I gather I didn't make my opinions on conspiracy, the Commission, and ~~Oswald~~ Oswald clear when we met. I think the main difference between our views is that I suspect Oswald was knowingly involved in conspiratorial activities with the (other??) ~~assassins~~ assassins before the 22nd. I read Bonner's book after Newman's, and I think Sgt. ~~Hill~~ Hill's story is about as much of a confession as we are about to get. If all that happened today, I wouldn't doubt that the DPD framed Oswald. I reread what you wrote in Accessories about a pre-existing DPD file on Oswald, and as I look around I ~~find~~ find even more evidence of its existence. For example, the reports in CE 1409 seem just too ~~detailed~~ detailed to represent the recollection of the officers after 1 year; they look like slightly revised versions of contemporaneous reports.

If you feel that you could tell me who in Dallas mentioned my alleged pro-Commission views to you, I would like to consider the possibility that he was deliberately misled. (That sounds paranoid, I know, but I am quite curious.)

Sincerely,

Paul

Honey, Dew Not Put Us On

Olson, Alvarez and Hoch

(Pronounced to rhyme with "joke")

Formed a grand alliance

To demonstrate by use

Of dazzling Science

(And merciless abuse

Of lowly melon)

That Oswald was indeed

An unassisted felon.

Let authors of the WR rejoice

Three academicians with a single voice

By thermodynamic hocus-pocus

Will vindicate their tainted opus.

Small wonder if we dwell on

The melon burst asunder

Sans casaban blunder

To the rear it fell

O fruit, thou swell!

Where apple proved the law of gravity

Melon proved doctoral depravity.

Masters of the jiggle, blur and frame

A place awaits you in the Hall of Fame

By sacrificing persian, cran and shaw

Beauticians you became to Newton's Law.

Why not aspire to demonstrate in still a better stunt

How one can get shot in the back from the front?