

9/10/70

Dear Sylvia,

Your mailing of then8th re Hoch, happily, I got early this a.m., for I had to take my wife to town and was able to pick themail up at the p.o. Otherwise, I would not have gotten it until an hour hence and would not have had time to respond before an expected visit. Unfortunately, we are reduced to the point where my wife is accepting temporary, part-time employment for \$2.00 an hour, and this will require four trips to and from town for me each day. Aside from the cost of the travel and the interruption in work it creates, it will also take me more than an hour daily. Yours is the only mail I've opened, I've scanned it briefly, and will now go over it paragraph by paragraph.

As I wrote you, I have sent Paul a detailed, specific, not a general response. While I was vigorous in it, I was not really personal. I have not sent copies to other critics for two reasons: not to shape their opinions and, although you seem to be unaware of the possibilities, to be completely fair to Paul. Although without realizing it, you have provided me with evidence of finkery I did not have, to which I'll return, I am not yet willing to accept this for there remains another possibility to which your not-unjustified passion blinded you.

Our approaches are different, as we have, on many occasions, people and subjects been. I have spent an enormous amount of time trying to prevent just such damages to what the serious ones of us seek. It has extracted from me, in substance and health, what I think no one will ever understand, particularly you, because your Lifton/Thornley/anti-Garrison hangup too often precluded sharing with you. However, on certain things, as with the medical evidence, the Halleck trial, ince, etc., I did background you completely.

If the time has not come when I'll have to give up this defense activity, it is close. However, with this Paul think I cannot, and before I forget I'd like to ask that you locate the address of Physics Today and give it to me immediately. I think that if I cannot prevent the publication of this drek I might be able to arrange simultaneous publication of an analysis of it. Considering that you are a woman, which is generally a disqualification with ballistics materials, and that you lack significant knowledge, I must say that some of your perceptions are brilliant and you should be proud of them.

I still do not want to run the risk of shaping your thinking, so I still will neither send you the 8-pp single-spaced analysis I think is a total destruction, even if hasty, nor will I tell you the other considerations, whether or not they ultimately prove to be valid, of which you give no indication of awareness. To make this more specific, I am not saying that I am right. I am saying there is a possible explanation that has escaped you, a possible purpose. And, as in the even greater than usual haste I respond so I can get this mailed back to you when I pick my wife up and have it completed before the animated unpleasantness arrives (we face disasters entirely unknown to you and I must seek to cope with them), if a phrase or a sentence seems as a personal criticism or an attack on you or your judgement, understand I do not so intend and in no sense do I or can I mean this. Let me dispose of one to begin with, so the context will be clear in your mind. Please leave Tink out of this to the extent you can. I know your feelings about him as of the past. He has a record of which you may not be aware that I think justifies this and his present attitude is "what difference does it make", regardless of what he may have told you. He also has trusted Lifton alone among the "critics" with what he stole from LIFE. His work was fiction, not science, as two engineers immediately proved to me, spontaneously and independently. Stamm's is too far in the past past, when he and we understood too little (as his mailings to me amply demonstrate) and he, too, if Lifton-oriented.

By the way, when Mary was here, and we had a wonderful weekend, I did share these possibilities with her because we had had a chance to go over many things, as one cannot by mail, and were able to exchange thoughts on the spot. So, I will send her a copy of this, as I presume you sent her a copy of your letter to Paul.

Before getting into your letter, and again hoping to avoid any conditioning of your own thoughts and beliefs, I do suggest that you reread what you wrote and ask yourself if some of the things you did spot can be some kind of clues.

For brevity I will refer to your writing by par. and page/

Attached note. I am not yet ready to believe Paul a fink.

1:2 I've not yet read Newsman's book. He prevented commercial publication of WW in the summer of 1965.

3 If Mary was your source that PH believes IHO was the lone assassin, she did not tell me this. If you can tell me your source and any amplification without violating confidence, I would appreciate.

4: PH's disavowal of the WR has been specific to me, on many occasions. You have misread his position on Garrison. He was, to the best of my knowledge, never "pro-Garrison". I think you do him a considerable injustice, particularly for the period beginning about 2/68. His suggestion that judgement be suspended is accurate but again, I think you neither understand nor reflect his reasons and I suggest your own rather vigorous position precluded and precludes the probability, even now. I think it is fair to say that Paul never displayed to me any personal approval of Garrison, whereas when I first met him I was very favorably impressed.

5: When you can, whether or not he might take it as insulting, I think you should write asking for PH's clarification of his views, unless this refers to Garrison, in which case I think it serves no purpose, esp. not with what we now have to contend with. Invective and denunciation can now accomplish nothing but a foolish luxury, self-gratification. We have more important considerations for the little time any of us has.

6; His request for confidential treatment was a temporary one not a permanent one. I saw no inference it was intended to preclude any inner-critic communication on it. I suggest you consider whether there is something here you may not only have misread but missed entirely.

7; On requests for secrecy, you will have to reconsider your own hangups. I've recently addressed these. Limit this to Lifton for my present purposes. Is there, in the light of what I understand you now realize, anything but the best reason to request confidence? I can add others, including Tink, who is a whole-sale crook, among other things. However, here is one of the points that disturbs me. PH and I have been working very closely on Oduo, among other things, and I cannot recall anything he has sent me that fits your description. Again, the fact that it has been impossible for you to work as I have, with your own heavy job commitments, may account for this. If you feel you can send me this, in confidence, if necessary, it may provide a dependable clue on the Paul of today. Here I should also acknowledge that he has written me much less since before his recent trip to Washington, and virtually nothing on what he there got. But to answer your question, why might you tell, need I say more than Sprague, to whom you have given what he immediately misused? Paul can be aware of this kind of thing when you may not be in a position to.

2:1 Would you say that Lifton "has demonstrated integrity and trustworthiness"? Or Vince? Or others, like Epstein? You are demanding that others

accept your judgement as beyond question and without possibility of error. As you know, I have not. As you also know, I offered you information on this long ago on the basis of precisely this and you refused. This, in itself, responds, I hope you will regard as sufficiently, to your own ^{concern} ~~disquiet~~ ^{about} among the critics. I can tick off a long list of others, some perhaps little known to you.

I'm sorry; there was a major interruption here, and I may have lost some of my own thoughts, for I ~~xxxxxx~~ have been occupied by another subject and problem. My man isn't coming today, so I can make this longer before having to get my wife. Before leaving this, I suggest your trouble would have a better basis if it were not about the "trend...to impose secrecy" but the feeling that there is a need to. I would also suggest that you may not be in a position to evaluate, as you do, about what is "small, medium and large". On cooperation I am in complete accord, and until recently I sent Paul, for example, a copy of everything I had and made the same offer to Mary and others. But are you suggesting that on the basis of even what you had to know before your recent disillusionment about Lifton I should have entrusted some of the things I got to him? And are you still unaware of the fact that the Archives has gone out of its way to attract his attention to things of which he had no knowledge? So while cooperation is the desirable condition, can you ask that it be with the plagiarists, the nuts, the crooked and devious? You may have been unaware of these records, but others were not. On this point, a digression: if you have anything at all bearing on Flammonde's crookedness of any kind, it can now be important to me. I have more than enough of my own evidence, but for this need, something from others than me would be better. You continue on this to call self-defense, for that is what it is with some of us, "irrational". Would you now call it a contribution to progress to give Lifton what he can misuse, as part of his "proof" that LBJ and Rusk/Dulles (take your choice-the same proof "proves" with either) were meeting secretly for the week before the assassination to plan it? Or to advance his "proof" of the papier-mache trees, or the secretly-constructed and secretly-removed Brown & Root tunnels? I do not conceive of such things as "cooperation". Your final words here disclose your own awareness of this, to a degree of discussion or disclosure which does not involve risk or misuse". Apply this to Lifton, Sprague, Berkeley, Turner, Flammonde, Trent, Skolnick and others I haven't time to try and think of, including Bud's board of directors, and have you not, really, answered this?

2:2I suggest you are too modest, or so subtle I was taken in, in suggesting a lack of knowledge of physics handicaps in trying to understand this flat-world science.

3: One of the flaws of the paper is that it is, in fact, entirely divorced from any contamination with forensic science. I suggest the intended misleading is only the "lay public ultimately, that it has more immediate objectives of exactly the character you specify.

5: Backward and leftward. My continuing studies convinces me more of the accuracy of the first and then very limited reference to this in any book. The motions are, as I recall saying in WWII, discontinuous, as you may not have been able to detect from Nix alone. After writing that, incidentally, I was so afraid nobody would credit it, I went back and eliminated most of what I had written. I immediately spotted this in Zapruder alone. CD298 is entirely wrong in saying "head suddenly snaps to the left", for it is neither immediate nor a snap. I may soon be able to be more definitive in commenting on what Nix alone shows, and you do not mention Muchmore, which also supports what I am telling you (for your understanding, not in commenting on what you wrote Paul).

6. You need no longer wonder about the melon and you appeared to have missed the boring lemming. The melon is the least-faithful of possible duplications of the human head

Notice he is so indefinite he didn't identify the variety or condition of ripeness or size or rind and meat character of the melon, all of which influence results. I went into the points you here raise so well and many more. One of the significant things you ignore is the knowingly and deliberately unfaithful angles, like Euclid hasn't been born, which is a new kind of physics.

3:1 I have already commented on the rifle and ammo-and the care with which the ammo was not identified, its weight, speed and design so studiously avoided, also a new kind of physics. For your understanding, he said "reloaded", but did not say how, with what or for what purpose. But generally speaking, the .30-06 is both heavier and much faster (the 2766 was of only medium velocity, despite the WC), and most hunting and varminting projectiles are designed to explode or mushroom on impact. Your points here and in 2 are very well taken. Your question is rhetorical, I presume, for if from no other source you know that most of the material was ejected in the wrong direction from PM and PM III. Most, to his certain knowledge, went leftward and backward. And note what you missed, his assumption that what is seen in Z includes fragment of bullet, etc.

On the me, on, I have to assume a certain share of responsibility, for when he first told me of this work, I took it with complete seriousness, I suggested firing into something like a melon or grapefruit. But my point was only for seeing what happened to the spray, etc, and in no case envisioned such a Rube Goldberg physics as tape and an incompetent mounting.

4: Reread and see if you can ask yourself a different question.

5: In an entirely different sense, it can be said that the tests "do basically resolve the issue", but you've missed it and I tell you this only so you can see if you can find what I have decided is a possibility on your own. The issue is resolved against the stated conclusion.

6: Your point about the wounds is fine, but it is even worse than you say, for I have given him knowledge of the wounds you do not have. Aside from the career imputed to 399, do not forget what is here central, the head wounds.

7: The thing you call and properly describe as misused "Alvarez 'jiggle'" may address itself to Paul's basic integrity. This is not Alvarez's and Paul, knowing its origin (WW) called it to Alvarez' attention so he could therefore claim it as his own "discovery". But there is no doubt in my mind that part of the upper right side of the skull that was, in fact blasted away. You here say not and I believe you err.

I do regret your non-intended pun, for it is the perfect description. Please intend it! And in meaning it, think of Jericho, too.

I have to leave in a moment (and I apologize for inflicting my awful typing and typos on you, but I want nothing to delay this reaching you). I add that we are much alike in some ways, including the enormous angers and passions of which we are capable. I think those reading what I did will consider that I was thus dominated. I tell you I was not. I began by feeling these emotions, but others took over...Is it possible that you and I were intended as prime objects in the advance distribution of this work, which will be much abbreviated if published? I think its publication may not, in fact, follow what I have sent PH...Reread this effluvia and see if you can give me an opinion other than contained in your letter. ...I think it possible and not unreasonable. I do not insist it is necessarily correct. This we have yet to learn and I have taken a few steps in that direction, without response as yet...Ask yourself who PH may hold in highest regard among the critics...And other questions you should have. Many thanks and best regards,

Handwritten signature