

19 September 1970

Dear Harold,

As you say in your letter of the 16th, you have had a relationship with Hoch that I have not had. Indeed, I knew him only through correspondence until a brief visit some months ago. Therefore, to me, his paper speaks for itself, loud and clear, just like the WR. To answer you quite directly, I find no merit in the suggestion that Paul was "giving us signals" and while I agree that he may have been under certain subtle pressures connected with his doctorate and his future career, that would in no way exonerate him, any more than it would exonerate the ambitious young lawyers who worked for the WC.

I foresee certain difficulties in connection with Physics Today. First, you would have to see the Alvarez manuscript before you could address yourself to its contents. You cannot refute an unseen article by Alvarez by a critique of a different (though collateral) paper by Hoch. Second, while I am not familiar with Physics Today or its editorial policy, I suspect that like the medical profession and other disciplines they take a parochial and orthodox attitude which would mitigate against publishing material by a "lay" writer, however persuasive and well-founded. Even if they were willing to give simultaneous space, they would not do so without first consulting Alvarez, who might or more likely might not consent.

However, if his article is published, it is almost certain to be picked up by the press—that, after all, is the real purpose, and it is that contingency for which we should be ready, all of us, if possible, with a unified set of rebuttal arguments. Certainly I will be glad to look over anything you draft with a view to submittal to Physics Today or to release to the press, by you or perhaps jointly by you, Cyril Wecht, John Nichols or others whose qualifications and standing will add force to a refutation of the Alvarez and/or Hoch "study".

Hurriedly,

cc Mary Ferrell