

9/23/70

Dear Sylvia (Mary),

Perhaps the most surprising thing about the Hoch-Olson-Alvarez vomit is the lack of expressed revulsion among the "critics". You and two others only have given me copies of their responses, and one of those I inspired.

What little evidence I can get is not comforting to my original belief (hope?) that Alvarez was leaning on Paul as, with their positions, he could. Nor is it comforting that Paul has been silent. I therefore have to consider, if not believe, that this rotten project originated with him and/or Olson, not Alvarez. With his silence, I cannot know. However, I can take earlier hints over the months as substantiation of the belief the original concept was Paul's.

Your estimate of the Physics Today attitude is probably correct and not unlike what I feel. Therefore, in the analysis I sent Paul immediately, I asked two things of him: copies of the crap that I could submit to my own experts, for a dispassionate comment (which, by now, I am certain is the last thing any of that trio desires) and the address of the mag. so I could write and ask for simultaneous and equal space. I'll be getting busier than usual for a brief period beginning Saturday, so I'll wait until Friday at the earliest before writing the mag.

Nichols, who is his own, sui generis kind of trouble, is the last person I'd ask or trust for any comment, Cyril one of the first. I had in mind Cyril and a physicist selected at random from those not distant.

While my ideas were not developed in detail, I had in mind writing a piece saying you don't have to be Columbus to know the world isn't flat, that science can be prostituted and shouldn't be, and that common sense and knowledge of the ignored fact is all that is necessary to show this "science" is political fraud. It should be totally destructive for a layman to show the scientific inadequacies of the study, which is child's play, for in no case is there a valid duplication, not even of the angles, which are not given, or of the weapon, or the alleged ammo (also unidentified). I'll accompany my letter to the mag with proof that A's first venture into the field was a plagiarism, which should not inspire confidence in him and his purposes, and may discourage their interest in the project. This is not to say that other publications would not be approached, or that we'd have advance knowledge (one of the things I took as a signal). However, while silence is not always easily interpreted, I think in this case it reflects extreme embarrassment.

True, I cannot refute the article if I haven't seen it, but I do have the study that is alleged to be its basis, and that should be enough if not, indeed, better.

Beware of Nichols. I began with confidence in him, while recognizing that he is a strange one. Increasingly, it became clear that he is ego-tripping. It now is without doubt that he is also ignorant of the material and shamefully dishonest. Two examples: Bernabei and I each, separately, informed him of work we had done, to inform him, and the bastard turned around, duplicated it, and then copyrighted it in his own name! In the case of one of these things, it has led to enormous and time-consuming problems, provided the government an out they almost carried off and are just now correcting

Best regards,

