

10/2/70

Dear Sylvia,

I think it not possible to improve upon your 9/29 response to Paul's 9/25. As you now know, he made next to no response to me at all. It is not, as he said, that he didn't want to "argue" with me in deference to my (healed) ulcer, which has never troubled him before or, to his knowledge, ever troubled me. It is simply that he cannot make factual response.

Nothing, to date, not even his belated confirmation that this was Alvarez' idea (not at all his first representation to me of many months ago), earlier in a letter he sent Gary, copy to me, explains this to me. I know I may be labelling myself the biggest fool of all time, but I simply cannot imagine Paul "sealing out". Not can I imagine him really thinking this way, or calling such dreck "science", or really believing he can use a melon, taped or naked, as replication of a human head.

Yet he insists he is not under pressure.

As for the pre-existing file on LHO: the M.O. P.D. also had one on him and on Ferrie, before the assassination. The Intelligence Unit had files on both and despite that perjurer Sullivan, Vice also had one on Ferrie. Needless to say, I did not learn this from the DA's office. They at first denied the existence, based upon representations to them, then said they'd get and give me copies. Since then their intermittent silence has been complete silence.

There is another and perhaps significant thing Paul wrote you: his belief Oswald was consciously involved in "conspiratorial activities". He has never before, to anyone, to my knowledge, so indicated,

I think it may also be significant that he asks of you, having no reason to believe you have been able to carry inquiry into this aspect further than the printed evidence, "I would welcome your assessment of the medical evidence on this point", where he refers to either the motion or the direction. Knowing of the enormous amount of work I have done on this, he not only does not ask me, but he ignored what reference I did make.

Either there has to be an undetected, certainly unconfirmed, merit in my first hunch, or he is sick, or your epithet fits. This is just irrational and that is not true of anything I have ever seen or heard from him.

In the realm of the indefinite are what he means by "conspiratorial activities", which could include a federal association, "persuasive evidence", on which we both hit him and, despite assurances, whether there is, in his/Alvarez' mind, any difference between a head and a melon.

I also suggest that if I am wrong, this widespread seeking of criticism could be a tooth-pulling, getting criticism before publication. There is no major revision that can eliminate the misuse that will be made of this paper.

Sincerely,



CC MF