

7/28/77

Dear Paul,

Your letter of the 25th came today.

You are as entitled to your views on the melonry and Alvarez paper as I am to mine.

The government did put out government cash on Alvarez paper. I have the proofs.

I don't think I said there is a direct connection with the suit vs ERDA. I do say there is a remarkable coincidence in time. And I do know that the timing was planned in advance.

You find as an example of my unwarranted conclusions that he would ask me for a free copy. "Not at all peculiar" are the words you used.

My belief is that I would not be alone in using other words.

You have no scholarly questions about his use as a source of someone else's verbal representations of the work of still another? Happily you practise a higher standard with your own scholarship.

I have no trouble believing his interest came from students in 1966. I don't believe I said otherwise in the letter. You here refer to a "general controversy." I recall no other work containing that content of Whitewash available at that time. So the students got it from Whitewash.

You are correct if you believe you could not convince me that it makes no difference where a shot hit a melon. I do not address this with a degree in physics. I have recollections enough of practical applications from my boyhood. Like with balls. Grown people, golf balls. Tennis balls. Baseballs.

I have no interest in the melonry, you can be assured. I was asking for no information on it.

I am interested in the use made.

But as I recall this is not where I began. That was with the propriety of Alvarez using federal money allocated for research into ^{energy} ~~energy~~ for so obvious a political purpose. My questions now are greater, not fewer.

I also believe that on an article of this nature there is no possible disclaimer once the source of support is stated.

Sincerely,

July 25, 1977

Dear Harold,

Thanks for taking the trouble to send me the copy of your letter to ERDA.

As you know, I don't share your opinions of either the melon experiment or Alvarez' paper. I have seen ~~no~~ no reason to even suspect that ~~there~~ there was any government support for any of this work before Alvarez started ~~preparing~~ preparing his paper, much less that there was any connection to your FOIA efforts.

There are many instances where your conclusions seem to ~~me~~ me to be unwarranted. To take a minor example, ~~it is~~ it is not at all peculiar for Alvarez to ask for your book, saying that he had not seen it, when it is one of his references. I don't have a very clear recollection of this, but I think I pointed out to him that you had referred to the ~~streaks~~ streaks in the film, and gave him either a page from your book or a quotation. I'm quite sure his original interest, in this specifically or in the case in general, did not stem from your book, but from conversations with various students which were prompted by the general controversy.

You asked, ~~from~~ in your letter of 6/6, where in the melon the shots were aimed. I don't know; I don't know whether they were aimed at any particular point. I don't recall whether I ~~kept~~ kept any record of where on the melon the shots hit. I'm sure I will never be able to convince you that, for the purposes of the experiment we were doing, it doesn't make any difference. I don't think I have any more information on this experiment which will help you.

Sincerely,

Paul

PLH