

3 Jan 71

Paul Hoch  
Berkeley

Dear Paul:

Thanks for your Christmas card and the reminder that I had not replied to your most recent correspondence. The reasons for my failure to acknowledge are several, none--perhaps--acceptable, but all--I hope--understandable. The letter arrived at a time when I was especially busy with things that demanded my whole attention, mostly things having to do with end-of-term business-- setting and grading tests, reading numerous term papers, some faculty board duties, and the like. I read your letter once and put it aside, intending to get to it when my time came around. Secretably, I remained rushed and occupied with other things from then until now-- including trips out of town and out of the country. To top it all, I cannot now locate your letter, although I think it is somewhere in my office, various misfiles-- I'll check when I get there. In the meantime, please excuse me for failing to refer to all the things that you mention.

Among the things keeping me busy was the writing of a monograph dealing with the fragments. I'll send you a copy of this the next few days. To save money, I started to circulate an earlier draft moving from person to person until finally it reached you. What you will get from me is the second draft. I recalled the first draft, since I have revised certain parts considerably-- largely changes of recitation and of emphasis, rather than of substance.

There are still a few things lacking in the footnotes, but I believe that they will be evident in the draft, so I shall not specify them here.

Except for footnotes and appendices, which will take some time to complete, this draft will probably be very close to the finished form. Later than discuss our previous correspondence, which has been distasteful to me, as undoubtedly it has been to you, I would like to start new and these discussions of the monograph. Currently it is the best and best that I am able to get forth, although some important additions are forthcoming. (The skull will pass, for example, undoubtedly will be revised. I am in touch with our former and am getting information that may enable me to get fairly accurate depictions of the areas occluded by the fragments.)

All, when I find and re-read your letter, I find that the monograph does not treat matters that you discuss. I'll write and discuss them in a letter.

I remember one thing in your monograph that I intended to mention-- it does not have to do with the fragments, though. I recall that you referred to the possibility that the newly-revised rocket projectile, fired from a rifle-like instrument, might now be used. I believe you are ~~xxx~~ referring to the so-called Gyro-Jet. (Somewhere I have articles on this, and will find and send them if you request them. Especially for two reasons I think it is not possible that the Gyro-Jet was used. For one thing, the Gyro-Jet projectile is not frangible. As I recall, it contains no lead, but rather is made of a metal

which, if it could break apart on impact, would not break into very small particles. More important than that, I am pretty sure that the Gyro-Jet was not commercially available until about 1965, and may not even have been developed by late 1960. Although I am now relying on my memory, I am almost certain the Gyro-Jet did not exist in 1963, except perhaps in experimental models. I doubt whether the latter is of such importance to you, so perhaps my assurance will satisfy you in this case. If not, I'll go, and I'll go through back issues of your magazine until I find a good article on it.

I recently read something that bears a little on something that you mentioned in your article about target-recoil. I don't know the material so good, you shall have to refer to it from your own source. It does not deal with target-recoil itself, but merely with the bit of backward spray of debris that emanates from the entrance hole on impact. Moreover, it concerns impact only on soft ~~flexible~~ substances, so perhaps it will mean very little to you. Nevertheless, I'll pass it for what it's worth to you.

Years ago, even before I became interested in the assassination, I read a book called Round Ballistics, issued by the U.S. Army Medical Service. I had almost forgotten about the book until recently when I accidentally spotted it in the library of the military college where I'm instructing. One of the early chapters contains text and pictures dealing with the backward spray from the entrance hole. I refer to it in one of the footnotes of your paper, so you can go up the reference from there.

The book has a great deal of material on missile penetration; not all that I would like, but much that I can use. I may revise my section on missile penetration so that it develops more from Round Ballistics than from the references that I used. Presently I'm sticking with the other references because they are succinct and clear.

I have to stop now. I'll write again when I find your letter and can't at the time. When I have finished updating the footnotes on your monograph, I'll send it to you--probably in a few days.

Still,

Vic