

Dec 17, 1965

Dear Sylvia,

Thankyou very much for your letter of Dec 10, to which I intend to reply over the weekend. Also thanks much for those encllosures. I will treat the material with utmost confidence, too.

You know the expression, "Be thankful for small favors" or some such thing. Well, for several months now, I have been using Ray's head panel as a potent weapon in my display arsenal. I assume you have one of these. (If not, let me know; I'll send you one immediately). Anyway, there are 4 columns of 4 frames each, starting with frame 310. The purpose is to show that the head snaps backward--and to do it without having to tell someone that so and so went to the National Archives and its obvious when you see it in motion.

Now---as you may know, frames 314 and 315 have their captions reversed in Volume 18. This means that if you are not aware of this typographical error, and you consider the sequence, ybu

see:	313	314	315	316	317
	start	back	forward	back	back

(with respect to 314)

continuity of the backward

Thus, if read literally, there is a break in the/motion between "314" and "316".

When Ray put these on the panel, he arranged them in the right pictoral order, and---being very intellectually honest---labeled them according to Volume 18, with a footnote to explain that although the captions read 313, 315, 314, 316, 317 etc etc.--- in fact the pictures are in the correct order.

Well, you know what happens next. You get up there before some ~~XXXXXX~~ skeptic, and you explain the headsnap---and why it means the shot came from the front, and you think you've really got him cornered---and then he starts quibbling with you about that footnote: "How do you know 314 and 315 are reversed" he whines, trying to squeeze out and created confusion!

Now you know how hard it is to ~~XXX~~ get the good old U.S. government to admit there is anything at all wrong with the Warren Report, and Ray has often expressed his fear that this ~~XX~~ particular error was put there on purpose--to muddy the waters etc. I have vehemently argued that this is not true, but have expressed fear that since it ~~did~~ indeed exist, and since it does have the effect of muddying the waters ~~of~~ an extremely powerful (and conclusive) argument based on nothing but freshman physics---that the government would never admit its existance. But I still had my little dream of getting someone important to say that 315 and 314 were indeed mislabeled in Volume 18.

Last week, I sat down and typed up two letters, using my girlfriend's name and address. One went to Shaneyfelt. (On rereading it now, I realize that I made two foolish spelling errors. ~~XXXXXX~~ First of all, I spelled his first name with two l's, and secondly, I constantly used two L's in the word labeling. Perhaps this lent an air of innocence.) The letter was not dropped