

(Bill O'Connell)

26 June 1967

Dear Bill,

It was wonderful to hear from you yesterday and to learn that your recovery from surgery is progressing so favorably. I do rejoice about that. I am also pleased and greatly heartened to discover that you have resisted the Garrison myth and maintained your fairness and objectivity in evaluating so-called evidence, regardless of its source.

I did call Maggie later in the day and, as I expected and feared, her reaction to William Gurvich's statement was that he had been bought, or maybe even planted in the first instance, to perform this sabotage in due course. Although we have both (Maggie and I) been very careful to avoid argument about Garrison, I had to ask whether Garrison was the ONLY honest man and everyone else suspect--whether it was not possible that Gurvich, like some other individuals, had become troubled and disillusioned, and was merely acting on conscience. She answered that that was, of course, possible--but obviously she is not really able or willing to accept this. As our conversation continued, I mentioned the disastrous effect that Garrison's downfall would have on the effectiveness of legitimate criticism. This is something that Maggie seems not to have realized up to now, and it obviously sobered her greatly. She then suggested that I should write a letter addressed to all the critics, pointing out that endorsement or association with Garrison was likely to compromise our position. I said that no one had appointed me moral arbitrator or grand strategist, that I felt that such a sounding-of-the-alarm would be presumptuous and in any case, superfluous--since this very aspect of the situation has been the subject of heated discussion and/or correspondence with several of the pro-Garrison critics.

However, I may still put my thoughts on paper, if I find time, in the form of a letter to Maggie. If she then wishes to share it, she will be at liberty to do so. I cannot see myself presuming to sermonize--especially on a matter so self-evident, in which the compromise of principle has already taken place on the part of those to whom I would be addressing myself.

The CBS first hour was despicable--thoroughly slanted and deliberately, grossly misleading and deceptive. Most of the dishonesty was achieved by acts of omission rather than by commission of explicit misrepresentation (although there were a few factual misstatements). You surely noted how careful CBS was to give us only a sampling of the results of their marksmanship experiments--without even specifying the level of skill of each of the 11 riflemen. Even so, it is clear that there was a 45% risk of rifle malfunction, in this replica of C2766, even without such deficiencies as the C2766 suffered. If they had really been "fact-finding," CBS would have tested their test rifle for fingerprints, after each use--among other procedures. What ammunition did they use? What ammunition clip? And since they permitted each rifleman some practice in an indoor range, perhaps they should have mentioned that even the WR concedes that LHO did not have access to C2766 for at least 2 months before 11/22/63, and that his purchase or possession of ammunition could not be established. As for the camera speed, the variations in their five replica cameras were very interesting but purely academic, since the FBI claims to have determined that the speed of Zapruder's camera was in fact 18.3 frames per second (the speeds in the tests average to 18.2 per second); and since Z's camera when used in the reenactment tests operated at 26 frames per second. As for the blurring of the Zapruder film at three specific points thought by CBS to correspond with three shots (after a 4 to 5 ~~mmmmmm~~ frame reaction period), Zapruder could have been startled or excited by any number of things other than shots; and it is my impression that the blurring occurs more than three times (although I still have to check the frames to be sure).

over

Certainly I will try to be available for rebuttal of the CBS monstrosity on WBAI or in any other way. Have you considered using a pair or a group of critics on WBAI? I have in mind specifically Leo Sauvage, who almost certainly would be willing to participate. He phoned me last night after the broadcast, snorting with disgust for the slick and calculated whitewash which CBS began to unfold, and which is likely to get worse.

If CBS and NBC were not enough, I am told that there is a five-page article in yesterday's Washington Post, detailing the results of an AP "investigation." Surprise! surprise! AP, too, finds that the WR is correct!

It remains only for Captain Fritz to send these media a telegram, saying with simple and homespun sincerity, "Awww, Thanks, felluhs!" Considering the brilliance with which Fritz solved these crimes within 24 hours (or was it 4 hours?), he should be head of Interpol by now, at the very least.

When all is said and done, however, this will prove to be merely one of several setbacks. Nothing, however expensive or ingenious, can really succeed in rehabilitating the WR. We will just have to work longer, and harder...

All my love, dear Bill,

Question One

Personally I feel certain that CBS conceived and executed its so-called documentary purely in an attempt to rehabilitate the disintegrating Warren Report, and in an effort to reverse the trend of public opinion, which is increasingly skeptical or scornful of the Warren Commission and its discredited, preposterous findings.

The CBS news inquiry was a massive, expensive, and deliberate propaganda exercise. It was in no way a genuine fact-finding process. CBS spokesmen have admitted this, privately or anonymously—for example, to the television editor of the Boston Traveler, who said as much in the April 19, 1967 issue.

CBS knew that no informed person would fail to realize the ugly nature of its so-called news inquiry, but CBS was not addressing informed persons. Its lavish program was aimed at a mass audience which is ill-equipped to understand, or to resist, manipulation by such opinion-makers as the TV networks.

To sum up, I would say that the assassins of President Kennedy remain unidentified, but that the assassins of the truth are known, and CBS is near the top of the list.

Question Two

The CBS theory of an earlier first shot that missed is predicated on the single-missile hypothesis, since CBS agrees with the Warren Commission's conclusion that a total of only three shots were fired.

But it is impossible to accept the single-bullet hypothesis. The evidence against it is conclusive and irrefutable. I can accept an earlier first shot that missed, or an earlier first shot that hit, but only on the basis of at least four shots, and perhaps five, fired from two or more different locations.

The early-hit theory as put forward by the critics argues that more than three shots were fired—some, from the front and the right of the car; and others, from behind the car, but not from the sixth floor window of the Depository, where a tree blocked the Presidential car from view, but from another point or even another building behind the car.

Question 11

Of course we cannot believe the Warren Report. The CBS news inquiry inadvertently provided ~~the~~^{NW} grounds for not accepting the Report, not as it intended, fewer reasons for rejecting it. ~~But what we can see, in the wake of the CBS program, is that we cannot trust CBS in its role of investigator, any more than we can trust the Warren Commission.~~ ^{The} CBS ^{Program} has merely compounded a shame and scandal unprecedented in our lifetime. I do not think that the American people will prove to be the complacent village idiots that CBS thought it was addressing.