

23 November 1968

Mr. William O'Connell  
4175 Stansbury Avenue  
Sherman Oaks 91403

Dear Bill,

Last night, to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the Dallas assassination, the local Pacifica station WBAI played a documentary "sound collage" produced at Pacifica West by Elliott Mintz ("A Shot Was Fired"). No doubt you heard this for yourself and I need not describe it.

Aside from the fact that the "collage" was pretentious and boring, it was apparently slapped together with little thought to the integrity of its own point of view—that is, that Oswald was a dupe set up in advance and framed as the "lone assassin." (As you know, I have held that view since 11/22/63.)

The program included the tape of the Stuckey broadcast on which Oswald contested Ed Butler and Carlos Briaguier, and spoke in support of the Castro regime. Mintz interpolated between Oswald's remarks a series of JFK's statements from a speech or speeches he had made during the infamous Cuban missile crisis. The effect was, of course, to create the illusion that Oswald and JFK were mortal adversaries on the issue of Castro—an illusion hardly calculated to sustain the thesis that Oswald was framed but wholly innocent. On top of that, there was a sententious reference near the end of the program to the moment when JFK "was killed by a bullet from a mail-order rifle"—again encouraging the illusion that the Carcano was used, and was the only firearm used, when the evidence completely rules out its exclusive use and, indeed, strongly suggests that it was not used at all.

But the greatest mischief of all was the inclusion in the broadcast of the entirety of Garrison's Los Angeles speech of about a year ago, to some society of newspaper editors or the like. There were just enough near-truths, half-truths, and quasi-protests mixed in with his misstatements of fact and misrepresentation of evidence to discredit, for any intelligent well-informed listener the valid statements in his speech (though the validity was not necessarily related to his accompanying arguments) no less than the preposterous and facile ingredients in his sophomoric presentation.

The contrast between the Mintz mishmash of last night and your documentary last year, which I heard relatively recently for the first time, certainly is arresting. You have every right to feel doubly proud of your serious, scholarly, well-constructed, and valuable contribution to the public's understanding of this complex and convoluted case, as opposed to the glib and ostentatious cacophony heard last night on WBAI.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Neagher  
302 West 12 Street  
New York, N.Y. 10014