

Dear Frieda and Sol,

2/16/91

Thanks very much for the N.Y. Observed article on Oliver Stone's masterpiece-in-the-works. It adds confirmation to what I've believed for months, that whatever kind of person he is he is involved with and ⁵trusting of the assassination nuts. I've written him a sort-of warning, not in the expectation that he'll heed me, if the letter gets to him, but in part in the hope it does and I can prevent another assassination atrocity, one that can reach a large audience, ¹if not the largest, and in part because I am trying to make as much of a record as I can for history.

His judgement is terrible, he anticipates ^{know}great profits (with which I agree, as much as what I can about that business justifies) or both.

He began with the Dallas nuts' center started by a wealthy and personable Washington lawyer, Bernard "Bud" Fensterwald, who has an insatiable yen to "solve" the political assassination and who ^Iwas able to get James Earl Ray to ask to be his lawyer. Bud blew that case early on by chickening out on a proposal I'd made and with which his then partner not only agreed but drew up the papers Bud then did not file. I had a solid case of irremedial denial of Constitutional rights - intrusion into communications with lawyers by intercepting mail, of which I have copies, after this was prohibited by the trial judge. But a nice guy. He and his associated nuts in Dallas got Stone interested in the overt fraud of a son who claimed his father was a JFK assassin. When they could not longer avoid (as Fensterwald et al have not) facing the fact that this rascal was a fraud Stone and his people continued their interest in the JFK assassination and according to a friend who claims to have seen the contract, ^{gave}have given that nut center \$80,000 to act as subject consultants. That in itself is enough to give Stone's character and reputation danger if not ruin.

I'd thought of writing Stone and his reported producer, Alex Kitman Ho, of Camelot Productions Corp., the only address I could then get, but decided not to until I knew more. I did learn more from a friend of mine who became a "fan" the last time I spoke in New York. It was at Harvard and he was then at NYU. He and his friend/roommate come up to me after I ~~spoke~~ spoke. (I went there and returned the same day so I had no time to get in touch with friends, afternoon speech.) The friend wanted to be a "cause" lawyer, did and died young. This fellow, Robert, said he wanted to become a Hollywood writer, went there from college, and is a success. He was a writer on The Golden Girls and that group, I think from a note I just got from him Disney, ^vsitched him to writing on a new show whose name I recall as The Fanelli Brothers. (That was the last time I saw allard Lowenstein. He was teaching there, had been in the audience, and came up to me with admiration for the way in which I handled the speaker-terrorizing Yuppies, to which I'll return, by ^{insisting}insisting that they be allowed to interrupt and then making a ^{laugh}laughing-stock of them in my responses.

After getting information from Robert that Stone was going for the Garrison disgustingly dishonest self-promotions that also are not factual I did write Stone c/o Ho.

There are two coincidences in the other Stone sources reported in this Observer story. One of the the books, "Coup d'etat in America" is by A.J. Weberman, who ~~is~~ I believe was the founder of those wild ~~to~~ Yippies. ~~His~~ book, coauthored with a ~~guy~~ named Canfield, made "positive" identification of Watergating L. Howard Hunt as an assassin based on an allegedly positive identification of him as one ~~of~~ of the so-called "tramps" in an assassination-time photo of three men who were not tramps. If I remember correctly, it was by ear identification, a process invented by a fellow with whom Lil and I were friends after Hoover fired him from the FBI for daring to try ~~to~~ to organize a union in about 1936, Mike Pooner. and it happens that I'd directed the author of the other book, an Irishman who had worked for BBC ~~at~~ least he now lives in Ireland, to Mike Pooner's book on J. Edgar Hoover, now behind schedule. (When the BBC crew with which this man, Tony Summers, was working were here when he was in Dallas about ~~20~~ 20 years ago they were anxious get get him here in an effort to disabuse him of some of his wilder theories. One of that crew, and I go into this as a sidelight on Mark Lane, was living with Lane's former wife, a Danish woman who'd ~~been~~ ^{born} Lane ^{two} to children, and ~~he~~ Lane had abandoned them when he was making much money, sending no support at all for his own children.)

Well, it wasn't Hunt and could not have been, a generality applicable to just about all the assassination theories. Some kind of lawsuit followed and I've forgotten the end. I have a file on what is wrong about Weberman and his book but Stone won't be interested, I think.

There is another coincidence on Summers. a woman student who is giving me part-time help on such things was ill and could not come so I spent some time doing some checking on another mouser with a PhD and I came to where he'd written that a Dallas printing plant that employed a number of people like Oswald at minimum wage did the CIA's developing and interpretations of its satellite photos for the CIA. His source? Summers' book "Conspiracy." Of course that is impossible. all these self-designated intelligence experts are not only imaginatively ignorant of intelligence, they are stupid. The CIA does its own such work, as is well known, thought in National Photographic Interpretation Center, if I ~~can~~ recall the unit's ^{name} ~~name~~ correctly. and who can imagine that such secrets are entrusted to anyone? Even those who can see that kind of stuff require a "need to know" besides high security clearances.

Self-portrait of Stone and what he is working on, I fear.

His friend say he fears being bumped off. If there were any danger, as there isn't, the kind of thing he is working on is his best insurance because it helps the only ones he can imagine would have any such motive. The story names the CIA. I've seen some of their records, more of the ~~FBI's~~ FBI's, ~~and~~ reflecting the uses they make of such awful stuff. It ~~does~~ does help them within the government.

You asked why my books are not mentioned. A story in which Sol was involved is illustrative of a generality that has been true since JFK was killed.

Sol sent me to see his friend Mort Puner in early 1965, after the contracted publisher broke the contract and never returned the manuscript, in itself, I imagine a rarity. Puner ^{read} the MS overnight, was enthusiastic, thought they'd do a first-print of 50,000 copies, high for that day anyway, but that it would require Frederick Praeger's approval. When Praeger returned from San Francisco ^{and} ~~was~~ rejected the book, I asked Puner why and he told me that Praeger told him, "we publish only recognized scholars." In a few years it was public knowledge that Praeger was a ^{CIA} publisher.

And who do you think published the books of the PhD monser I was doing some checking on when I came on his citation of Summers' fiction about the printing plant doing the CIA's most secret work for it? Praeger!

The second and current one, *Spy Saga*, after it was apparently rejected by a subsidiary ^{Praeger} ~~of~~ having a reputation of publishing only scholarly works that can't be otherwise published, often small and expensive printings. Greenwood Press. It had asked me to read and offer an opinion on ^{the MS} the book and for their lousy \$100 I gave them 97 pages like this page.

These are two of the ^{most} ~~the~~ absolutely worst books I've read and ^{among} the most dishonest, all of which I documented in ^{these} ~~this~~ 97 pages, which + really took that time for to make a record for history.

It is not immodesty and not an exaggeration to say that I've done just about all the original, factual and meaningful work on the JFK and King assassinations. I have about a third of a million ~~xxxxxx~~ pages of government records alone. You've seen the extent. So, perhaps simplistically, I believe that anyone intending any serious work has to want what everyone in the field knows I give access to, those records, or he is not intending serious work. There is a possible alternative: Stone may think he is being serious but is influenced by the nuts and those who are jealous. But he can't know anything about the field without knowing the volume of ^{what} I have and that nowhere else is there such an archive. So I believe that his intent if not ^{his} judgement are ~~not~~ clear: he does not intend a serious, factual production.

Because I do want to ^{leave} ~~live~~ as complete a record as + can and because ^{you see} ~~you see~~ publications I do not see, I'll appreciate any other such clippings on the subject in general that you see.

P.S. The Observer's 2/11 story has no by-line. Would you think of phoning the paper and asking for the author to see if he thinks the person he identified as a friend of Stone's would be interested in getting this and other such info to Stone?

Thanks and best to you all,

Harold