

Oliver Stone note

The author, not the CIA and its alleged "replied" reporters, initiated the criticism of Stone's movie when Stone did not respond to his lengthy, detailed and documented letter prompted by Stone's announcement that he would film their history for the people and tell them who killed their President, why and how, and would do that based on former New Orleans district attorney, Jim Garrison's book, On the Trail of the Assassins.

What Stone ignored was a detailed, first-person account of some planned Garrison excesses several members of Garrison's staff asked the author to attempt to abort after the staff had failed. One of two utterly baseless and irrational/"assassin" Garrison planned to charge to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the assassination in 1968, for example, had actually killed himself in New Orleans and to Garrison's knowledge 15 months before the assassination.

When Stone did not respond and the author was given a copy of the film script in which Garrison was virtually deified, the author gave the script and access to all his records relating to his preventing the additional Garrison desecration of the great tragedy to Gero George Gardner, a Washington Post reporter. Gardner's accurate and understated article in the Post was the beginning of serious criticism of Stone and his movie, mistitled for exploitation and commercialization JFK.

Stone, a skilled kin public relations and uninhibited in taking liberties with truth and fact, launched a promotional campaign in response, aided and abetted by an army of ignorant and ideological sycophants and other supporters and with the assistance of the public-relations firm of Hull & Knowlton.

A simple enormous flood of articles supporting Stone and his movie, most untainted by fact or reality and none responding to the actual criticism of Stone's exploitation and commercialization to rewrite the fact of the assassination, all in various ways portraying him as the victim of a non-existing campaign spearheaded by the CIA, immersed the country with Stone's propaganda.

While it was not possible for the author to respond to all of this propagandistic rewriting of the fact of the assassination, to the degree possible the author did attempt

to make and leave an accurate record for history by writing those publications he could.

Not one used what the author sent it, not one printed any correction, bot one asked any questions in response, and not one refuted anything the author told it or asked for more information.

In alphabetical order, these are the ~~most important~~ publications that in varying degrees converted themselves into mouthpieces for Stone and ignored factual comment and criticism of their becoming part of a vast propaganda campaign that added to the public confusion over the known truth of the assassination, without regard for fact or truth, and then made no correction or rectification at all: