

Dear Paul,

9/6/91

I highlighted your EOC 13:1 while reading it and I'm glad I did because there is too much on which I should comment and I'm not now able to think of organizing what I'll do. The vision in my better eye is impaired and I can't see the Johns Hopkins specialist who removed the cataract from it until the end of the month. ⁴¹¹ and I both have spinal stenosis, which had her in a wheelchair for several weeks although she is now ^wback to her recent norm, and it would take much longer to organize than I'll take in this.

First a general comment: You, Mary and others fell into Stone's trap and you will be used by Warners and Stone to promote what is really worse than a tragedy. It is so un-hidden a commercialization and exploitation (Camelot, JFK, TSBD and movie renovation, etc) I'm surprised that what is glaring did not get your attention.

Stone is as big and uninhibited a liar as we've been plagued with. He has trouble telling the truth by accident and usually doesn't. He launched his publicity for this monstrosity to promote Doors at the same time, or vice versa, rather. Until he got wind of what Lardner was up to he was repeatedly explicit: he was going to take their "history" to the people by telling the, his words, mind you, "who" killed their President, "why" and "how." I'm surprised that you did not spot this in Lagniappe, which appeared after Lardner's piece. In it Stone moderated ^{with "we think"} one of these three words only. So when he later said all that stuff about it being no more than a movie, entertainment, he was covering his ass. But he got that \$35,000,000 from Warners on the representation I quote above and I'm told by people in movies that Warner has budgeted the biggest advertising and promotion campaign ever.

There simply is no way Stone can retract his representation by changing it now when he got caught ^{with that}.

He, Lane and others started the false campaign that it was the CIA that is out to expose him. Like so much of the mouthing of so-called critics, this they just made up. The fact is that Lardner knew nothing about it until I interested him. He then got Bradlee's OK and came up. As his story says, I gave him the script, As it probably does not say, also a considerable volume of records. (Actually the CIA, FBI and other miscreants will love this movie because like so much you should have seen, they'll paper the government with memos selecting the most egregious, say it is typical of the criticism, and you can see we were right to begin with.)

Mary (to whom a copy) should remember that I broke up what Garrison was about to do when I learned about it on the way home from the trip out there on which I stayed with Jean Hitchcock and took your picture with her outside her mansion.

Before I forget, why did not you and Mary, knowing that I was at least involved in Lardner's story, ask me questions before you committed yourselves and went off into all the tangleants? Including some of Stone's, like withholding all criticism until the movie is out. If he had not gold-plated his fantasy as factual that would be legitimate but he

cannot now say he didn't and if we awaited the film's appearance it would be too late.

I skip a bit again. When I got quotes of what I quote above plus his own statement, later modified, that he was basing his movie on Garrison's book, I wrote him at some length 2/10/91 telling him that among other things Garrison was a deliberate liar in that book. I attached some proof and offered more. That was well before he started filming. I did not hear from him. But late Rosconi, who has been scraping the bottoms of the cruddy barrels, like with Giessrecht critics, pardon the word, phoned me. I told her that all I got under FOIA is available to all writers, etc., and did not hear from her further. She had asked if Stone might phone me the next day. I said sure. But his next day never came. I'll return the correspondence but I want you to know at the outset that it was quite some time after I wrote him without response ~~that~~ before I worked with Gardner on the story that I interested him in, not the CIA.

There is simply no way that Stone could make any significant changes in that script unless he junked it, which he didn't. I know someone who says he read the sixth draft. He says that there were minor changes only, to get rid of blatantly bad stuff that had already been criticized. It does make Garrison a hero and Boxley the villain. Back to what Gary should have remembered, especially because after the fact Penn Jones called me a CIA agent out to wreck all the good that would come from Garrison. It is now pretty clear he was the greatest liability and did more to repress legitimate criticism than anyone else.

Before I learned what Garrison was going to do to commemorate the fifth anniversary his staff, particularly Alcock, as I later learned, had argued with him with only limited success. Without any checking at all he was, as Gardner correctly quoted from the job I did that got Boxley fired, going to charge Perrin as being a grassy knoll assassin under the name Starr. He had agreed to eliminate all the others, including whatever of his many invented "identifications" of the other "tramps" was except Edgar Eugene Bradley. I started working on that before my plane for home left the airport. I had two thoroughly professional and entirely independent investigations made of those "tramp" pictures and they yielded the identical results. Who Stone quoted in his piece for the Post I do not know but I suspect it was Garrison's "improvement" on Newcomb's invention. In any event, the truth is that they were winos, not tramps, found an hour and a half later boozing in a parked boxcar behind the Central annex Post Office, they were never arrested, and should they have been? but were walked out the only way possible and this was where the photogs were filming everything that moved. *(No pistol in any hand, no handcuffs on men.)*

(As you may recall, shortly after King was killed there was a sketch said to be that of the assassin and looking like it was drawn from a picture of the wino Dick Sprague dubbed "Frenchie" and later referred to as LBJ's farm manager. So I gave a print of the picture and of the sketch to the local FBI resident agent, that led to an investigation in which the FBI interviewed the ~~the~~ policemen and ^{one} sheriff and that said essentially the same

2
thing and placed those three men even farther from Dealey Plaza. They were going from re-collection. It was where I said, behind 217 S Houston.)

I did return to New Orleans, Louis L'Amour had the investigations I requested made - Garrison and Boxley hadn't even checked the morgue book, which is a bound ledger-type book all handwritten so obviously not faked - and got me what rare there was of Boxley's memos. ^{By the way} He did most of it verbally, to Garrison only. I took Salandria along on the simplistic reasoning, if it takes a crook to catch a crook, it takes a nut to reach a nut. I did lead him to believe that Boxley was a CIA plant because otherwise I'd not have been able to get him to help and when Garrison had refused to listen to his staff, I knew he would not listen to me but he was hooked on Salandria. However, I have the memo I handed Sciambra, rather a carbon, and it begins saying quite clearly, that what Boxley was doing was feeding back to Garrison what Garrison wanted, that Garrison first made the fairy-tale up and then Boxley manufactured the "proof." Sadly, it was only too true.

Obviously, this isn't in Garrison's book. But ^{when} Sciambra, who met with Garrison and was assisted by Salandria, phoned me after they conferred at the NOAC he was effusive in praise. He picked me up and we went to his house for what he did not exaggerate in advance in telling me it was the best Italian meal I'd never had. And on the way there, he said, "Hal, you just saved Jim Garrison from being disbarred by the Supreme Court of the United States." The Shaw case then was there.

There are a number of such things. Much of my time there was spent in damage control.

So, with this and more, I told Stone before he started shooting that his movie was based on self-serving and deliberate lying. I attached proof of one of the more ridiculous and really purposeless lies and offered more proof.

When he began to get flak he started backtracking on his dependence on Garrison's lying fiction and started boasting of the "credible" critics he was using. Can you name one who is in your mind credible? He added also that he was amplifying Garrison with Harris' outhouse scrapings, all theories, nothing factual. And this is what the movie comes from.

So why play Stone's game and go in for all the other nonsense, dignify his lies and diversions and digressions? And give him and Warners quotes?

I've been interrupted several times and I hope I've not forgotten what I had in mind. Even skipped my physical therapy.

On 3, that Garrison's "flaws are not in his character or in his investigative skills." Meagher was right: he is an Ayn Rand type and without character. He had no investigative skill at all, did no investigating at all, just made it up as he went, disagreeing with himself too often in so doing, and proving nothing at all, ever.

Stone lies in saying the film is not the Garrison story. It was and is and will be. Stone left himself no choice.

On 4, the Rashomon approach: he decided on this after the Lardner piece and started using it then to back away from dependence upon Garrison.

and Marrs and with them he deceives and misleads the people. Between them + ^{they} doubt they have a single fact other than that JFK was assassinated.

11 Stone knowing the truth full well, that I started it, calls the reporters ~~xxxx~~ the government's Dobermans.

Kevin should have kept his mouth closed because he put Stone's foot in it. Stone has been saying that he had done his homework, ~~examined~~ ^{examined} all there is, all that came out in 28 years in one version, all after Garrison in another, claiming all the Warren Commission records are withheld (yes, all) until 2039 with the CIA being able to suppress its even longer, etc. True there is a little that might be relevant in what HSCA got from the FBI, but not much because of all that has been disclosed to which Stone refused access. I've got at least 250,000 pages. So now Warner can quote Kevin to promote this bastard and his conning of the people.

Much of the rest isn't really relevant except in dancing to Stone's tunes.

But on 15 Bailey is correct. Garrison did begin with a gay plot and did it have ramifications. I finally blew it when I caught Jim Rose manufacturing "evidence" to support it in LA, where Garrison fancied an ultra-elite S.M gang had parties. He had LBJ in on his gay nagles, his assistant, ^{Tennants} Walter ~~22~~, Gordon Clendening, Pierre Salinger and more I can't remember, along with Shaw. I did that just after I left SF on that ¹⁹⁶⁸ ~~10/11/68~~ trip and I heard him in Art Kevin's office in KHJ. Garrison had them on dope and those had two new needles, unused, he said he'd retrieved by garbology, I recall that much of it. And Turner was behind him and in on the homosexual jazz.

You have a very good point here in saying he grabbed out stage away from us, not exactly your words. Garrison even lied about what got him started. It was the reprint of Whitewash, as Dean Andrews told me and Jim told him in giving him a copy. Lardner checked Garrison's story with Senator Long. Long told him the first he heard of it was when Garrison phoned him and told him about it. And elsewhere you are 100% correct: we trusted him too long.

16 Kerry's book was published first right after JFK was killed, smaller in all dimensions than a small paperback, by a Chicago press. And on Thornley, Lifton forgets that he suborned Thornley's perjury in getting him to swear that John Gene Heindell was known as "Hidell." At some point you may recognize what you haven't in Lifton. I suggest that you go back to that Sibert-O'Neill report I told you where to find at the Archives when you went there from college in the early summer or late spring of 1966. Read the very graf that Lifton quotes and then ask yourself why he does not use that in facsimile? It would prove he lied. The body was not wrapped in a body bag and it was in the original casket when they helped remove it from that casket.

Of the stories, if not too much trouble I'd appreciate ^{15 and} 30, where pretty clearly Stone included the non-tramp photos;

31, if the alford ^{o/} quite is in it.

52, and if you think Judy Stone has further interest, please invite her to phone me. (I was Izzy's friend and knew Mark. I used to send Izzy galley proofs of our hearings in 1936, before he changed his name and when he was on the NY Post.)

53. Dowd is the kook.

58, seems like worthy of being checked out.

59, if those criticisms are other than I've used here.

Now on 63, which I'd like, Carr wrote a piece for the Hollywood Reporter, in which Stone says he uses my and Sylvia's work, and a different piece for the Globe that it syndicated. I've written both and expect no answer. Also wrote Stone about it, too.

The Clinton witnesses mean nothing until Shaw and Ferrie are connected with the crime. Neither was. Garrison just made it up. I can't imagine Shaw in the same room with Ferrie. Garrison could and should have followed up this side of the Perminex story, which I think I have in Oswald in New Orleans, but he didn't. He would have gotten some information he would certainly have misused on Bloomfield. I got it. As I did much in which he had no interest that is more relevant than what you mention. Including on Thornley and on Oswald. It was only later that Garrison learned that Ferrie was in New Orleans, not Dallas, too late for him to make any changes. He could have gotten somewhere on the CAP angle and on the literature but it wasn't grandiose enough for him.

Stone having puffed this as the true history of why, who and how this will be the disinformation that reaches more people than anything other than the Warren Commission. No matter how reasonable any theory appears to be, it is an imposition on trust to ever describe any as other than a theory - fiction. The crime itself was never really investigated officially and there thus are no leads to be followed. Dreams is what Garrison ^{ed} ~~has~~ made of and now Stone has his coming nightmare for ^{truth} ~~turn~~ and understanding from them.

Best to you all,
Some time after I wrote Stone after his article appeared in the Post Kusconi wrote me. It was a thinly-veiled offer to bribe me. I replied and have heard nothing more.

Harry