Jim Marrs
P.O.Box 189
Springtown TX 76082

8/17/93

Dear Jim,

I'm sorry I do not remember you from Jim Tague's. The only one I remember of those who came while I was there is Jack White. But I am glad to hear from you.

I begin with the last part of your letter because it reflect what I regard as a serious problem from conspiracy theorizing rather than proof of one: in plain English, and I'm trying to get you to pay attention and learn from it, you do not know what you are talking about although you were connected with Stone. You do not even know what I was wanting to get known, and is now a matter of record for our history. (One of the reasons I want to get all I can of copies of what Crazy Harry is and has been up to,)

I believe so strongly in the first amendment that I do not even know what those who come here and have unsupervised access to all I have copy. And a few times steal even though all have access to our copier. But there are limits to what can be called a first-aemndment right, as the Supreme Court said in the Gitlow case: it does not give a right to cry "fire" in a crowded theater, You apparently know about Stone only the bullshit he put out. The actual and the literal truth is that when he first went public about his movie he said he would record their histroy for the people, tell them who killed their President, why and how. He also, then without mention of your book, ~~also~~ said he was going to base his movie on Garrison's On the Trail of the Assassins. What few if any of you know or recognized, if belatedly, as I did, is that the trail of the assessins is the one trail Garrison never took.

So, and I remember even the date, I wrote Stone at some length on February 8, 1992, which was well before he started shooting. (You've also swallowed his b.s. about the canges in the script, which are entirely irrelevant to any of the criticism I was involved in.) I went into considerable detail of the atrocities Garrison was going to perpetrate that even his staff could not talk him out of. Those who were, to my knowledge, the two most loyal to him and worked more extra hours for him asked me to try. To give you an example, he was going to ~~coem~~ commemorate the fifth anniversary by charging two grassy knoll assassins. One was Edgar Eugene Bradley, and that on the basis of the always misrepresented "tramp" pictures- nothing besides a misidentification of Bradley in them, and they had no relevance at all. The other was to have been Robert Lee Perrin. Who had killed himself in New Orleans, as Garrison knew, the year before. He made up a cock and bull story about the conspirators, in 8/62, faking Perrin's death and burying a Venezuelan seaman under Marr-Perrin's names. Can you begin to imagine what that would have done? I conducted the investigation never made by Jim or for him. The account of the firing of Boxely in Jim's book is 100% false. There was no phony information planted on him, none by the CIA, none even by Boxley. His fault was trying to prove the falsehoods Garrison just dreamed up. It was I, not Salandria, and I have my copy of the report I handed in that told Jim he did not dare

pull that one. With the documentation. Two months or more went by and I heard nothing from Stone. I'd attached some proof, offered him more and said I'd answer any questions he might have. That wretched commercialiser and exploiter had no questions at all. And to this day, together with his so-called research coodrinator, he and she have known nothing at all about the fact of the crime. All they cared about was giving his bullshit credentials.

I did not steal the script, as he said. It was one of the many he gave away. When all that time passed and I knew he was going to pull the most extensive and effective disinformation and I had that script I gave it to Gardner. There is no error in what he wrote. Stone first asked the Post to print more of his imaginings and then he asked to be able to do a different one on which he had so-called expert help. It was another atrocity, if you give a damn about truth and fact, and I wrote him again, not the Post. In reply Rusconi sent me a scarcely hidden solicitation to accept a bribe.

And Stone had the balls to tell reporters he was also basing his movie on my work!

Now it he had not lied to begin with- and three weeks after the Post story he had the same false claim in the papers all over again, about recording history and saying who killed the President, why and how - and had said his movie would be fiction, I would not have had a work to say.

But he did lie, and if you want the record to show that Garrison was a hero when he was a fraud and a phony, I suppose you have that right. But I sure as hell have the right to see to it that lies are exposed as lies. And that, without your having a glimmer of understanding, is what I started and did.

There was more of the crudest lying in Jim's book and I told Stone about some. More than enough to tell him he could not do what he said he would do with Garrison or his book.

Yet you know nothing at all about the reality, I suppose inevitable immersed as you have been in the dreams and nightmres of so many, and you even say of the movie, "after all, it was just a film." Not in the assurances Stone gave! He never really stopped claiming it was real and it was true. And all those "recipied" CIA reporters boils down to one old and ill man the CIA hates.

You are way off base in some of your other comments, again because you believe the stories people make up for their own purposes. All that stuff about Bannister was made up by his former secretary when she got into a fight with the wife. None of it is true as it relates to the assassination. "They existed and their information," more of your words, again reflect your lack of factual knowledge. They existed only in terms of being alive and what came from any of them is not "information."

You have been so deeply immersed in the fabrications dignified by being called "theories" I fear you cannot now make contact with reality. Which is strange to those people in any event. That is probably why there are so many errors in your book. You have been believing and trusting the wrong people. You wrote about people you knew nothing about. Please do not ask me to go into it. I'm past 80 now, unwell and want to write and

what is done cannot be undone. And that includes the enormous amount of harm from all the many supposed theories ~~this~~ that are not even theories. It is fun and games with the horror of that crime, it deceives and misleads the people, confusing them even more, and it is used as justification in the major media and inside the government to see to it that nothing that does or can mean ~~anything~~ anything gets any attention. I am not talking about anyone's intent, although it does apply to a few, and I am sure this was not what you had in mind. But if you'd seen the government records I've seen on just this kind of thing, not you, and the thousands of letters I've gotten, more and more reflecting understanding of and concern over all the bullshit palmed off as theory when it is not rationally even that, you would understand my concern and why, when each thing I now ~~to~~ do and for years I have done is at the cost of something I'll not be able to do.

With Livingstone, what can you do that can mean ~~anything~~ anything at all after his book is out?

Can you show malice, for example, in all the lies he tells about so many, probably now including you? Is it in any sense meaningful that you have the right to sue? If you think it is, ask around. Of those who know, lawyers in particular.

When I wrote you and you did not respond my interest, if I did not tell you, was in giving the local prosecutor proof that he is a felon under Maryland law. He is. No question about that. What is a question is whether any prosecutor wants to file anything against a writer. I gave copies of some of what I got from others, along with what he wrote me, to the prosecutor. His assistant, on skimming them indicated federal offenses and perhaps others. I was told that after the prosecutor went over it and after they consulted I'd hear from them. I have not and I'm not been back to ask or anything like that. They have not decided and I leave it that way. Anything else I get I can just mail in for the file. I've done that with several things. When I began I had no idea that he would do a book on it. His publisher's boast about that book has us all accessories after the fact. Pretty dirty stuff. ~~Also~~ Also, I want all of that kind of evil for the record for history. I've given all I have, when I can no longer use it, to a very good local college. It will make everything available to other institutions with some kind of ~~visual~~ optical wizardry when it can put that in. It has made Meagher's records available for research. And we'll see what I'll write when I know more about his book.

So, these are the uses I might make for anything you can send me not in your words but in his, copies of letters or of that tape, etc. In the real world hearsay has no value.

From what you say about what you told Evida and from what Jack told me I can see how he ~~had~~ added his own unique genius to it. He has not given me copies of your letters or Jack's and I'd welcome them from the two of you, again if only for the record for history.

I have no reason to believe that Groden wrote much if any of the first High Trash. I think Livingstone made him co-author for the pictures and info. I have no idea what the fight between them comes from but I do know that long before he printed it or mentioned G

Groden to me he sent me very large chunks of his computer printout. Groden had nothing to do with those many pages. The rest I do not know about but getting Groden to write a letter is almost asking the impossible. Unless, perhaps, he has his own objective.

Long ago Livingstone sent me a letter from someone at Harvard. Silly stuff!

In any event, I'd like to have anything from him you can let me have, Ditto for what was sent to Vidal, who refuses to make a direct response. He preaches, sermonizes, pontificates but he evades direct response. And I know of nobody other than Livingstone who has even said such things about me as he asked in his affirmative question. My only real interest there is eliminating all other than Livingstone as his source, if it was not his own idea.

If you like or any other have the idea that Stone will be the cause of the disclosure of records, thus far it has slowed all down. If he had not been seeking personal publicity all that would have been required was a simple motion of the House of Representatives to turn all HSCA's record over for processing for disclosure (two years ago!) But Stone wanted the personal attention, he testified to what the Members knew he knew nothing about and was very often very wrong, and he demanded that "all" be disclosed. That put it in law and in fact in a different category and the net effect will be that what is of possible value will be lost in the great volume of meaningless records that neither you nor anyone else will be able to go through. And the government will look like it has at last come clean.

Another deception of the people.

I hope you understand that I have taken this time not to bawl you out but to given you understandings you do not have.

Thanks and best wishes,

Harold

August 11, 1993

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick MD 21702

Dear Harold,

Thank you for your letter of August 4. It is always intriguing to learn what new rumor mongering is taking place within the JFK assassination research community. Over the years I have studiously tried to avoid this type of personal infighting but it seems impossible to do so once your name gains any prominence within this community.

First, let me get a few things straight between you and I: (1) I have NEVER stated nor even intimated that you are a government disinformation agent because (2.) I do not, nor have I ever, believed that you are such. (3.) I have always, and still do, considered you to be one of the most diligent and credible of the assassination researchers and have always held your work in the highest regard. You may recall our only personal meeting some years ago in the home of Jim Teague.

In late April I was contacted by George Evica regarding the Third Decade research conference. He asked if I would submit a paper regarding institutional suspects in the case (the CIA, FBI, SS et al) as "false sponsors". I replied with a short, two page synopsis of my thoughts on the subject. Nowhere in this letter was there any mention of government disinformation agents and certainly no mention of your name. This has been my only contact with Evica since the ASK conference in Dallas last year. On that occasion I have no recollection of talking about you or anyone else as disinformation agents. I hope this settles this matter.

As to Harry Livingstone: I was not even aware that he and Robert Groden had published High Treason until a chance meeting with Groden in Gary Shaw's home on March 23, 1989. I am certain of this because I bought a copy from Groden and he inscribed it along with the date.

Some months later Livingstone contacted me by telephone and complained to me about Groden taking credit for their book while Livingstone claimed that he wrote the bulk of it and published it through his own printing company. I gave him a sympathetic listen and told him that since I had known Groden for several years, I just assumed that it was largely Groden's book. After hanging up I vowed to myself not to get in the middle of what obviously was the beginning of some very bad blood between Livingstone and Groden.

Shortly after the JFK film was released, I received a letter from Oliver Stone. It was from one of Livingstone's associates in Cambridge and charged that I had plagiarized High Treason in my book. I was irked that they didn't have the decency to accuse me to my face, but I sent a very polite but pointed letter refuting these charges. Most of the examples they cited of my plagiarism were simply my quoting from the same newspaper or magazine articles, which indicates that Livingstone has no understanding of copyright. Anyway, I thought that would be the end of it.

But then Livingstone developed the idea that Groden somehow worked with me to "steal" portions of High Treason, which is ludicrous in that I was not even aware of their work until after it was published, as I mentioned above. Livingstone continued to badger me by

telephone and on one occasion left a nasty message on my answering machine threatening to sue me and ended with yelling "Fuck you!" My adolescent daughters were quite shocked when they arrived home and cleared the answering machine. Since this was on my answering machine and since I knew that there was absolutely no basis for Livingstone's allegations, I did not keep a record of this call. But my entire family heard his profanity. Since that time I have tried to stay as far away from Livingstone as possible. But despite my replies, both written and verbal, I understand that he is still spreading the same malicious lies about me.

Livingstone is free to believe any fairy tale he wishes, but I assure you that if he writes untruths about me in his forthcoming book, I will not allow it to go unchallenged.

One final thought while I am clearing the air with you: I sincerely think you were used to great ill effect for the research community by making the statements you did prior to the release of the film JFK. As one who was working closely with Stone, I saw the script change drastically and continually throughout the process of making that motion picture. What finally was released in the theaters bore little resemblance to what was in the original first few scripts. This was largely due to the fact that Stone and his research people carefully checked each and every statement of fact. I even learned that actress Sisssy Spacek went so far as to meet with Liz Garrison to confirm the situations and feelings in the Garrison household during the time of the trial.

While I acknowledge your right to voice your own opinions about the film, good, bad or indifferent, I believe your comments were premature and were used by people not as well meaning as yourself to blunt the effect of the film. And what was that effect? I do not believe that the movie JFK changed anyone's fundamental beliefs about the Kennedy assassination but what it did accomplish was to make a public discussion of the assassination socially acceptable, a situation we had not had previously. For this fact alone all of the research community should have supported Oliver Stone. After all, it was just a film. There were parts of it I disagreed with, but as it was only offered as entertainment (informed as it may have been) I saw no reason to play into the hands of those who were saying it was all just fantasy. While I am not certain that the actual plot unfolded as Stone presents, nevertheless Ferrie, Shaw, Banister et al were not fantasy. They existed and the information concerning their existence as well as other issues of the assassination deserve to be brought to the attention of the public.

I truly support the right of everyone to their own beliefs, but in this case, with so much power obviously trying to split up the research community, I feel we should all resist the urge to aid this effort by backbiting, undue criticism and personal attacks. I appreciate your letter which obviously is meant to gain credible information and avoid such activities.

Best regards,

Jim Marrs

Jim Marrs
P.O. Box 189
Springtown TX 76082