Lies of Our Times
145 West 4 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10012

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
12-2-91

Dear Lies,

I'm sorry that my 78 years and enfeeblement following a series of surgeries prevented my writing you several weeks ago when I was sent a copy of the first eight pages of your September issue.

Based on reading these eight pages I wholeheartedly agreed that you do represent the lies of our times! I found also that in referring to yourself as "LOOT" you had encapsulated perfectly what Oliver Stone is up to in his coming movie to the defense of which you devote these pages: he will rip off the national mind while ripping off the purses and, from what I know of his project and you represent about yourselves, you also should have known that this is what from the first he has been up to.

I doubt if it would be correct to begin what I now quote by saying that you do know this so instead I say that at the outset you claim to have the knowledge to which I refer: "After having researched the Kennedy (sic- there were two) assassination for more than 20 years, and having published Jim Garrison's book, On the Trail of the Assassins...."

In this you do claim factual knowledge of both the subject matter and the content of Garrison's book.

In this note to your readers you also refer to the alleged "frenzied disinformation campaign around the making of the film." This is as real as Garrison's book which you published without the most rudimentary checking. His lies about his times is what his book is.

And as you should have known and I presume did but found the truth unsuitable for your purposes, which coincide with Stone's, I am that "campaign."

Because all of you share the problem of not being able to tell the truth even by accident and thus I do not know what Stone told you and did not tell you, I tell you that when I learned that Stone was basing his movie, as he said over and over again, on Garrison's book, I (on 2/5/91) wrote him at some length and in detail about the utter and complete dishonesty of that book, with some documentation and offering more. He did not respond.

Of the basic lies in that book faithfully repeated in the copy of the script that was sent me (you may prefer Stone's lie, that I stole it) I repeat one that I called to Stone's attention, the alleged proof that the CIA wrecked Garrison's investigation, having infiltrated "Bill Boxley" for that purpose. This is what Garrison says in the book but it is a lie. The truth is that among other adventures that should have left any honest and self-respecting publishers and editors aghast, he was going to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the JFK assassination by charging Robert Perrin, who had killed himself in New Orleans in 1962, with having been a Grassy Knoll assassin in 1963! Among other things.

To prevent that additional monstrous national disgrace I conducted an investigation in which I was assisted by Garrison's chief investigator, who assigned some of his staff

to make for me those investigations that even one who had flunked a mail correspondence course in detective work should have known were basic - and that Garrison had not conducted or directed any of his staff investigators to make or even his "Boxley."

(Who was not, by the way, what Stone and your editor on his book and script co-author lied in saying he was, an assistant district attorney and thus a city employee. He was hired by Garrison ~~after~~ over strong staff objections and was paid from private funds.)

Among some of the other things I used were some of Boxley's reports to Garrison, along with ~~his~~ Garrison's paranoidal annotations of them. This work was neither pleasant nor easy and I had to put in long hours, even using a borrowed and defective portable typewriter.

When Garrison was confronted with my report the morning after I completed it and in particular with its beginning, which is quite explicit in stating that Boxley was making up "proof" to support the utter irrationality Garrison himself had made up, Garrison had no choice but to abandon his ghastly contrivance for the commemoration of that anniversary of the most terrible crime I've lived through, to blame it all on Boxley, and to fire him.

It was to Garrison a nice and fitting touch to blame the CIA for what Garrison himself had done, "infiltrated" Boxley into his "investigation."

I have a carbon copy of my report. Stone had no interest in it. You also had no interest in truth and fact or you'd have checked Garrison's book out and learned the truth about this and so much more about which he lied.

So, when Stone was silent several months after I let him know the truth, which was well before he started shooting, after I read the script I phoned George Lardner. I've known him for 25 years and while there is much on which we do not agree I've known him to be an accurate reporter and a trustworthy one. I've been his source on a number of stories that are quite the opposite of what you and Stone represent and I am hardly CIA, as also alleged by you (pl) since I started this all. I've sued the CIA and the FBI many times and as a result have about a third of a million pages of once-withheld government records.

The very records Stone has prated repeatedly are suppressed until at least the years 2039, the records in which he had no interest and did not ask to be able to see or for copies of any. Simultaneously, his mouth having at least as many corners as Garrison's, he was also telling the world that his film drew on all that had come to light in the 28 years since that assassination.

So, if there was the "campaign" to which you refer, as there wasn't, it is obvious that Stone himself caused it and that I alone started it. Now how much of a campaign do you think is possible for a man of my age with all the infirmaties that followed complications ~~are~~ a series of surgeries that began with arterial and of which the last was open-heart? It hasn't been safe for me to drive out of Frederick since 1977 and I have not, I can't stand still for more than a moment and when I'm not walking I must keep my legs elevated, as I am now, with the typewriter to a side. And am not to lift more than

15 pounds.

"disinformation" I'll come to but you also say this alleged campaign is "frenzied."

Do your really thing that a "frenzied disinformational campaign" is within my capabilities?

In Carl Oglesby's article that begins on page 3 he says that "The attack on Stone enlisted," and with his flair for accuracy he lists the Washington Post, which was the first, as not the first of the papers and magazines he has in my supposed Army.

He begins by saying that the "attacking" journalists are those "who ordinarily could not care less what Holly wood has to say about such great events..."

I have most of the stories to which he refers, those you described as "disinformational." He did not phone me to ask me anything at all. Not that he had to. But because he refers to the Post's story and it makes it clear I was its source and because he knows about my work and has some notion of its breadth and depth and because some rudimentary check would seem to be required for authentic scholarship.

Unless, of course, fact is irrelevant to him as to all of you.

You (plural) also did no checking before you converted your "Lies" into an Oliver Stone propaganda rag.

Oglesby and all the rest of you do find fact irrelevant as you pursue political objectives in spite of and contrary to fact. Oglesby's first interest in the JFK assassination was just such an adventure. You say he was the founder of what called itself the Assassination Information Bureau. I know he was a leader in it.

"Information?" They gave the word a meaning closer to Goebbels' than to Webster's.

They got started after Garrison excited the world with his multitude of theories he represented as fact and that is precisely what they did. There was nothing too obviously untenable or too extreme for either of them. As as they ripped off the minds, particularly collegiate minds, while dipping into the pockets, they made acceptable to most of us, who are lumped together as "researchers" or "critics" by the media and by the government, substitution of what was imagined for established fact.

Yes, there is a great volume of fact in the enormity of now-available government records, fact that is beyond reasonable question. While I know of none that gives comfort to the official mythology, there is a considerable amount of information relating to the body of the crime.

These exploiters and commercializers including Oglesby had no interest in it. They knew me and of my litigation and they certainly knew what I gave the press and the press used. Including, please note, George Lardner and the Washington Post, among others.

Garrison wrote a letter saying that a statue should be erected to me for bringing all that information to light, but he asked for none of it for his book.

Beginning not later than Garrison and these AIB "scholars" who made up fact as they would like

just to be
liked fact and theory became indistinguishable and fashionable. Garrison's book makes up
mixing them
his own history and, in announcing that his movie would be based on Garrison's book, Stone
also told the world - here this, all of you who complain about alleged "prior restraint"
or as you say, "precensorship"- that his movie would record their "history" for the people
and would tell them "who" killed their President, "why" and how." (Odd that in eight pages
you found no space for this when this is the true basis of the controversy- whether Stone,
Garrison, Skalr Sklar or any others have the right to fix a false account of the great
crime that turned arou the world around on the people and proclaim it to be the truth.

Stone has no right to claim his fraud cannot properly be subject to criticism until
he is able to perpetrate it.

And it is not at all true, as he told Oglesby, that this criticsm of his fraud is
"sight-unseen, before completion and on the basis of a pirated first-draft screenplay."

Without sight of the script the legitimacy and the urgency of the criticism comes
from basing it on Garrison's shameless and false account of his own fiasco, and the
more it is amplified by that compendium of all the nutty nightmares compiled by Jim Marrs
for his book "Crossfire" the more dishonest, misleading, misrepresenting and disinfor-
mational that movie is.

Stone burps and all of you sycophants and like-minded and amoral get bellyaches.

The wild tales by the AIB lecturers were, of course, exciting. When you make it up,
you make it attractive. No serious speaker could compete with their concoctions and thus
for practical purposes they and they alone had the collegiate audiences for their sub-
stitutions of the awful reality.

All of this, as a number of once-withheld official records make clear, did their dirty
work for our official miscreants, putting them in a position to circulate some of this
garbage (of their selection) along with disproof of it, and thus inside the government
they persuaded that they had told the truth, witness this criticism.

Superficially less unreasonable than most but still not factually so are
several of Oglesby's statements (page 4) that Garrison "established" Oswald's "association"
with "three people who had clear CIA ties to the CIA," Shaw, Guy Banister
and David Ferrie. No part of this is true. What Garrison got was the unsupported and un-
supportable statement of a woman who was obviously incredible, Delphine Roberts. She had
been Banister's secretary. For a long time she would not even speak to Garrison. But
when she got into a squabble with Banister's widow - the scuttlebutt was that she had been
Banister's mistress, whether or not true - she made these things up as part of her fight
to get possession of Banister's files.

On Oglesby also says that because Victor Marchetti said, Oglesby's words, not Marchetti's,
"that Shaw and Ferrie as well indeed were connected to the CIA," this is "proof of a CIA
connection to Shaw."

Although I also was told in 1967 that Ferrie had worked for the CIA there is no proof of it of which I know and further, no reason to believe it. They do some crazy things in the CIA but hiring as crazy and undependable and uncontrollable a character as Ferrie was not one.

(There is a fiction that the CIA hires almost anyone for "contract" work. They do not if for no other reasons than because they have few such needs and they don't dare run such risks.)

One can conjecture needlessly about whether of not Shaw worked for the CIA, which is not the same as Oglesby's weasel word "connected" to it, but there is not a scintilla of credible evidence.

If people like you and Oglesby feel comfortable telling the people that unproven rumors or your own speculations are fact and the truth, which is what you join Stone, Sklar, Garrison and others in doing, I am not and I will not lie that way.

However, Shaw did have a "CIA connection," along with millions of others. He was a source for its domestic-contact service, an open and above-board and completely normal and not infrequently very important intelligence function.

Shaw was also a "contact" source for the FBI, never mentioned by Stone so not by his sycophants.

To illustrate with one of many examples, with all the dubious Latin American personalities, incldding bloody dictators, who came to New Orleans, and with all the enemies they earned and had, should not public authority know and be prepared?

The business matters alone with foreign countries of which Shaw had personal knowledge was important, normal and universal intelligence information, from the CIA to the KGB and all in between.

Stone farted that Lardner is CIA so there is Oglesby's bellyaches (page 4) that Lardner is the "dean of the Washington intelligence press corps." Lardner wrote the first story so Stone and his ass-kissers focus on him. Not that he is intelligence, not that Stone has not apologized for that libel. They assail him to divert attention for the truth and the actualities of the ~~set~~ stories and the controversy.

But this is Oglesby, and he was AIB, and with him at AIB was Jeff Goldberg. Goldberg was recently in the news as Tom Mangold's research assistant and co-interviewer for his book "Cold Warrior." It is about the late James J. Angleton, who had been head of the CIA's counterintelligence.

So now, in Oglesby's way (and of course not his alone among all of you), I'm going to show Oglesby's "CIA connection."

Mangold's is an excelent book with but a major ~~ful flawl~~ flaw: it blames all the terrible things done by the CIA on Angleton. To put this another way, in pinning it all on Angleton, he exculpates the CIA. as an initiation

There ought not be any real dispute about how important this is to the CIA.

Hey, maybe this connects you with the CIA? After all, you got Oglesby to write this and then you published it, so you are "connected" with him, he is "connected" with Goldberg and few people in recent years did more of what the CIA wanted done than Goldberg and Mangold. They wiped the institutional slate virtually clean in pinning all those awful things on the safely-dead Angleton. with chuckles of assistance.

Again flaunting his ignorance and irresponsibility, and again holding his gut after Stone's fart, Oglesby says that "Lardner stooped to a still greater deception [remember this word] with respect to the so-called 'three tramps', the men who were arrested in the railroad yard just north of Del Dealey Plaza after the shooting and taken to the police station, but then released without being identified. Lardner knows there is legitimate concern about these men."

First of all, ignorant Oglesby, indifferent to fact, which he here also makes up, is really talking about me. I gave Lardner that information and his accurate story is, Stone, Oglesby and the rest of you fart-be reactors to the contrary notwithstanding,

First of all, those men were not tramps. That was Garrison's invention.

He believed, fadt being immaterial to him also, that one of them, who'd been identified as many, many different man, was Edgar Eugene Bradley, then west-coast representative of the ultra-right New Jersey preacher, Carl McIntire. On this evidence Garrison was going to charge Ed Bradley with having been Perrin's fellow assassin when I broke the grassy knuckle uproar before it could be birthed.

In order to do this I had two independent, professional investigations made. Both, neither knew of the other, yielded the same information. These men were winos, drinking it up in a boxcar when spotted an hour and a half after the assassination.

Stone insists they were in a passenger car and that it was behind the Texas School Book Depository Building and they were "arrested" within minutes of the shooting.

He either had to come up with this bull or change the script all over again.

One of his changes was triggered by Lardner's ridicule. In the script he has two baddies holding David Ferrie's head in the toilet by his hair. Well, in my "Oswald in New Orleans," which Jim Garrison did read and for which he wrote an eloquent foreword, I brought to light the fact that Ferrie had alopaecia totalis and thus did not have a hair on his body! (You and your Sklar sure show the benefits of the kid of "research" you have spent 20 years on! Sklar-script coauthor, Garrison's editor!)

This was not, as Oglesby, with his usual precision and factuality, says was, "north" of Dealey Plaza. It was south of it, behind the Central Annex Post Office. Its address is 217 South Main Street. Or, the boxcar was a block west of the building the government claims the shots were fired from and two and a half blocks south of it.

D'ya suppose that the CIA had invented for this assassination a rifle that can be sighted and fired at such a distance at right angles?

Or trains its assassins to linger near the scene of the crime to get caught an

hour and a half after it?

Garrison says they were arrested, Stone says they were arrested, two farts and Oglesby is right there holding his belly, saying that they were arrested.

Well, they weren't. They were led off to dry out and those ~~xxxxxxxx~~who profess an interest in individual rights may wonder why ~~thxxx~~you all insist that drunks should be charged as criminals. Of course they weren't! And should not have been?

Stone qualifies as an expert on pictures, Garrison is this self-proclaimed demon investigator, and all of the rest in your army have your own skills. At least I so presume.

How anybody in his right mind can look at those pictures and decide the men are under arrest or regarded as dangerous is beyond me?

The only way to walk them off those tracks was to walk them past that building. The news cameramen were photographing everything that moved. So, these drunks were photographed, too, as they walked, without handcuffs on them, or any other restraint and with none of the three police escorts, one of whom was a deputy sheriff, having a pistol out.

That is how assassins are escorted by police?

There was another confirming investigation but this should be enough.

If Lardner isn't as nutty as Stone and his claque he has to be CIA. Naturally!

Broadening his assault on the press Vi Oglesby asks, "Why do normally skeptical journalists reserve their most hostile criticism for those who have tried to keep this case on the national agenda."

Although this seems to be reasonable it in fact amounts to a demand that each and every one of many invented and unproven theories of all those who pretend to solve the crime of the assassination be accepted without question by the press. No matter, as with Garrison, the theories were proven to be untenable, everyone is to forget that ~~have~~ place implicit confidence in the next crew of zany conjectures.

It pleased Garrison to start a whole new area of conspiracy imaginings when he saw the pictures of those irrelevant winos being walked away for drying out and so everyone either believes this ~~xxxxxxx~~warrant nonse nonsense or he somehow has to be a government agent. Those poor men have been "identified" as dozens of conspiring assassins ranging from the former CIA agent E. Howard Hunt as well as some of his former friends and associates to one "Frenchy" who's "identification" was embellished into his allegedly being Lyndon Johnson's farm manager!

Somehow the irrationality lingers, any kind of lie told about the assassination ipso facto becomes fact on its uttering, and the endless series of palpable lies commercialized by Oglesby and his ~~xx~~ AIB and others, notoriously by Garrison, this is what really is needed "to keep the case on the national agenda?"

Educated and experienced as most of these conspiracy-inventors are it is not easy to

believe that they have, after more than two decades. not learned that no matter how often lies are repeated they do not become true in the repetition.

They should have learned that theories are not and cannot be accepted as fact merely because someone finds them attractive. and they should have learned, particularly because it was well known, that the major media was antagonistic, had supported the official mythology and had debunked the eminently debunkable Garrison, that it would be difficult enough to get attention to established fact and impossible to interest the major media in the multidtude of often self-contradictory theories substituted for fact.

Oglesby's defense of Stone and his movie has nothing to do with fact. It is an attack on those who criticise Stone and his project that, even if justified, would not be relevant to the controvsery Stone started with his fictional "histroy" that is a crude, & crass commercialization and exploitation of the great tragedy. Calling his film "J.F.K" when it is not about the beloved President. Calling his production company "Camelot" and going to court and otherwise fighting to be able to redome the TSBD for reality, as he also did with the movie house.

Oglesby's idea and yours throughout is that one Garrison utters a lie in the form of his nonstop theories it becomes instant fact, as it does when Stone adopts Garrison's lies and amplifies them with Marrs' concoctions and his own imaginings, and anyone who does not fall in ~~lien~~ line is somehow a government ~~gan~~ agent and opposed to keeping "the case on the national agenda."

Stone invented and Oglesby adopts a new concept of the first amendment. It is that the wealthy and the callosuly indifferent have an unlimited right to abuse their wealth and power to rewrite our tragic history, immune ffom any criticism until criticism serves no purpose, until Stone and Warners have flooded the country and the world with their ~~xxxxxx~~ adaptation of Garrison's lies and imaginings and told the people this is their true history, the way Stone began his propaganda for his exploitation, in words he cannot now withdraw.

Stone, Warners, Garrison, Marrs and all the other fabricators and popularizers of deceptive and misleading non-solutions have a first-amendment right to be heard. Only they on this subject.

Not a 78-year-old who dares insist that the truth be told, that fact be established, that criticism be justified, factual and truthful, that thepeople not be lied to about any aspect of the terrible crime that turned their country and the world around.

I have no rights, according to you and your gang of sycophants. Stone says he alone has a first-amendment right and neither I nor anyone else, particularly not the major media has any Constitutional right to dispute his rewriting of our history. It is the people the truth.

This is what Oglesby and all of you insist upon.

Stone's First-Amendment fart that gave you all pain is that he has the right to perpetrate a fraud by means of which he can enrich himself and perhaps win commercially-valuable honors but it also denies those with no commercial interest or any benefit at all the right to oppose or expose his perpetration of his fraud. Real funny!

Herbert I. Schiller, who neither has factual knowledge nor claims it has the same pain from the same fart and gets even more irrational and unfeasonable, apparent having gotten a satisfying whiff, and he makes the identical spurious argument.

He begins by having me the flunky of the Bush administration, of all things! (page 6) as well as its instrument in its "controlled-media cultural atmosphere" because Stone's movie "is currently getting this treatment from a bevy of journalists."

If this is what it takes to be a professor of communications what a crop of communicators he has turned out! Not Schiller alone, as we'll see.

He misstates the issue as "the right to question (his emphasis) the established and official version of what happened [no matter] how realistic or fanciful the theory, what facts are selected and which ones are discarded." As this "communications" guru sees it the sole right is that "of the filmmaker." And only after "the movie has been completed and publicly screened" can there be any criticism of it and that criticism is limited to "the audience."

How in the world is the audience to be in a position to judge? Is every American if not all the world's movie-goers a subject expert?

What good is criticism - and I note that long before Stone started shooting he had constructive and factual criticism and he persisted in his fraud and prostitution of our history nonetheless - what meaning can it have if in the Schiller version of the Stone rewriting of the First Amendment no criticism is permissible until it is too late, until it can do no good, serve no purpose at all?

Once again, only Stone has any rights under the First Amendment - the right to lie to and mislead and misinform the people - and it denies anyone under any circumstances the right to try to tell the people the truth. Goebbels again.

Schiller, like Stone, can contrive this Amendment as he does and seem to be reasonable by misstating the basic issue. He ignores what Stone had repeatedly told the world about his movie and as recently as what he seen gets to repeated it still again: that his film would tell the people their history and in doing this would tell them "who" killed their President, "why" and "how."

This is not at all the same as presenting mere entertainment, non-fiction, whether "realistic or fanciful."

Schiller proceeds to misquote out of context from the June 20, 1991 New Orleans Times-Picayune. Either he is selective in his quotation from that paper, or if Stone or someone else provided it to him they withheld from him what triggered the Rosemary James letter he cites. It was a lengthy, self-serving and factually incorrect interview

in that same paper on May 24. In this interview Stone repeated what I quote above and that was three and a half moths after he knew and did not question the truth I sent him.

In this interview he also added to his claim of making a non-fiction movie and lied about its content: "He added the researches of about 28 years" to Garrison.

Whatever his source Schiller can't even quote straight. What a model of a professor of communications, one of those who prepare those who inform us in the democratic tradition he is, these credentials added to his special Constitutional interpretation!

Without saying that she was the reporter who broke the Garrison story for that paper, then covered his fantasies for it and coauthored a book on it or even telling you (not that there is any reason to think you'd have cared) or the reader that she was really talking about Garrison, this is what Schiller says she said: " that Lardner's Washington Post account was based on information provided by ' spies in the Stone camp.' Is this where the secret finds of the CIA go?

(No, Herr Professor, they didn't give me a penny!)

What James actually said, after recounting that Lardner had written his story and used a copy of the script "and revealed its flaws" is:

"Spies in the Stone camp report that he was livid (and) he described Lardner as a government agent in reporter's disguise."

Still in his Bieg Heil mode Herr Professor criticizes Reporter James for exposing the existence of Garrison's 'investigation" because "it was a secret investigation."

Or, lies of our times in Lies of Our Times, Schiller does lie, on his own or in repeating what Stone fed or had fed to him.

Is this the Sheridan Square/ Lies/ LOOT, Ellen Ray/William Schapp practise, even belief, that because an investigation is allegedly secret reporting it is wrongful? Like the FBI's in the CIA's?

Are you really saying that government should be secret? Schiller does!

But the plain and simple truth is that Garrison's so-called "investigation" was never secret and could not be. It had not been reported because Garrison asked reporters not to report it. He had been interviewing many people, personally and through his staff, which is how other reporters learned about it. At least two whom I now recall told me that. How the story did get reported is because it was not and could not be what Schiller says it was, secret. James got her information from the public records of his expenditures that Garrison by law had to file.

After more regurgitations of what Stone farted Schiller concludes with another big lie: "The criticisms have a common objective. It is to defend established orthodoxy's version of what happened in Dallas in November, 1963 and at the same time censor or marginalize views that challenge the official account."

This, remember, began with my February 8 letter to Stone informing him that Garrison's book was false, loaded with lies, documented, and a fraud. Is this "to defend

oethodoxy's version" or is it warning Stone in advance that he would be lying to the ~~de~~ trguting and still-sorrowing people? Offering him access to a quarter of a million pages of those records he before and after persisted in lying to the people about in saying they were all suppressed until at least the year 2039 was "defending" this same "orthodoxy?"

One of the reasons the major media was so one-sided in its reporting and non-reporting about the assassination and its investigation is what this Schiller lying typifies. It and its reporters and editors for years have been ~~flooded with a mild~~ wild a flood of overt lies and zany theories invented or popularized by those who now support Stone ~~that~~ they were turned off and automatically discarded all releases as "more of that JFK trash." Which almost all of it was!

Lardner's and the Post's record are better than that of most of the media, as is stated in the only professional bibliography on the JFK assassination, by Drs. Guth and Wrone (Greenwood Press).

Two of the Lardner/Post stories that I recall, and there were a number hardly defending "orthodoxy's version", are his reporting that our only Unelected President was, as a Member of the Warren Commission, a stool-pigeon for the FBI and his reporting that before any investigation was possible the man then running the Department of Justice, Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, wrote LBJ through his channel, Bill Moyers, as soon as Oswald was killed and he knew there would not be any trial, that the public had to be convinced that Oswald was the assassin; that he had no collaborators still at large; and that the evidence was such he would have been convicted at trial.

Professor Schiller may be emeritus in teaching communications but he sure as heal isn't in truth or fact or plain common sense.

But at that he performs better than Professor Zachary Sklar, coauthor of Stone's script and editor on Garrison's book.

His attack centers on Richard Zoglin's Time Magazine story exposing some of Stone's factual errors. Time magazine, it should be noted, is part of the corporate structure that includes Warner films, which advanced those reported $40 millions to Stone and, as Lies/ Sheridan Square surely know, Warner Books, ~~which paid~~ Garrison $137,500 for the paperback rights to reprint his book and as sordidly retitled it "J.F.K.," the same explitative mistitling Stone used for his commercialization.

Sklar rehashed the non-existing First Amendment claim and flaunts the same disdain for truth and reality in his defense of the book he edited and its author. Of Garrison, who did not ever bring a single new fact to light, he says that "His investigation of the Shaw case turned up a great deal of evidence that nearly every book on the Kennedy assasination since that time has used."

To the extent that part of this is true - the allegation of Garrisons developing of evidence is not true - it is an indictment of the trash on which Stone draws for what

he added to Garrison's flight into Lala Land, those nutty theories compiled by Jim Marrs in his "Crossfire."

Sklar quotes Zoglin for writing, "Stone appears to have bought [Garrison's] version virtually wholesale." Terrible and unjustified criticism, huh? Stone himself did not boast of this over and over again? Did not also boast that he was also drawing on that great scholar Marrs?

How can this be true, in Sklar's version, when the revered Kevin Costner plays Garrison in the movie? Sklar did not say for $7,000,000 or that Costner took Stone's word for the validity of the movie.

This line comes from what Stone wrote the Washington Post in pretended but non-existing refutation of Gardner's article. Stone then added other names he bought so he could trade on them, a number of established stars like Ed Asner to whom he paid large sums for what amounts to walk-on parts.

Sklar then pretends that I helped Stone in his movie, along with the late Sylvia Meagher, saying what is a lie, that Stone "incorporates information...from the separate investigations of Sylvia Meagher and Harold Weisberg...." and among others Sklar does not say Stone bought, for $80,000 to act as experts after they dumped on him the atrocity of a loving son, Rickey White, who tried to commercialize by alleging that his dead father was an assassin. One of these nuts described by Stone as "respected researchers" is Larry Howard, whose proud boast is that he achieved such unique subject-matter expertise by not reading a single book on the subject. After this issue of LOOT appeared he assured me that the Ricky White combination of fabrication and plagiarism is absolutely true, no doubt the reason why, after I exposed it, Stone backed off of it. Another, Gary Shaw, had only recently publicly endorsed an entirely different "solution" than Stone's, that three top mafia types were the real assassins, including the also safely dead Sam "Momo" Giancana and Johnny Roselli.

The copy of Stone's script that I have contains no "information" from either my investigation" or that of Sylvia Meagher's and it is a script that cannot be altered to make your dependable and factual work pertinent or in any way useful in it.

While on the one hand Stone uttered this lie on several occasions and got nationwide publicity trading on Meagher's name and mine, when I complained about it to him he referred my letter to his lawyer, who assured me that it is not true. My second letter of protest, correctly addressed, was returned by the post office, which had been told that Stone had moved and left no forwarding address!

The uglier truth is that Stone sought to bribe Meagher's heir who was then under severe emotional distress and without income with his attempt to buy the rights to "use" her book. This meant, as with the also innocent Asner and others, that Stone, in plain English, was trying to buy the right to trade on Meagher's name. Not having succeeded in his bribery, he and now Sklar falsely do it anyway.

As this professor of journalism displays his high standards he states, "Garrison himself was offered a federal judgeship on the condition that he stop his investigation." Proof cited? None. Source: Garrison and Garrison only, in his book that Sklar edited without the most primitive checking, the book redolent with so many lies some have little point.

Any witnesses to this alleged offer?

Not one.

Only those without any factual knowledge at all or those influenced by the Garrison/ Stone/ Sheridan Square/Sklar fantsay, that Garrison really did conduct a real investigation and that it really did turn up solid information won't choke on this fiction.

What Garrison did do is adopt the work of others as his own, indiscriminately, taking the fancy with the fact, and he pored over the Warren Commission's 26 volumes finding codes where there were none, hidden meanings that existed only in his imagination, and using these documents as his spring-board for his own wild flights of fancy that, to him, became real as soon as he made them up.

Garrison brought not a single substantial fact about the JFK assassination or its official investigations to light - not one! Period! Any statement to the contrary, like this just quoted from Sklar, simply is not true. It is the mythology he created about himself and magnified in his book but it is only mythology.

So, there was no reason for any such offer (the original script has it from the CIA, which from its records I have was laughing at him all the time while rebutting or ridiculing his endless manufactures of alleged evidence) because he not only was doing the government no harm - he was doing it a favor!

As do Sklar and Stone.

I have countless records in which these improvisations pretended to be facts are quoted, often selectively, and then rebutted, for internal distribution, with comment that amount to, "See, more nonsense, more that is false, as we herein demonstrate. Once again the critics prove that we were right to begin with."

So, on Garrison's word alone, and a riskier proposition is not easy to imagine if one seeks fact or truth, Sklar says the government tried to bribe Garrison to "stop" him.

Next he says, again no proof, only the unnamed person whose word he takes, perhaps Garrison, perhaps Stone, perhaps some flunky, "according to documents released under the Freedom of Information Act, the FBI followed Garrison wherever he went." Naturally, Sklar does not say to whom these documents were "released" or where they could be found to be checked, not that he personally checked them, or who got them released.

I don't blame him, given his unhidden intent to shill for Stone and Garrison when both are under severe and factually-correct criticism.

I, not Garrison or Stone or anyone else, filed Civil Action 78-0420 to obtain all the New Orleans FBI office records relating to the JFK assassination, with the files on Garrison among individual files specified. I also filed at the same time Civil Action

78-0322, for the Dallas FBI records relating to the JFK assassination, Dallas being what the FBI calls the "office of origin" and the funnel through which all records pour into FBIHQ. Earlier that year, in still another FOIA lawsuit, I compelled the FBI to give me without charge all its headquarters JFK assassination records.

So, to the best of my knowledge, with the litigation extended for a decade by official stonewalling, ultimately I got all the files in which the records Sklar refers to had to have existed. And they are not there. The FBI did not have any need to "follow Garrison everywhere he went" and it didn't.

It did faithfully clip and forward the newspapers and it did diligently prepare memos on and evaluating the Garrison myths as soon as they appeared. The New Orleans office sent FBIHQ what it had on and knew about the wierdos who sought Garrison out and about the fairy tales attributed to them by the papers, as they told reporters or as in one way or another they came from Garrison.

Like just about all else that Sklar says, this just is not true.

Nor is it true that "all of the files that Garrison's staff had assembled were turned over to Shaw's defense counsel before the ~~trail~~ trial", which Sklar says Tom Bethell admitted in his book. False. Besides which I saw all those files in those file cabinets long after this alleged heist. It would not have been possible to remove all of that junk without detection, it was that voluminous.

All Bethell had to do and all he did do when he could no long stifle his disgust was tell Shaw's counsel what Garrison's alleged case consisted of.

Readers should be reminded that when Garrison finally took his case before a jury that, as Stone has acknowledged, believed there had been a conspiracy to kill the President, that jury, believing there had been a conspiracy, ~~also~~ threw Garrison's case out within an hour. He just had nothing at all except his unsupported suspicions and all he had when he went public was these suspicions and theories.

With his bare face hanging out Sklar concludes by saying of the movie "it has been thoroughly ~~[illegible]~~ researched and fact-checked." Stone was not in a position to do this to begin with and he had no such interest or intent. Moreover, how can you "research" what is imaginary or "fact-check" gross, overt lies, like a few I cited above?

How can you "fact-check," even if it happened, which it didn't, that an effort was made to "stop" Garrison with the offer of a federal judgeship? There is only Garrison's word and taking him at his word with his public record is neither "research" nor "fact-checking."

Stone had not authentic scholar or researcher working for him with the exception of an eminent and well-informed pathologist. In that area he was the best person Stone could have had. Only, there isn't a thing about it in either Garrison's book or in the movie script!

Stone engaged Cyril Wecht so he could trade on Wecht's fine reputation - and had he! he did!

Without doubt Stone had the assassination mythologists and other ignoramuses, like his $80,000 "I -didn't-read- a -single- assassination-book" expert. He had Marrs, whose book is restricted to what he understood of the assorted assassination theories not one of which is based on fact - and Marrs can't even get that guff straight. Except when, as he did, he plagiarized. Samples of both if requested - copies of what he ribbed verbatim included. But he had no real fact experts working for or with him and he did not dare risk that, witness what happened to him and his movie without inside knowledge of his adventures with our history as he rewrites it.

With Sklar it should be emphasized that as the book's editor he should have checked what Garrison wrote for accuracy and he did not. As the publisher, Sheridan Square had the same responsibility. Without doing this it imposed upon the reader's trust and then abused that trust.

What seems probable is that the checking, if any, was restricted to whether or not there was libel. With most of those who might have had an interest in libel action, if not all, safely dead, there was no need that I recall for any concern about libel.

When it is fiction, and crude fiction, albeit well written, there really is little that can be done by a publisher with minimal concern for his reputation. One way, with the book Garrison's, is to consult with those who have personal knowledge of his shenanigans, not those involved in them or those impressed by his account of them.

So, what Sklar builds up to is as big a lie as any of the many in the book and the script based on it, and it was not possible for there to be any credible "research" or "fact-checking" to confirm the book's manuscript or the movie's script.

Witness - and this reflects the factual knowledge Stone and Sklar had by the time they drafted the script - they had the entirely hairless David Ferrie with his head forced into the toilet bowl - by his nonexisting hair!

And this after what Sklar refers to as "thoroughly researched and fact-checked!"

On this subject, other than that the President is dead, neither Stone nor Sklar knows what a fact is or, from their public record, give a damn.

Then, of course, there is the unsolicited and unpaid "research" and "fact-checking" that I gave Stone before he began shooting his extravaganza. He had it, but ignored it and it was both free and accurate, and he ignored it. He was offered more and he did not ask for it. So much for the alleged "research" and "fact-checking" when what Stone was told is a gross lie of Garrison's manufacture remained and it is basic in his movie and he was silent except for proceeding with what he knew before he shot was a deliberately dishonest book, which meant a deliberately dishonest script.

Stone might have claimed that he did not know before he got my February 8 letter but thereafter he could not. Thus he did, knowingly, shoot from a "deliberately dishonest script."

He opted over truth and a decent film that did record their tragic history for the

people as big a lie as he could have grabbed and he made that even more dishonest, aided and abetted by Sklar and that menagerie of phonies and ignoramuses he calls "respected researchers."

Maybe Stone believed that because I am 78 and feeble I would forget about it. If he did, he did not get any such advice from any authentic experts in the field. Most of my extensive FOIA litigation began after the first of my venous thromboses and it was after that that the Department of Justice organized what it referred to as its "get Weisberg" crew of lawyers from its Civil Division. I have no way of knowing how many other from other components it had but the number of FBI special agents arrayed against me was not inconsiderable. If I do care about our real history and try to keep it straight.

And now he has you (plural) ass-kissers of the left and the most expensive and prestigious "door openers" of the right lying and lobbying for him and Warners to save him and them from what they have earned and richly deserve, a monumental failure.

They deserve this because despite his later contrary pretenses Stone told the world that his would be a non-fiction movie, that it would record their "history" for the people, that it would tell them "who" killed the President they love and sorrow over, "why" and "how." He cannot possibly do this from the type-set garbage and multitudinous falsehoods in both Garrison's and Marrs' books and Stone knew it.

It was not possible to revise the Stone-Sklar script to eliminate this basic dishonesty and as long as his script came from these two travesties it had to be a lie once he described it as he did describe it repeatedly, as telling the truth, as presenting fact.

If he had not begun his propagandizing of the monster that he hoped would bring him still more fame and wealth, if he had never represented his movie as truthful or factual or as recounting our history, then in a work of ~~non-~~fiction he did and does have a right to say anything he might want, to be as untruthful, as inventive, as obscene, as this actual movie has to be obscene and as the script I have is, and while he could and should be criticized for this, he has the right to do it.

But The Great One was not satisfied to produce a fictional account. He first latched onto Garrison's book which he represented to be factual, then on Marrs', of which he made the same misrepresentation, and then he fought to get the right to and spent large sums of money to remake the TSBD, which had been converted to other uses, and to refurbish the movie in which Oswald was arrested. This was only to indicate his fidelity to fact when he was unfaithful to it.

"Camelot" Productions, the title "J.F.K." for a movie <u>not</u> about JFK, Garrison's book identically retitled, and it sure as hell is not about JFK, all the alleged hiring of all the alleged "respected researchers" and all the other Hollywood scrimshaw xxx plus all the fine sums for all those respected actors for bit parts only and it is apparent that before there was any public knowledge of what was soon known as "The Oliver

Stone Project for 1991" what ~~this humble genius~~ he was up to is sheer exploitation and commercialization of this great national tragedy.

Describing this as indecent praises it, it is that monstrous.

It will deceive and mislead more people than anything since the Warren report, unless perhaps with all the publicity Garrison had for so many years Stone can't top Garrison's corruption of both his own record and the crime itself.

It will within the government be the vehicle for persuading even more officials that the "solution" is more probative than criticism of it.

My can the FBI and the CIA have a field day with this drek coming from this combination of ~~drek artists!~~ drek artists!

They surely have more clippings than were sent me of what Stone said and can't take back. They'll quote that effectively and they won't have to make anything up.

Until Stone raised his exploiting and commercializing head, Garrison did the most damage to legitimate and factual criticism of the official mythology palmed off on the people by their government.

It remains to be seen whether Stone's movie does more damage. It has a more effective means of conveying his false message and of impressing people so that they remember.

About what he has done and what you have done directly and indirectly (your crap has already been used abroad for all the world as though it were true and real) there is no doubt; this project was and is and will be a major assault on the credibility of all decent, honorable and factual criticism of the terrible thing the government did when it lied to the people about the JFK assassination.

You, Stone and Garrison reflect the belief that because what the goverbment did was false, was wrong, you have a collective license to do as the government did, be false and wrong, and you actually, collectively, regard this as a public service.

It has even been suggested that this could lead to a new investigation.

My, what that would mean! How much more it would disenchant and disllusion the already overly-abused people.

Were a fraud and a travesty to be investigated, could anything good emerge?

Could there be anything other than a condemnation of all criticism, the factual as well as Stone's and your drek?

Anything better than a justification of those many official miscreants who failed us when it was their obligation to determine and report the truth to the degree that was possible?

Anything better than what officials could represent as further proof that their fraud, their travesty, was not a fraud and a travesty, and that it told the people the truth?

But a new investigation based on this mishmash of fabrication, knowing falsehood, unfactuality and conjecture is the one consequence of which there need be no fear.

The government will love the movie that tends to justify and exculpate it.

As I write this Stone's promotions for his movie are several weeks old.

His ~~280,000~~ 880,000 Dallasnuts have held a symposium that, whether or not he arranged, suggested, financed or subsidized it, generated puffery for his movie.

Except that the night before general release of the movie in the movie houses there is to be a benefit pe showing in Dallas, the information I have from the press is that ~~the~~ Stone is departing from the general practise and not permitting reviewers to see his movie so that they can review it before it is shown. The information I have, ~~that~~ which may have to be changed if he fears a kickback, is that ~~critic s~~ movie critics would not be able to see it until too late for their reviews to be ~~printed~~ printed before ~~ic~~ tickets are sold. Unless the Dallas benefit is daytime, this will be true of that $100 a ticket showing. Reviewers who might want to go to the expense of flying to Dallas and then paying $100 could not have their reviews in the morning papers of ~~the~~ December 20, opening day.

Whatever this exceptional departure from norm means or represents it does not suggest that either Warners or The Great Oliver Stone want any reviews to be available before tickets go on sale and the movie can be seen and talked about by the ~~unknown~~ nothing about fact.

This does not suggest that they anticipate favorable reviews ~~now~~.

It is not an expression ~~of skill~~ of confidence in another Oscar movie by thrice-Oscared Stone.

Not to exploit Camelot as the shameless Stone has done but to state a simple truth, none of us is Merlin and we can't remember the future.

So as of this writing there is no way of knowing whether or not the movie will succeed; whether or not Warners will recover its $40 million or make a profit on that investment; whether or not the ~~sable~~ superb talent Stone hired for his movie ~~will~~ has peformed so well as to be honored for their performances.

I know only what justice and a decent concern for our tragic history require and I do hope that in justice this rotten exploitation and commercialization, this deifying of a wretched and dishonest failure, this newest imposition on the ~~teut~~ trust of the people fails as it should fail.

Whether or not it does, at the least, because an enfeebled old man was willing to ~~send~~ confront all the wealth and power behind this latest and most heavily ~~perms~~ promoted disinformation, and because beginning with George Lardner's completely factual and truthful story in the Washington Post the reporting of which I know has been fair and accurate, there does exist, if in no way comparable to the power of a movie made by so talented a man, a body of fact with which those having the interest can compare the movie and those having more than the average interest have a means of learning more.

If what I have done does no more than warn those who would exploit, commercialize and tarnish our history that it just may kick back on them, then it is worth all the trouble and time when at 78 I have so much less time, and all the abuse of which yours lies of our time is but one example.

Pretending with his usual contempt for truth and fact that by his revisions of the script he ~~has~~ perfected it and that it is accurate, Stone boasted of at least six revisions. Some of the major media swallowed this phony line instead of wonde ing why a supposedly factual ~~film~~ script required any revision at all.

Stone or one of his spokes-persons did admit ~~that~~ the stupidity and ignorance about hairless Ferrie having his head toileted by the hair on his head, where there was not even fuzz. This was the Stone/Sklar, to use the word Garrison used so much," objectifying" the story. Sklar enough of a subject expert to edit the book and co-author the script that ignorant or that indifferent to truth?

Garrison boasted of reading the script often and about how fine it is - Stone's hero, demon investigator but to me the Pink Panther who made Stone into a Mack Sennett doing a Keystone Kops ~~director~~ movie - and he did not perceive or correct this stupidity?

So, Ferrie, or at least his ~~xxx~~ hairless head is, out of the ~~xxxipt~~ toilet if not out of the script.

After what I told Stone about Garrison's mendacity about Boxley and his firing, Stone has to be crazy, important as that corruption of truth and reality was to the script, to leave it unchanged, if in at all.

But whatever changes Stone made in six or more revisions, it remains GIGO, garbage in garbage out.

From the Garrison and Marrs books it can be nothing else or better.

Stone has put his honors, his reputation, in his GIGO "LOOT."

You have now vested your reputation in your "Lies of Our Times."

A line Garrison loved to prate is appropriate:

"Though the Heavens fall, ~~be~~ let justice be done!"

Amen!