Editor
Texas Monthly
PO Box 1569
Austin, TX 78767

12/14/91

Dear editor,

Not anticipating that I would have occasion to write Mark Seal I did not keep the address to which he asked me to send copies of my Oliver State correspondence, so I write him through you because you published his propaganda that, like most propaganda, begins with intended dishonesty.

I'd wondered why he did not keep his word and send me a copy of his whoring for Oliver Stone in your December issue. When a friend sent me a xerx of it I wondered no longer. If he has any principle, no matter how self-shredded, any vestige of self-respect, he did not want me to have his self-debasement or to be aware of the prostitution of normal journalistic standards in which, knowingly or not, you and your magazine joined.

I suppose that one of the reasons I make an exception and take the time to write when I am 78, in impaired health and do not have time for what I want to do is that, in addition to the disgust and contempt I feel for such journalistic depravity, I feel imposed upon. If he had not indicated the exact opposite of his real interest I'd not have wasted that time and the cost and trouble of making and mailing xeroxes. In return for which he was so damned cheap he did not even send me a copy of what he wrote and you published.

You have a right, of course, to be as dishonest, as misleading, as prejudiced and as ass-kissing as you want. But you do not have the moral or ethical right to mislead those you have the intent of involving in your propaganda.

There is much in this ugly, unclean self-characterization that I could address were there any point in it, any more than is accomplished by telling a whore she is a whore.

Aside from a comment on Seal's sloppiness I restrict myself to one, your presuming to condemn real journalists for their practise of fair and honest journalism. Which just happens to be one of Oliver Stone's more effective and corrupt means of promoting himself and his exploitation and commercialization of the great tragedy of that assassination.

On page 166, ~~aside from~~ there is the crude and misleading inaccuracy that it was only after I got a copy of the script that I knew plenty about the movie." The one of the several letters Seal got that he referred to makes it clear that I did not need the scfipt to have that knowledge and that in fact when I wrote the one letter he referred to it was without reference to the script that I then did not have.

I do not mind Seal's characterization of that latter as "scathing" but I do believe that after this characterization he gives the false impression that I scathed Stone. I did not. I address Garrison's record and the utter and complete dishonesty of the book that Stone himself had said was the basis of his movie. Separately there is what I believe makes Seal a twobuck whore, his ignoring what I said in that letter and dismissing it

as whatever he meant to imply by "scathing" where it is of unquestionable accuracy. And in this puts what Stone was up to in clear view. I also note that Seal was not even accurate on the punctuation within quotes. Sloppy.

I do add, having just noticed, what I say above leading into it and the complete abandonment of decency and traditional concepts of journalism, that Seal says on the same quoted page that Stone "won't give an inch about the factual accuracy of JFK." He and you can publish this when Stone has yet to deny a single word I said?

On this Stone accuracy, you and Seal did a little rewriting to hide his subject-matter ignorance and his contempt for truth, again on the same page, where he says that the script had two Cubans forcing medicine down Ferrie's throat." What the script actually said is that they were holding Ferrie's head in the toilet bowl by his hair. The reason for Seal's casting himself in the Goebbels role on this is obvious, and Stone, Rusconi and Garrison at the least knew it: Ferrie had, as I brought to light in "Oswald in New Orleans," alopaecia totalis. He did not have a hair on his body, anywhere. So much in a triviality of his determination to be accurate!

What is really disgraceful and utterly disreputable is your repeating of Stone's knowing lie and slander of the non-whoring journalists. Stone begins by referring to them as "a thousand and one vultures" who "just peck out my eyes and rip my guts out. ... a lot of paid-off journalist hacks... with their recipied political theories..."

Elsewhere Stone alleges that this is all the Establishment out to get him and that the CIA is behind it.

The truth, as Seal knew very well, is that there was no orchestrated campaign at all. I am neither Establishment nor CIA and there is no question at all, I started the exposure of Stone's exploitation, commercialization and rewriting of history and the story was such that it took off on its own. Lardner's was, despite Stone's feeble and foolish attempt to rebut it, completely accurate. Seal had and ignored the letter I wrote Stone detailing his lies and fabrications in his rebuttal the day after it appeared. So much again for Stone's "not giving an inch about the factual accuracy..."

As I think back over this small illustration of the rotten, dirty thing you have done I conclude that I owe whores an apology.

Contemptuously yours,

Harold Weisberg