

George Lardner, newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

1/5/92

Dear George,

Thanks for the copy Oglesby's Playboy fairy-tale about Garrison, the tooth fairy and almost imperceptibly, the Oliver Stone movie.

While I have no reason to believe that you will need to refer to it, I've highlighted enough fabrications, outright lies and misrepresentations so that I'll be reminded of enough if you do.

Oglesby dates his meeting with Garrison in July. That means he was working on this story then. In turn this means that it was delayed to coincide with the release of the movie. Or, Stone propaganda? Garrison's?

The piece itself is both.

What you sent begins with page 7, followed by two unnumbered pages and then the carryover. At least the page before the carryover is missing. The third of these first three pages has the "Where was the FBI box in the lower righthand corner.

Thinking back I cannot recall a single statement of relevant fact made by Garrison, as quoted by Oglesby, that is correct.

If you do not recall them Oglesby was a founder of the self-styled Assassination Information Bureau. It cloned itself on Garrison and was no less fertile in the invention of "evidence." They misled an entire generation of collegiates and others. Aside from Lane and Garrison, they are more responsible than any others for the invention and propagation of convincing and persuasive, to the uncritical mind, fictions palmed off as real.

No a single word of this lead story is dependable or other than misinformative.

Playboy has an earlier history with Garrison. This article takes no risks- there is no mention of any living person who might file the kind of costly suit Gordon Novel filed against it for its Garrison interview of about 1967.

On another subject, the Groden interview I sent you suggests that the Parkland emergency room was available for Stone's use in his pretense of complete devotion of historical accuracy. I think I wrote a memo saying this. I learned from Gary Mack that it was disassembled and stored for history. So he could not have used it if he'd wanted to

Best,

Nacody

Dear Jeff,

2/26/79

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to the editor of Outlook rather than a letter-to-the-editor for publication. I intend this as more than a courtesy. I express my disappointment over your personal irresponsibility in what for all practical purposes is indisputable from spook disinformation.

The letter is an under statement in many ways. I am aghast that you would present Blakey by the long ending quotation as other than his record in running- dominating- the committee leaves without doubt. He is a practising anti-civil libertarian, a practising authoritarian, and in his ripoff of an approach that is responsible he presents himself and the committee falsely. They are merely the newest of the basic institutions of society to fail the people and the system. Failure hardly describes their record.

Oglesby has a long record of not letting fact or truth interfere with the silly theories he dreams up and then wills into actuality. But of you I'd expected better.

Why you did not bother to check the few so-called facts in this nightmare I do not know but you should have because your factual inaccuracy is total.

If you would care to provide a written explanation of how what you and others criticize in the Commission, the FBI, the CIA and others becomes right for you people personally and the AIB and others like it in general I will be glad to include it in my files for archival deposit.

You might want to include how all that is wrong for all that went ahead becomes right for the abortion in which you share responsibility.

How is the committee better with Baden and Humes than the Commission was with Humes and many others.

How was it wrong for the Commission not to take Burkley's testimony and right for the committee to duplicate that offense?

How does it become honorable and decent and right and proper for the committee to limit Guinn's examinations to exclude copper and wrong for the Commission not to disclose any results of the same tests? Or for the FBI to hide them?

If you believe that in these non-rhetorical questions I am not addressing the honesty and intent of the piece in the Post I would again welcome a written explanation to accompany my letter to Greider and this to you.

On a personal level, I repeat, I am very disappointed in you. I expected no better from the Yanker of the Cowboys.

When you speak to Katz please thank him for the suggestion he made to me at Boston U. I was interrupted by questions before I finished speaking and because the audience was so small decided to continue with taking and answering questions. Bob suggested that for an uninformed audience there was an insufficient basis. I rearranged the cards from which I speak to have the basic crime facts at the very beginning and believe it is much more effective even when I am not interrupted. I tried it last week.

Sincerely,