

Mr. Mary Ferrell  
4406 Holland Ave.,  
Dallas, TX 75219

9/17/91

Dear Mary,

Glad to hear Buck has improved so much! I assume from your mention of surgery that you came through it well. Hope so!

Thanks for the copy of your letter to Huch. I've heard nothing from him. And the way things now are I've forgotten what he wrote and what I did!

I want to correct you on one thing, that Stone" is making a fictionalized version of" the JFK assassination. That is his current story. It is not how he began and he did not change his ever-sought propoganda until after he knew of Lardner's story.

He began his real campaign with the release of "Doors" and then and later he said that his movie will record "History," and that it will tell the people, his repeated word, who killed their President, why and how.

He can't withdraw that now. He is trying to, of course, and pretending he never said what he did say. He did say it and it says non-fiction.

Were it fiction he might have a legit claim that criticism await the showing. But he can't claim to be making history into a movie and then at the same time demand that his monkeying with truth and history be immune.

If I did not say it in what I sent you, I warned Stone 2/11/91 that Garrison's was a false, a knowingly dishonest book, but that did not lead him to base his concocting of his account of our history on any other book and Hairs' is an atrocity, very hurtful in its absurdities and wrongnesses. Stone's basis, whatever else he says, is these two.

With \$35-40 million he paid big-name stars well to do bit parts so he could trade on their reputations and he has done this repeatedly. and he describes the nuts with whom he is dealing as respected critics. Some of whom boast of never having read a book! In even his sets he restores them to "history." For fiction? Or to make fiction?

We are both about as well as we can hope. Lil was in a wheelchair for a while and when I got so much benefit from physical therapy she went to the orthopaedist who arranged it for me, found out what her trouble really is, and this therapy was so effective for her in two weeks she was out of the wheelcahir and in two more weeks needed neither walker nor cane. The problems I had I still have and I make out OK. So, for our age, not too bad.

We do hope both of you progress well. Our best,

OOPs! I've three days I forgot you wrote me and enclosed your letter to Paul!...I'm sorry the suspicion that we are friends led to criticism of you....The Garrison actuality

is I think worse than you can know. You do not know the details of my exposure of what he was up to of which Boxley was the victim. I've gotten out what records I have of that painful job and the report I handed Sciambra that he used to keep Jim from charging the

dear perrin and the live and ignorant Bradley is quite specific in stating that it was apparent that what Boxley did was feed back to Jim what he knew Jim wanted. So, Jim called him a CIA agent. Truth is Jim insisted on hiring him, over staff objections....On those CIA records on the critics and writers, if and when you can I'd appreciate a set of copies because I do not know that - have them. The CIA cooked up a scheme for not complying with my FOI A requests and Cesar did not sue over that for me.

Russell Long in the movie: Garrison even made that up to hide what actually got him started toward the end of 1966. Long told a reporter I know.

Stone's final cript: I've made no effort to get a copy but I have spoken to someone who has the first and the sixth versions and he says the changes are few and designed to eliminate the utterly ridiculous that had been exposed as such. *(won't give me a copy.)*

On Bradley, the above is not all I did. He came here, I gave him what he wanted, helped him in any way I could, and then drove him 50 miles to Baltimore, or 100 miles, and the next thing I knew he was badmouthing me in California.

On Garrison being misled by his staff on Bradley, the truth is the opposite and I have staff memos on that. And when the staff <sup>was</sup> fighting the utter irrationality with which Jim was going to commemorate the 5th anniversary, the one of the many he clung to was Bradley. He did give up on the others!

There can't be any truth in what Bradley quotes Garrison as saying, that Stone titled Garrison's book. Jim was fast and loose with truth and remains that way.

If he really told Bradley what Bradley said he did, about his being so interesting a person, etc., he was lying. Not at all what he'd been saying.

I often wonder if now, whether or not in those days, Garrison has any knowledge of what is real. He made up so much that he seemed to believe when he made it up, can he now distinguish?

Mary McHughes Ferrell  
4406 Holland Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75219-2133  
(214) 528-0716

September 10, 1991

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Harold:

I received a copy of your letter to Paul today. Harold, you are not the only one who wishes I had called you (or written to you) before I wrote that letter in June. When Paul attacked me, it was not for the same reasons you give in your letter (not that your letter is an attack of any kind). I wrote a response to Paul on July 13th and am enclosing a copy of that letter. One of the letters of "criticism" I received mentioned that the writer thought you and I were friends. I was almost certain that Paul had received a copy of that letter, from things he said in his letter to me. That was my reason for trying to set the record straight (in the July 13th letter) where you and I are concerned.

Your long letter to Paul is excellent! You have summed up the researchers' "case" exactly -- beginning with Jim Garrison's performance. I realize that my June 22nd letter appears to be a defense of Garrison and perhaps there was a bit of "defense" in the letter. My "defense" was because of the numerous pages we received under FOIA in 1976 reciting the unbelievable efforts the CIA exerted to discredit Garrison and all the JFK researchers and writers. The concerted efforts of the CIA were infuriating to me. It would have been exactly the same if Garrison had pursued the many legitimate leads you, Vince Salandria, Arch Kimbrough and people like you, gave to Jim's office, and if he had been successful in putting the true facts before the world. It is my belief that the CIA would have put forth the same efforts. There are documents in the CIA's material attacking you, Penn Jones, Jr., Mark Lane, and every other researcher, writer and critic.

As far as Stone's movie goes, I have not seen any copy of the script. I do have a slim chance of getting the final version from a friend of Walter Mathau (who played Russell Long in the movie). I would really like to see it because they sent a number of the actors and actresses to me for copies of the documents and testimony in the Warren Commission's volumes pertaining to the characters they were playing. Those poor people told me that Stone changed the script from one minute to the next.

- An interesting sidelight -- Edgar Eugene Bradley calls me frequently. He told me early this year that some time ago he and Connie were traveling by car from California to Florida where one of their sons is a minister. Shortly before they had planned that trip, Gene called Garrison from California and asked him why he had accused him of complicity

in the assassination. Garrison told him that his office had misled him and he was very sorry the mistake had occurred. Garrison invited him to visit him if he were ever in New Orleans.

Within a few months, Gene and Connie were passing through New Orleans and Gene called Jim. Jim invited them to lunch and took them to a lovely place where the food, service and atmosphere were beyond anything Gene and Connie had ever experienced. During the lunch, Gene remarked that he had been trying to obtain a copy of Jim's latest book but couldn't find it. He asked for the exact title. Jim told him he would be happy to give him a copy and would autograph it to Gene. He asked them to come back to his office so he could present him with the book. When Gene saw the book, he said, "On The Trail of the Assassins' -- that's a catchy title." Jim said, "Oliver Stone gave the book that name." Of course, Gene Bradley did not get the significance of that statement!

Jim almost begged them to stay over another night (Friday night) and he would like to talk to Gene again. Jim said, "You are one of the most interesting men I've ever met. I just wish I had met you before my staff persuaded me to charge you." (Have you ever spent any time with Edgar Eugene Bradley?) Gene was really elated but explained that they had a very limited income and were traveling cheaply by avoiding the big cities. They would drive on to some small town and stay in a cheap motel. Jim Garrison "put them up" in a lovely hotel and took them to a posh private club for lunch on Saturday. Needless to say, Eugene Bradley now thinks Jim Garrison is a superior human being and he blames all those on Jim's staff for the problems he experienced.

I am glad to learn that Lil is somewhat better. The fact that you have had eye problems is most distressing. If I were unable to read constantly, I would almost as soon be dead (not quite -- but close). My children, grandchildren and great grandchildren would just have to read to me.

Buck is doing better than I am. I have not worked for some time now. My granddaughter in Austin is still taking care of him. I hope to return to the office in another week or so. However, I plan to retire next year. I wish I could make it until I'm 70 (next year) but I may not make it.

Love to you and Lil,

  
Mary

/mf  
Enclosure

Mary McHughes Ferrell  
4406 Holland Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75219-2133  
(214) 528-0716

July 13, 1991

Dr. Paul L. Hoch  
1525 Acton Street  
Berkeley, CA 94702

Dear Paul:

I am disturbed over the furor my letter has created. Yours is not the only criticism I have received. I had no intention of causing problems among the researchers and most certainly intended no criticism of my dear friend Harold Weisberg. You are quite right that I have tried to keep my name out of the debate. However, I felt very strongly about the Washington Post article and the review in Time Magazine's cinema section.

Paul, I would have been equally indignant if the above-named publications had given good reviews to the Stone movie. I am certain I will not like the finished movie but I plan to wait until I see it to start reviewing it. From reports I have received from those who were either in the movie or were at the scene during filming, Stone has taken liberties with the number of shots fired in Dealey Plaza and with critical dialogue various individuals spoke. If these reports prove to be true, I will be offended despite the fact that he is making a fictionalized version of the events that day. However, I shall wait for the final cut.

You are welcome to print my name. I would appreciate it if you would also explain my explanation for the letter, something I should have done in the June 22nd letter.

Buck was taken out of the hospital in May and I went to the hospital for surgery in May. My children want me to recuperate fully before I try to bring him home. My granddaughter and her husband are watching over him in Austin until I rest a bit more.

Sincerely,

Mary M. Ferrell

/mf