

Mr. David Talbot, editor
Image
San Francisco Examiner
Box 7260
San Francisco, CA 94120

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
2/27/92

Dear Mr. Talbot,

While in general there is much justified criticism of the major media in Todd Gitlin's "Killing the Messenger" commentary on Oliver Stone's "Killing the Messenger" article (2/16/92) it in fact reflects Stone's success in suckering the nation into believing that criticism of him and his movie was part of a CIA plot by "recipied" CIA reporters and "The Estblishment." I speak with authority on this because I am those "recipied" reporters allegedly working for the CIA, as Gitlin should have known from what he states to begin with:

"The campaign against JFK started rolling before the cameras did, back on May 19, 1991, when ~~George Lardner~~ Washington Post national security writer George Lardner, working from a purloined first draft of Stone's screenplay, lit into the moviemaker for his re-interpretation of historic events."

Lardner's article, which appeared after Stone had been filming in Dallas for weeks, makes it clear I was his source. I am the author of the first book on the Warren Commission and of six others on the investigations of the JFK and Martin Luther King assassinations, all factual, advancing ~~not~~ theoretical solutions, and all critical of all government agencies, including the CIA and the FBI, involved in those investigations. And as anyone with the most rudimentary knowledge of the subject matter knows, I filed about a dozen FOIA lawsuits against these agencies as a result of which I obtained about a third of a million pages of previously-withheld records that I make freely available to all writing on these assassinations.

In early February, 1991, from Stone's own propoganda for his movie, I learned that he touted it as recording their history for the people, telling them who killed their President, why and how and as based on Jim Garrison's false and fraudulent rewriting of his own tragedy and fiasco. On February 8 I wrote Stone in detail, with documentation and offering more documentation and to answer any and all questions he might have, telling him that he would inevitably be producing a fraud and a travesty.

If Stone had not from the outset and without ever ending represented his movie as the factual truth, as non-fiction, he would have had every right to say anything he wanted to say. But once he said it was factual and truthful when he knew it wasn't and could not be, he was properly subject to criticism based entirely on what he himself said and what is public knowledge about his hero, Jim Garrison.

Gitlin repeats Stone's lie, that the script I gave Lardner was "purloined." In fact it is a copy made from a copy Stone himself gave away. As I told Stone in my second letter to him, refuting his June 2 Washington Post article pretendedly responding to Lardner's, like Garrison, he has trouble telling the truth even by accident - and doesn't.

anyone with any factual knowledge of what Stone did and said, and I believe this is the kind of knowledge required for writing your article, particularly when the author is a professor of sociology, has to have known that it was without question from Stone's first propaganda for his movie that he intended it to be a commercialization and exploitation of the JFK assassination. He missed no trick, beginning with taking the name "Camelot" for the time he was making the movie and abandoning that name as soon as it was in the can when his own production company is Ixtlan, the name on the film and in Warner's press kit on it, continuing with his well-publicized insistence that because of his determination to be true to fact in every detail he required the use of the building from which, in the official mythology all shots were fired, and emphasized in his many interviews with those he believed would support him - and did. In fact, as one of his associates has written, Stone told him that he was using the JFK assassination as a vehicle for saying what he wanted to say about Viet Nam.

Simultaneously Stone was proclaiming that he was basing his movie on all that had come to light since the Warren Report. This is a Goebbels-like lie. He had no interest in fact and he never once asked for access to or even a single page of all those records he knew I have and make freely available. *His sole interest was in conspiracy theories.*

When he did not respond to my warning (in which I asked nothing at all of him) for two months, ~~and~~ having known Lardner for 25 years and knowing that he wrote more stories critical of the official "solution" than any other reporter, I gave him the Stone script and access to all my records relating to what Garrison did and planned. Lardner used some of what was in my first letter to Stone, how when asked by Garrison's staff, which had failed to persuade him, I prevented an additional atrocity Garrison planned for his commemoration of the fifth JFK assassination anniversary. One of the illustrations should suffice. He was going to charge two additional "Grassy Knoll" assassins, both innocent and solely on the basis of what he imagined, knowing full well that one, Robert W. Ferrin, had killed himself the year before he allegedly killed JFK.

Knowing this and more almost two months before he started shooting, Stone filmed ~~for~~ from his original script in which he made minor changes to get around only some of the exposures of its many fabrications.

as from my own reporting experience of the distant past and subject-matter knowledge I hoped and expected, once there was a definitive and accurate exposure of Stone's ~~mass~~ crass commercialization and exploitation the story ^{did} would carry itself.

Stone's lies were faithfully retailed by his sycophants as part of his propaganda to pretend that sinister forces were out to ruin him and suppress the alleged truth he would be filming. As recently as the day before I write this I received another of the many allegations that I started exposure of him because he refused to pay me for being one of his consultants. There is no basis for this at all and the exact opposite is true. In

non-response to my June 3 letter of point-by-point refutation of his June ²/₄ article his "research coordinator" wrote me what can be interpreted only as a solicitation to accept a bribe. My response was that I wanted nothing at all to do with him or his movie but nonetheless he like all others was welcome to free and unsupervised access to all those once-withheld records he insisted on all possible occasions remained suppressed.

Stone has, of course, excited the multitude but in doing this he has in fact re-written the history of this great tragedy for commercial purposes. He has deceived and misled the people and added to the confusion about the assassination. He has done this in a way that further protects the official miscreants from their failings, including their deceiving and misleading the people in the unacceptable official "solution."

And, for his Warren Report from the other side and his propaganda that sinister forces were out to suppress him, aside from the money his movie makes he has already been awarded a "Golden Globe" for his fraud and travesty and as of this writing is candidate for a number of Oscar awards.

With your unfortunate article additional propaganda for additional awards when for what he has done he deserves condemnation.

Our great national tragedy ought not be the subject of commercialization and exploitation and those writing about it ought be fully and accurately informed lest, as Gitlin did, they become part of his propaganda and further confuse, deceive and mislead the people.

Should you want the truth, I'll be glad to send you copies of my correspondence with Stone.

Please excuse my typing. At 78 and in impaired health, I am required to keep my legs elevated except when I am walking and thus the typewriter is to my side when I use it.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg