

Editor, Premiere
K-III Magazine Corp.
2 Park Ave.,
New York, N.Y. 10016

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
12/17/91

Dear Editor,

Oliver Stone and Jim Garrison are alike in their inability to tell the truth even by accident.

They are alike in imposing upon the trust of others as Stone imposed upon your trust in his lengthy diatribe you would have headed more accurately if you had omitted the last word in "Oliver Stone Talks Back." He does not once, in all those words, even indicate what "created" that "storm of controversy" and not a word "answers his critics," as he never once did in the past. It is all just talk in attempted justification of the crudest of exploitations and commercializations of that great national tragedy, the JFK assassination.

He begins his article with a broad assault on the major media for being "generally wrong". Sometimes just a little, sometimes a lot, but wrong."

If he had said "entirely" he would have described his movie mistitled "JFK" as part of his exploitation perfectly.

I am uniquely in a position to know.

I am the unnamed man he refers to as "a bitter researcher in the J.F.K. conspiracy community, who, I hear, continues, illegally, to sell copies of the script for \$30 each."

Save that I might be referred to as a "researcher" not a single word of this is true.

He has modified his earlier characterization of me as a thief in saying that what I openly gave George Lardner of the Washington Post, a copy of his script, he "consider(s) to be a stolen first draft."

I am enfeebled at 78, could not have stolen it, and I know that my source did not.

While I have not sought to trace ^{this} the copy of the script I was given because of ^{my} ~~what~~ ^{work of} I have done over the past 28 years, I am certain that its source was one of the large number of scripts Stone himself, as he very well knows, distributed to be able to latch onto the reported \$40 millions of Warner's money.

I am a former reporter, investigative reporter, Senate investigator and editor and professional (OS.) intelligence analyst. I am the author of six published books on the JFK assassination, ^{including} ~~and of the first of them~~ ^{on the Warren Report. These are the only available books that do} ~~and the only one who does not impose upon the~~ trust of the still-grieving people with phony "solution" of that terrible crime.

Stone lies and he knows he lies in placing me with those nuts he hired from among the many in the "conspiracy community." *I have never been in it*

In the course of my work I sued the FBI, CIA and other agencies under the Freedom of Information Act, obtaining about a quarter of a million pages of once-withheld records to ^{which} ~~which~~ ^{as} Stone knew, I give unsupervised access to all writers. In practise this means those with whom I disagree because they do invent irresponsible and untenable conspiracy

theories. I believe that this law makes me surrogate for the people, not the owner of these records, I ^{like} with this belief, practise it without any exception, and Stone himself declined access to them.

He found he could promote himself and his movie better with his reiterated lie, that all these records are officially suppressed until at least the year 2039.

I ^{decided} ~~decided~~ to expose the "fraud and travesty" on which Stone was engaged when he did not respond to my lengthy and detailed letter of February 8, 1991, in which I informed him with complete accuracy that he could not, and I use his words, record their history for the people, telling them who killed their President, why and how, based on Jim Garrison's shameless rewriting of his own history, his monumental fiasco, in his "On the Trail of the Assassins." I was there, I ~~was~~ ^{was} very much involved, and that is the one trail Garrison never took. ^{He} This was a career of endless inventions of conspiracies he imagined, none ever proven, and as you can see from my ^{enclosed} letter, I was able to prevent some of his more ghastly indecencies.

You will see that I attached some documentation, offered ^{Stone} ~~him~~ more and to respond to any questions he might have. ~~And~~ ^{Stone} This was some time before ~~he~~ started shooting. He had no questions, he did not issue any denials of the accuracy of what ~~he~~ ^{by} I told him from Garrison or anyone else. Obviously he could not and equally obviously he proceeded with what he knew was a fraud and a travesty, his rewriting of earlier rewritings of our history.

His reference to me as "bitter" is a moderated version of a lie by one of those in his pay, one who also retailed the lie that I sold copies of the script, ^{in that version} ~~in which~~ I am allegedly "bitter" because Stone did not cut me in. As the correspondence, all of which I ^{any} enclose leaves without ~~doubt~~ at all, the exact opposite is true. I refer to the thinly-disguised offer to bribe me by his "research coordinator" in nonresponse to my point-by-point disproof of what Stone wrote and got the Washington Post to publish under threat of a lawsuit the defense of which could be enormous.

I ^{when about three months} was only ~~after~~ Stone did not respond to my informing him that he would be foisting off on the people what amounted to a Warren Report from the other side ~~after about two months~~ that I phoned ~~Laudner~~ ^{him} who I have known ^{him} for about 25 years and who I know ^{him} to be an accurate reporter and an authentic subject expert, one of the few in the major media, if not in fact today the only one. ^{He} He had access to all my records, ^{those relating to} including ~~of~~ what I am confident was at least modified in the script, Garrison's great lie that he fired Bill Boxley because Boxley had infiltrated his "probe" to wreck it for the CIA.

Garrison fired Boxley because he could not fire himself!

Boxley's sin of excess loyalty was in going out and making up "proof" of ~~his~~ Garrison's own sick invention, that Robert ^L Kerrin, who Garrison knew had killed himself in New Orleans, Garrison's own turf, in 1962, was a Grassy Knoll assassin in 1963!

And this was only part of what Garrison planned as his commemoration of the fifth

anniversary of that great tragedy that turned the world around!

In Stone's account, in his movie based on Garrison's lies and that compendium of all the unproven and usually rabid conspiracy theories (Jim Marrs' "Crossfire") Garrison "wins his soul in the end!"

Garrison charged an innocent man, Clay Shaw, with the most terrible of crimes in a society like ours, presidential assassination, and in an interview Stone referred to this as of no consequence at all. In his article that you published he pisses on the innocent and defamed victims with his own assortment of lies and distortions.

This is but one aspect of the Goebbels-like campaign Stone launched rather than becoming an honest man and doing a new script not based on all those fantasies and lies he loved so for their potential, a campaign in which he succeeded in making himself be the victim of a non-existing major-media campaign to vilify him and destroy his movies.

The gruesome truth about Stone and what he was about, once exposed, was certain to be a story that carried ~~it~~ itself, I believed, and it ~~was~~ did.

As Stone also knew, few if any movie reviewers could be in a position to assess his honesty or factuality in his movie that he never really stopped referring to as recording the actualities of our history. He knew also what his name means to reviewers, all those honors he now, alone and unassisted, sullies and endangers, at least in history, and he knew what Warner's influence, money and connections would mean once its \$40 million was endangered.

Part of his disinformation campaign is Stone's ^{special} interpretation of the first amendment: it applies to him only. He has a right to lie and rewrite our history and I have no right to expose him.

If he had not launched this travesty from which he expected rewards with the gross lie, that it was non-fiction, that he was really recording the truth of our tragic history, really would tell the people who killed their President, why, and how, I would have had not a word to say, and, like all the many others with whose writing I disagree, if he had had what he has never once manifested, any interest in the official investigations, like so many others, several dozen at the time of the 25th anniversary, he would have had unsupervised access to and copies of those records he never stopped lying about to promote himself and his ~~my~~ movie.

When my deteriorated health precluded my writing more of the kind of books I've written I decided that, to the degree possible for me, I would undertake to add to the historical record the abdications and failures of those so-called critics. You are welcome to examine the separate file I have on those who, like Stone and Garrison and their hangers-on, trivialized this tragedy in that "commemoration."

Among other things, you will find no suggestion of "bitterness."

We are none of us Merlins who can remember the future. I do not pretend to be. But I

do believe that regardless of how this disgusting commercialization and exploitation does at the box office, Stone's not inconsiderable ego and his smug confidence that there is nothing he cannot get away with, will be his self-defamation, all those Oscars and other honors notwithstanding.

If he had regarded himself as a mere mortal, not as omniscient, he would have made at least a rudimentary check of Garrison's indecent and dishonest self-justification - as Garrison's editor on the book, Stone's coauthor of the script and the publisher did not - and if he had any honesty at all he would not have given this project a second thought.

But greed and ambition overwhelmed him and I believe that history will record him as one who prostituted himself and his art because of his greed and ambition.

There is a long history of books and other expressions of fantasies represented as factual accounts of this terrible "crime of the century." All have deceived and misled the sorrowing people and have justified the official miscreants who in that time of great stress and since failed in ^{their} obligations to the nation.

As I believe the end will show - and certainly should show - in his concluding paraphrase of Santayana Stone wrote his own epitaph:

"What is past is prologue. To forget that past is to be condemned to believe it."

From the time he got my letter of February 8, Stone had no innocence.

Live and relive, ^vliver Stone!

Harold Weisberg