

ABANDONED HISTORIANS PONTIFICATE FROM IGNORANCE ABOUT THE JFK ASSASSINATION  
AND OLIVER STONE'S EXPLOITATION AND COMMERCIALIZATION <sup>OF IT</sup> ~~OF IT~~

as war is too important to trust to the generals, so also is our history too important to trust to our professional historians.

Nothing better exemplifies this better than the April, 1992 issue of the American Historical Review in which the editors, ~~taking~~ not inconsiderable liberties with the word, describe ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> solicited essays as a "Forum on Oliver Stone's movie JFK and the 'culture of Violence.'"

For this it selected three men each with impeccable standing in the areas of their own expertise but utterly unqualified for authoritative and responsible addressing of the topic by their profound ignorance of the established fact of the JFK assassination; and by their failure to draw upon the readily-available and well-publicized information about Stone, his ulterior purposes, his gross and persisting ignorance of the fact of that assassination, the knowing dishonesty and irresponsibility of his selecting ~~the~~ Jim Garrison's indecent rewriting of his own fiasco <sup>and on Jim Marrs' Crossfire, an</sup> and the trash of that incompetent and uninformed compendium of all the nutty assassination conspiracy theories by Jim Marrs, <sup>MARRS</sup> his "Crossfire" <sup>in which he</sup> flaunts his gross ignorance of both the fact of this assassination and the dependable, authoritative <sup>literature does</sup> books that do not espouse unproven and unprovable theories as "solutions" to what, without exaggeration, is described as "the crime of the century."

Stone's is a multimillion <sup>dollar</sup> exploitation and commercialization of this great tragedy, ~~on in which~~ rather than hiding this intent he used it to promote his movie before he began shooting it.

Not one of ~~the~~ <sup>ly qualified,</sup> these supposed scholars reflects ~~any~~ of this. <sup>I doubt they are aware of it, such is their "scholarship"</sup> Not ~~one~~ <sup>of</sup> even suggests it. <sup>journal</sup>

To anyone who is aware of the unquestionable fact of the assassination and its investigations, which not one of these eminences reflects, or <sup>of</sup> its official investigations, to which they devote no attention in the remote event they were capable of it, these are the fairies and needles boys of historical scholarship each of whom begins with reconceptions of his own, not a few prejudices, and misuses this prestigious <sup>change of time</sup>

2/ and the opportunity it afforded them to further mislead, misinform and confuse sincere historians who trust and depend on the publication to inform them honestly, responsibly and dependably. *The impression on the trust of the non-professional reader is greater.*

*Why?*  
That such a prestigious publication could and did select such unqualified "experts" (for pursuing their own agendas without inhibition) rather than professional historians who have truly authentic credentials on the ~~edit~~ <sup>19/</sup> editors can explain.

Because I raise these questions with the directness and emphasis that I do I believe that I should begin by stating the credentials I have for this, how I can justify my own statements of fact and opinion, what right I have to be regarded as a qualified subject-matter expert.

I am the author of six books on the JFK assassination and its investigations and one on ~~those~~ <sup>that</sup> of Martin Luther King, Jr. Not one of these books advances ~~any~~ <sup>conspiracy?</sup> conspiracy theory.

*entirely based on a great volume of these records,*  
They are factual, and they have withstood times testing, especially by the government agencies of which they are critical. My book on the King assassination was ~~validated~~ <sup>scrutinized closely and carefully because</sup> when

it provided the basis for accused King assassin James Earl Ray's habeas corpus effort and with its success for the two weeks of evidentiary hearings in federal district court in Memphis, Tennessee. There ~~it was subjected to~~ <sup>it</sup> was subjected to ~~W. J. Moore's~~ <sup>W. J. Moore's</sup> machine for establishing truth, cross-examination, and it more than survived. ~~It~~ <sup>It</sup> was validated.

My prior experiences, <sup>also</sup> albeit not as a professional historian - and I am not a lawyer - are those of a reporter, investigative reporter, United States Senate investigator and editor, <sup>World War II</sup> and war-time intelligence analyst, investigator and <sup>double-shooter</sup> double-shooter. Part of my responsibilities ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> to do for professional historians what they could not do for themselves in obtaining and evaluating the kinds of information <sup>not included in</sup> outside their education and experiences.

Without this single/magical bullet theory the Commission could not have concluded that there was no conspiracy.

The grim fact is that even ~~xxxxxx~~ if this theory is accepted as fact, the official evidence itself proves, as my books show, that no one man could have committed that crime and on this basis alone there was without question a conspiracy.

of the <sup>books</sup>  
The first/four (of my Whitewash series, Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report,  
Completed six months after that Commission's report was published and only four months  
after publication of its 26 volumes of appendix, was the first book on that Commission  
and its work. First published in 1965, it is still used as a college and university text  
in criminalistics, history and political science.

When republished in 1966 it was <sup>the</sup> first book to include any records from the Warren  
Commission deposit in the National Archives.

My subsequent books drew more heavily on this deposit and my last, Post Mortem (1975)  
includes <sup>more in the</sup> about 200 pages of facsimile reproduction of records <sup>the rest of which I</sup> obtained by a series of  
Freedom of information lawsuits.

(Despite these well-known facts not one of the forumists noted that Oliver Stone  
insisted <sup>steadfastly -</sup> ~~through the release of his movie~~ and as recently as his March, 1992 <sup>Congressional</sup> testimony <sup>if</sup>  
that is the word for his remarkable display of <sup>ignorance</sup> ~~factual knowledge~~ of the assassination <sup>its investigations relating to</sup>  
~~and~~ <sup>alleged un-</sup> ~~of the availability of official records~~ before the Congress, that the Commission's  
records remain suppressed until the year 2039, <sup>when</sup> in fact all but about two percent of  
them are accessible at the archives. In other and constantly varying <sup>morning better</sup> formulations, he has  
represented that "all" other official records also are suppressed.)

3  
4  
The 1976 reprint of my 1966 Photographic Whitewash includes facsimile reproduction  
of CIA reports <sup>proving</sup> ~~disputing~~ the Commission's interpretation of the amateur movie of the  
assassination by Abraham Zapruder <sup>It was</sup> used as a timeclock by the Commission and as alleged  
validation of its theory, represented as unassailable fact, that a single, magical bullet  
caused all seven nonfatal injuries on the President and Texas Governor John W. Connally  
and, from this career, unequalled in science or mythology, emerged in virtually pristine  
<sup>insert 3A of the CIA's</sup> ~~These~~ analyses of that film by the CIA's <sup>to national</sup> ~~Photographic Intelligence~~ interpreta-  
tion Center were disclosed to <sup>and ignored by</sup> the Rockefeller Commission, appointed by <sup>the</sup> former Warren  
Commissioner (Gerald Ford, who also appointed one of its former assistant counsels,  
David Belin, to head it.

In this series of FOIA lawsuits, <sup>several</sup> ~~some~~ precedental and one leading to the 1974

4/ amending of the Act, I obtained and make available to all writers about a third of a million pages of once-withheld official records, not the least of which are the Warren Commission's formerly "Top Secret" executive-session transcripts several of which, one running 85 pages, I ~~reproduced~~ published in facsimile.

(Again, part of that "all" alleged by Stone to be withheld ~~of~~ of the Commission's records he says can't be looked at <sup>39</sup> (until the year 2025) without a peep from any of the three <sup>"4 parts"</sup> insensitive and immodest enough to be published in the AHR <sup>on Stone</sup> despite their subject matter indifference and either ignorance of or disregard <sup>when they know the little of his</sup> of Stone's nonstop lying and virtuoso displays of his <sup>ignorance</sup> ignorance of all ~~matter~~ matters relating to the JFK assassination <sup>except</sup> other than the nuttiness dignified by referring to it as "conspiracy theories.")

Among this great volume of records disclosed to me <sup>W</sup> but allegedly still suppressed until well into the coming century are thousands of pages of FBI reports relating to ~~the~~ its scientific testings and many, <sup>many</sup> more of its witness interviews.

As these are now available to writers and scholars they <sup>continue to be</sup> will always be ~~so~~ available when they become a permanent archive in Hood College, Frederick, Maryland, where some have already been deposited.

"No single factual error of any significance has been called to my attention in any of my books and no single one of the hundreds of people I <sup>write or phone</sup> write about ~~has written me to~~ complain that <sup>of unfairness,</sup> treated him or her unfairly. In all these seven books there are in all fewer than a dozen minor errors and they <sup>most of them come from the official documents.</sup> almost without exception are faithful reporting of official documents.

In my FOIA litigation in which the defendant was also the prosecutor, I made most of <sup>representation to the courts</sup> ~~my~~ my allegations under oath rather than in lawyers' pleadings, thus making myself subject to perjury prosecution if I erred. The government was not able to <sup>prove a single</sup> complain about any error in lengthy and tailed affidavits that in overall length equal the volume of quite a few books.

I have been ~~was~~ consulted by committees of both Houses of the Congress and even my FOIA litigation adversary, the Department of Justice, prevailed upon the court in my O.A.,

*Handwritten notes:*  
The...  
Should...  
many...  
center...  
plans...  
the...

4/5

Da  
What I did by these unusual means, as Historian David Wrone described it, was to write that part of the history of the JFK assassination and its investigation while it was happening.

75-1996 in federal district court for the ~~District~~<sup>District</sup> of Columbia to have me act as its consultant in my lawsuit against it!

In addition to addressing college and university audiences from coast to coast I have conducted seminars at them, including for faculty only, and at 79 and in seriously impaired health I still do this at local Wood College.

I have been used as source, consultant and expert by all the major media in this country and <sup>in</sup> ~~by~~ not fewer than eight <sup>European countries</sup> ~~in Europe~~ that I can recall. In not one instance was there any allegation of inaccuracy or unfairness in ~~any~~ anything <sup>or said when interviewed</sup> I wrote ~~and said~~.

The FBI even certified to the federal courts that <sup>I</sup> ~~I~~ know <sup>more</sup> ~~more~~ about the JFK assassination than anyone in its employ during this series of FOIA lawsuits, ~~against~~ most of which <sup>were</sup> ~~are~~ against it.

There is a similar representation of my <sup>reputation</sup> ~~standing in the field~~ in the only professional bibliography in the field by Guth and Wrona. (Greenwood Press.)

I have, in fact, done with diligence and success for professional historians what they failed to do for themselves, correctly interpreted the official subject-matter, publication and files not published, and brought to light the ~~not~~ <sup>above</sup> inconsiderable value of until-then withheld official records to which I refer <sup>about</sup>, not fewer than a third of a million pages of them that, with very few exceptions, professional historians ignored.

In doing this I forced the government to face my contradiction of its official "solutions" to these two political assassinations in open court, where it did not refute my sworn-to accounts.

and in doing this I in effect placed my head on the block and dared the government to chop away because if I had erred that would have been the felony of perjury and the government is also the prosecutor. insult SA Hre

While I do not recommend this to others, including historians, as a way to live and to compel the unwilling government to divulge records it wants to suppress, to paraphrase the poet, I did break a path for others who are willing and ~~be~~ able to follow.

I have <sup>other</sup> ~~additional~~ credentials knowingly misrepresented by Stone and ignored by these three "experts" who swallowed <sup>book, line and stinker</sup> without question and repeated his false account without

reflecting any awareness of <sup>its falsity in his self-portrayal</sup> the ~~grossness of his lying~~ in which he portrayed himself as the victim of a vast campaign to, a la Garrison, wreck his movie.

Stone's account of the controversy about JFK that began publicly about the time he started shooting, an account he repeated endlessly with only minor variations in it, is that the CIA and its "recipied" reporters, who on occasion he numbered at 200, were out to "get" him and, like a thousand vultures, were perched ready to pick his bones.

He also attributed <sup>this objective</sup> criticism of his project to the undefined "Establishment."

What he was talking about and knew he was talking <sup>of</sup> about is this one <sup>9</sup>/~~7~~-year-old, severely limited by a number of serious illnesses and post-surgical complications <sup>in</sup> in what he is able to do.

Stone began promoting JFK <sup>-which is not about JFK-</sup> with his promotions for <sup>his</sup> The Doors when it was released. He then announced that in his movie on the JFK assassination he would record their "history" for the people, telling them "who" killed their President, "why" and "how." Almost immediately he added that he would do this based on Jim Garrison's "On the Trail of the ~~Ass~~ Assassins."

Shocked that a man with Stone's reputation would base a movie with a reported initial \$40,000,000 initial investment of other people's money and risk his reputation on a book I knew to be utterly dishonest and know<sup>ing</sup>/~~ing~~so, the book in which Garrison rewrote the history of his own fiasco to make himself the victim of the CIA, and having the most painful personal knowledge of what Garrison really did and how he did it, I wrote Stone <sup>at considerable length</sup> on February 8, 1991. <sup>his</sup> was several months before ~~g~~ he ~~start~~ started shooting.

My letter is detailed and specific. I attached some proof, offered more if he wanted it and to respond to any questions he had.

aside from citing petty lies Garrison told in his book to present a false picture of himself, <sup>several</sup> ~~one~~ really ludicrous if he had told the truth, I was quite specific in my account of how Garrison had planned to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the JFK assassination in 1968 with a truly monstrous indecency of his own fabrication.

In their learned writings about the JFK controversy AIR's three "experts" ignored



8 | what was widely ~~published~~ <sup>reported</sup> published indicating that I, named, had begun the controversy when after several months Stone did not respond to my letter.

I told him that after Garrison's staff had failed to deter his planned "commemoration" atrocity two of them asked me to try to make it impossible for him to dare.

Like others ~~who~~ who should have known better earlier, I had believed that Garrison's excesses were his effort to fight fire with fire, his way of defending himself against <sup>what he said was</sup> the government's effort to ~~wreck what in New Orleans was referred to as his "probe."~~ <sup>abstain or about his "investigation"</sup>

What these two members of his staff told me ended my innocence that in retrospect I realize should have ended months earlier.

Garrison planned to ~~charge killers~~ <sup>two killers</sup>, a charge he did not make against Clay Shaw, the only survivor of ~~this trio that also included the then dead Lee Harvey Oswald and David Ferrie.~~ <sup>then both dead</sup> His ~~Crassy~~ "noll" assassins" were Edgar Eugene Bradley and Robert Lee Perrin.

Bradley was the west-coast representative of the Cape May, New Jersey <sup>Shaw's</sup> ultra radio preacher, Rev. Carl McIntire, to whom we are indebted for the <sup>convinced</sup> ~~guaranteed~~ "fairness doctrine" ended by the Reagan administration. Perrin was the former husband of Warren Commission witness Nancy Perrin Rich.

Garrison's imagined proof that Bradley was one of those who killed JFK is ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> also-imagined "identification" of Bradley as one of the three men <sup>by news photographers</sup> whose pictures were taken/ two policeman and a deputy sheriff walked them as ~~they crossed~~ past the Texas School Book Depository Building, from which, in the official account of the assassination, all shots had been fired. Assassination conspiracy-theorist nuts dubbed these "the tramp pictures" and along with Garrison attributed a wide and often self-contradictory variety of "identifications" and importances to them.

The man Garrison "identified" as Bradley was also known to these nuts as "the walking man," not that all three were not walking. He was also ~~identified~~ "identified" as CIA/Watergater ~~Howard Hunt~~ Howard Hunt ( "proven" in one book by the new science of "ear" identification!), as Watergater Frank <sup>"Cheers"</sup> ~~turgis~~ turgis and as, among many others, confessed murderer Charles Harrelson, father of the star <sup>Frenchy</sup> Woody.

another was nicknamed "Frenchy" and soon he was further "identified" as Johnson's farm manager!

He also insisted that no record of their arrest was made and that no trace of them remained when ~~they~~ they were let go. If he had spent a pittance of Warner's millions on a phone call to the police he would have gotten the records of their arrests on trumped-up charges and their identifications. The police had disclosed those records but Stone and his hired "experts," including ~~xxxxxx~~ <sup>xxxx</sup> the Dallas Assassination Information Center

1  
did not know it!

) ?

9/ In my earlier efforts to debunk this nonsense taken so seriously by the conspiracy theorists I tried to get some rational explanation of why they hung around to get caught.

The invented explanations, none of which made any sense at all, ~~even~~ included that they were the assassination "paymasters" even though they were taken into custody without the alleged pay.

9/ I began my investigation, as I reported to Stone in full detail, by asking two experienced professional investigators to learn the truth for me. The two independent investigations, neither knowing that I had asked the other, yielded the identical results. The men were winos, drinking it up on a parked railroad boxcar behind the Central Annex Post Office. ~~about an hour and a half later~~ when the police searched the entire area they were found reeking and taken to be questioned. The only way to walk them off the railroad tracks was to take them north across the triple overpass, then east past the ~~TSBD and there the news photographers were shooting everything that moved.~~ *That was about an hour and a half after the shooting*

That boxcar was a block west of the scene of the crime and two and a half blocks south of it. among the marvelous CIA inventions for assassination, no rifle that shoots around corners has yet been reported, or sights that enable seeing around corners, *to shoot.*

(Yet knowing the truth from my letter of February 8, ~~xxxxxx~~ in his June 2 article in the Washington Post Stone insisted that these men were <sup>real</sup> legitimate suspects ~~xxx~~ who had been <sup>arrested</sup> apprehended in a <sup>railroad</sup> passenger car parked "behind" the TSBD from which, *as a matter of* ostensibly, they could have shot -without any weapons! *SA here*

One of my efforts to debunk the misuses of these "tramp" pictures led to an FBI investigation the results of which confirm the investigations made for me *(add cite) photo*. I later obtained it under FOIA. It still made no difference to Stone. *here*

*10/13/68*  
~~Ie he had asked the Dallas police he's have learned that the men were identified when picked up and were released. Stone alleged, historian that he is, that they were not identified and that there were no police records. After the movie was out the police released the records identifying the men as \_\_\_\_\_~~

*10/13/68*  
SAC Baltimore (44-669) to SAC Dallas (44-2649)  
(RUC) 8/21/68 *sum "Murkin" file 44-1987-Sub. E*  
*Memphis*  
~~FBIHQ 3/6/~~ *also a similar memo same files*

11 For others the fact that ~~the~~ his alleged assassination had killed himself 15 months before  
JFK was ~~offed~~ would have been an insoluble problem. But not for derring-do Garrison! He  
merely ordained that, the plot having begun before August 28, 1962, the plotters had ~~not~~  
buried ~~the body of~~ an unknown Venezuelan seaman as Perrin while Perrin ~~continued~~  
and conspired  
lived as a pulp writer using the name "Starr!"

11/1  
Doing what could make it impossible for Garrison to charge Perrin was touchier. It required investigations the leg work for which was done for me by Garrison's staff investigators at the instructions of Louis Ivon, chief investigator and one of the two who had asked me to undertake this mission.

Garrison's sick and impossible scenario was that Perrin and others <sup>conspirators</sup> had a secret communications center in an empty apartment in a New Orleans complex owned by a man really named Khrushchevsky, with Perrin in charge.

This was the Perrin known to have killed himself the year before ~~he~~ in Garrison's nightmare he had killed JFK!

Garrison had not bothered to conduct or order any ~~real~~ investigation. Instead as ~~made~~ <sup>baseless plots</sup> he dreamed these things up ~~out of nothing~~ <sup>sent out</sup> he dispatched an investigator he had hired over staff objections and paid from private funds, <sup>This man,</sup> William Wood, who used the name "Bill Boxley," ~~out~~ <sup>was...</sup> to develop the "proof." Loyal and dedicated to Garrison as Boxley <sup>and</sup> was, he dutifully came back with the "proof."

Boxley had worked for the CIA, which fired him for drunkenness. This was well known.

(In the original script, which ~~tone~~ <sup>tone</sup> changed after he got my letter, he had Boxley as an assistant district attorney and the inside wrecker, the stoolpigeon ~~for~~ the CIA planted to wreck the "probe."

The delicacy ~~involved~~ <sup>involved</sup> was that Garrison knew that Perrin had killed himself on August 28, 1962. But that presented no problem for Stone's hero, brave man that he was, undeterred by the powerful CIA. ~~Garrison's explanation around Perrin's 1962 suicide was that the plot to kill JFK had begun before then that that an unknown Venezuelan's body had been substituted for Perrin's. Perrin, in his about-to-be-filed charges, live to assassinate under the name Starr.~~

12/ <sup>Garrison's</sup> Among ~~the~~ <sup>of</sup> records I could have given Stone had he expressed any interest, ~~if~~ <sup>if</sup> he had had any interest at all in preserving his personal and professional integrity and that of his movie, is Garrison's annotation of a report on Perrin's suicide. (attached) Stone could also have had, <sup>what Garrison files held and I used,</sup> ~~as a reference to files had~~ <sup>written report</sup> what I got, the reporting of the

suicide by a Louisiana state trooper <sup>ment</sup> who Perrin had phoned as soon as he took the  
~~were this not enough, I have the report~~ <sup>of Perrin's admission and death</sup>  
 cyanamide, ~~the report~~ on the Charity Hospital records, <sup>plus</sup> obtained for me by ~~Staff~~  
 Garrison's own staff investigator, the experienced Frank Beloch, <sup>and</sup> a photocopy of the  
 handwritten morgue book, which was not and could not easily have been forged, obtained  
 for me by ~~an~~ <sup>another</sup> Garrison staff investigator whose name I have forgotten. <sup>attached</sup>

<sup>new</sup> These, of course, are basic, simple and obvious investigations, had any investigation  
 been necessary, as none was because it was well known that Perrin had in fact killed  
 himself. I knew <sup>it</sup> that before I began the investigation that did prevent this additional  
 Garrison indecency and atrocity.

My problem was the certainty that Garrison would not admit what he had done and  
 was doing. That would have ended his "probe" and would have been a serious problem for him  
 with a Clay Shaw appeal then before the Supreme Court of the United States.

12  
13

I worked my way around this seemingly impossible obstacle by the simplest of thinking:  
 If it takes a crook to catch a crook, then it takes a nut to reach a nut. I knew just the  
 man to persuade Garrison, Vincent Salandria, <sup>a</sup> Philadelphia lawyer who was almost Garri-  
 son's Svengali. Garrison just loved the politics and philosophy he got for hours at a time  
 from Salandria.

So, I phoned Salandria, telling him that I had just learned of a plot by his preferred  
~~hete~~ <sup>hete</sup> noir, the CIA, to ruin Jim. I asked him to be with me, knowing he would do no work  
 but would be closeted with Garrison, while I developed the remaining proof. We even  
 stayed together with a mutual friend, <sup>Matt Herron,</sup> while I worked and Vince and Garrison spent <sup>then time</sup> a week  
 bull-sessing, mostly at the New Orleans athletic club, which Garrison used as a second  
 office. <sup>(NOTE)</sup> in the childish belief that the FBI would find it more difficult to intercept his phone  
 conversations there.

I finished my investigative report, laboring on it with Matt's defective portable,  
 mine having been totalled ~~in~~ when my luggage was intercepted on an earlier trip to New  
 Orleans and totalled, <sup>tax report</sup> on a Saturday afternoon or evening. I gave ~~it~~ to Andrew (Moo)  
 Sciambra, the most junior of Garrison's assistant district attorneys and the one with  
 whom Garrison spent far and away the most time. Sciambra <sup>is</sup> was the second of <sup>his</sup> the two Garrison  
 staffers who had asked me to undertake this mission seemingly impossible.

3/

I did learn more about Oswald, who did have associates in his New Orleans ~~was~~ pre-assassination activities, even had Sciambra with me when I developed some of the proof with live witnesses, and Garrison, who had Oswald charged in the Shaw case, was indifferent to it.)

11  
13.1  
sitter: in sport wagon, then  
Sciambra suggested that I drive to the office the next morning with my Svengali, "Baby"  
(that the two of them would present the results of my investigation to Garrison at the  
New Orleans Athletic Club, and that I remain in the office doing my own work so I would  
be where he could find me easily.

So, driving the District attorney's office's souped-up Chevy II that had been  
confiscated from a gangster, the <sup>an unavailability</sup> one of the vehicle the staff refused to drive, it was  
that unpredictable, so it was always available, <sup>Sciambra and Garrison's</sup> I drove it to the office, where Sciambra  
awaited us, I proceeded with my work and they to their rendezvous with Stone's heroic  
figure.

13  
14  
(Virtually all of the time I spent in New Orleans was in trying to learn more about  
Oswald and any associates. I always had work with me wherever I went. My large attache  
case when <sup>full</sup> loaded weighed 35 pounds. 11A here

Several hours later the phone rang. A clearly euphoric Sciambra exclaimed, "Hal, you  
did it! I'm coming over to get you and take you to the best Italian meal you've ever had."

He did not exaggerate his wife's <sup>culinary</sup> talents.

If the man described by Stone as the most daring and principled of district attor-  
nies was at all embarrassed he did not reflect it in any way at a lunch he arranged for  
the next day in a NOAC diningroom. Besides himself, of his legal staff he had Sciambra  
and Jim Alcock (later a judge) present. <sup>included</sup> Those not of his staff <sup>included</sup> besides Salandria  
and me, William Turner, like Garrison, a former FBI special agent but unlike Garrison he  
<sup>J. Edgar</sup> was one Hoover had fired after about 10 years in which he had been an FBI specialist in  
"black bag" jobs; illegal enterings and stealing what the FBI wanted. Turner was then on the  
staff of Ramparts magazine.

He and Salandria were the only contributors to Garrison's exposition of <sup>the</sup> his latest  
of his all-encompassing conspiracy theories of the JFK assassination. He had a black-  
board there for <sup>demonstrating</sup> illuminating it with a sketch <sup>on an outline</sup> of the United States. Those of the innumerable  
partners in his imagined conspiracy, as he marked them on the blackboard, included  
Boeing in the upper Northwest; Lockheed in lower California; Bell helicopters in Texas;  
along with oil men; Michoud near New Orleans; The bomber command near Omaha; McDonald-



15/16

Extra space

*Garrison's files*

of what ~~his~~ files held,  
 ith this as a sample, and it is by no means an unfair sample, of the utter baseless-  
 world's  
 ness of the multitudinous conspiracy allegations ~~Garrison~~ <sup>he</sup> announced to the media, ~~and~~  
 and with his having ignored the viable <sup>S.I.</sup> invetgative leads concerned people did give him,  
 particularly relating to Oswald and his activities and associates in New Orleans - and  
~~this~~ these include even the kidnapping of one Warren Commission witness by another as  
 soon as David Ferrie died, ~~of~~ of which I have confirmed personal knowledge/- is it any  
 wonder that ~~after~~ <sup>after</sup> he was defeated for reelection and had to vacate the district attor-  
 ney's office, ~~Garrison~~ alleged and says in his book that his files were stolen?

Did he dare allow so ghastly a self-indictment, <sup>as those files</sup> survive?

Could he have written and published and profitted from as utterly and completely  
 a dishonest rewriting of his own monumental fiasco if ~~an~~ such records existed to con-  
 demn it and him for what they were, my description to Stone, <sup>is</sup> "a fraud and a travesty?"

Stone can hardly have been gullible enough to believe ~~this~~ <sup>Garrison's</sup> self-serving canard.

Not would it have been reasonable of him to ~~go~~ <sup>accept</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>unsupported</sup> Garrison's account of this  
 alleged heist, ~~As~~ <sup>as</sup> given to me by one of his staff <sup>most</sup> dedicated to him, ~~It~~ <sup>another</sup> is that ~~the~~  
 also devotedly loyal member of the staff <sup>who</sup> that Garrison asked to move the files from his  
 office to his residence instead sold them to the CIA.

I knew these men personally, knew of their great personal devotion to Garrison and  
 the toll that took of their personal lives, and I knew enough about the <sup>garbage</sup> ~~trash~~ ~~this~~  
 with which those files reeked to have no doubt at all that it was Garrison himself who  
 saw to it that they would no longer exist, either to indict him or to jeopardize the  
 not inconsiderable sur~~he~~ he got from his books and from Stone for the movie rights to  
 his fanstasies.

If the CIA ~~or~~ any other enemy, real or imagined, had latched on to that simply un-  
 imagineable collection of investigative <sup>trash</sup> ~~garbage~~ and mythologies what a time it would  
 have had, how it would have revelled in leaking them to make a ~~lughin~~ <sup>lughin</sup> laughing stock of  
 this phony hero and his conspiracy ravings!

ile/

On his part, Stone clamored for the release of official government records as a means of promoting himself and his movie knowing that ~~was~~ many of not most of those records were not withheld and were <sup>readily</sup> available to him and to anyone else. He had no interest in government records save as a propoganda ploy. ~~If~~ <sup>he</sup> had had any concern for his personal and professional integrity and for the honesty of the movie he was producing, particularly after he got my letter of February 8, 1991, he would have asked Garrison for some documentation.

and, of course, Garrison had his explanation set- ~~they~~ <sup>it had all</sup> been stolen. - for the CIA!

314

181

Knowing, he did it anyway, making a hero of this <sup>trayor</sup> charlatan and in so doing foisted off as the real thing still another phony explanation of the JFK assassination to the largest audience ever.

Ex/Nov 12, see at dips

Douglass at Marietta, Georgia, and I can't remember who all in Washington, <sup>elsewhere.</sup> ~~New York and~~

Such was life around the <sup>only American</sup> ~~one~~ district attorney, as Stone refers to him, who had the <sup>place</sup> ~~bravery~~ to use his office in an effort to establish the truth about the JFK assassination.

Modest to a fault, this man <sup>on December 9, 1969,</sup> ~~(based~~ on whose book Stone <sup>his assurance to</sup> ~~assured~~ the country he would record their history for the people, telling them who killed their President and why, <sup>how and</sup> issued a press release to announce Boxley's firing, "after evidence recently developed by <sup>1 minute</sup> ~~the~~ District Attorney's staff" <sup>Stet</sup> ~~because~~ he was "an operative of the Central Intelligence Agency!" <sup>why</sup>

Aside from its first paragraph the press release made no reference to Boxley or his firing. Garrison devoted the rest of it to his alleged accomplishments and added details of his conspiracy.

now  
insert  
24/18

~~knowing this and more~~ Having been told this and more and having been promised further documentation and answer to any questions he had, <sup>Stet</sup> ~~Stone~~ ignored ~~the~~ letter. and this was two months before he started shooting, time to ~~replace~~ replace a script which I'd told him, and I think to reasonable people proved, was "a fraud and a travesty."

18

<sup>Stone</sup> ~~He~~ knew exactly what he was perpetrating from the moment he got my letter, <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ he did get it because he had his "research coordinator," Jane Rusconi, phone <sup>me</sup> in great excitement to tell me how pleased they were to hear from me because they were both "fans" of mine and had <sup>read</sup> ~~heard~~ "all three" of my books, of which there <sup>are</sup> ~~was~~ six on the JFK assassination. Stone wanted to know if he could phone me the next day. I assured her at any time. <sup>Thinking about my</sup> ~~he read~~ the letter. <sup>advice</sup>

If Stone had not <sup>given</sup> ~~assured~~ the country that his movie would be non-fiction, a faithful account of the assassination, he would have had every right to do and say anything he ~~wanted~~ wanted to, no matter how wrong, deceptive, <sup>and</sup> misleading it might be, and I would have said and done nothing. But once he <sup>gave and repeated</sup> ~~made~~ these assurances, <sup>given</sup> ~~with~~ the audience he would without question reach with what would further confuse and misinform the country, after waiting for some weeks to hear from him I decided that any attention to ~~his~~ rewriting of our history and glorification of Garrison would make a major story that would carry itself.

7  
109

Meanwhile, I had been given a copy of Stone's script. It was the biggest assassination disinformation since the Warren Report. I found it difficult to believe that anyone could work such a penny-dreadful into Oscar-quality. Moreover, the gross ignorance of both the established fact of the assassination and <sup>the well-known</sup> details of Garrison's mishmash it reflected astounded me. So I gave a copy of the script and of my records of my investigation that made it impossible ~~to further desecrate~~ for Garrison to further desecrate "the crime of the century" <sup>as a</sup> ~~and calling it a commemoration~~ <sup>of it</sup> to George <sup>of the Washington Post</sup> Lardner, ~~whom~~ I've known him as a dependable and accurate reporter for 25 years and I believe he knows more about the JFK assassination and its investigation <sup>than any other reporter.</sup>

Lardner's completely accurate story <sup>in fact understated</sup> appeared May 19, 1991. That is the beginning of accurate exposure of what Stone was really up to, a crass and rude commercialization and exploitation of the JFK assassination, and that for an ulterior purpose.

And so it was that, as he made a hero out of the failed and faulted Garrison, ~~that~~ Stone made of me the CIA, some 200 of its "recipied" reporters" and even "a thousand ~~vultures~~ vultures" waiting to pick his bones because it is I and none of the above who am responsible for the ensuing and lingering controversy.

Lardner's <sup>report</sup> story, which was <sup>d</sup> syndicated, identified me by name as his source, so anyone doing any research, if ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> experts needed anything more than the murk of their minds to be able to write with authority and dependability for such a publication, made it apparent that I started it all and how I could be reached.

But I underestimated Stone enormously. I had not idea he could say as much without ever coming in contact ~~at~~ with truth at all or in any way. He could and did say what at any time seemed to serve his immediate needs as he saw them and say the exact opposite the next time he faced a pad or a microphone. What he said also was angled to appeal to the interviewer.

14  
92

He labelled me a crook who stole the script when he knew that was not only not true but was also impossible, <sup>?</sup> and that of his endless lies, like most of the rest of them, went everywhere in syndication <sup>and in radio and TV accounts.</sup>

The Post extended unprecedented courtesies to him, even allowing him to withdraw a

scandalously and stupidly inaccurate <sup>article</sup> statements he had asked it to publish and to replace it with a more modest self-exposure as an assassination ignoramus rather than an expert.

~~The next day~~ His more ~~subdued~~ subdued mythology appeared in the Post on June 2. The next day I wrote him about his many factual errors in it. and to this I did get a response, a rather snotty one from his in-house expert, Rusconi.

after this self-indulgence so appropriate to authentic scholarship - she was ~~the~~ Stone's "research coordinator" - she got to the nitty-gritty:

~~XXXXXX~~ "If it is at all possible, we'd like to salvage something constructive out of this relationship," she began her concluding paragraph. She ended it, "short of dramatizing the <sup>250</sup> pages you've wrested from the archives (from which I <sup>only a small percentage</sup> wrested none of them), what can we do to make the best of our situation?"

"Relationship" describes my causing this exposure of the "fraud and travesty" Stone was producing when the exposure could endanger Stone and Warner's \$40,000,000?

"Relationship" when I informed him that Garrison was a phony he was recreating into a hero and that his "probe" of the assassination was <sup>only</sup> what he <sup>d</sup> dreamed up and believed as soon as he imagined it?

We had no "relationship" and "our situation" was not mine at all - it was Stone's and his alone.

I've asked several others, including professional historians and lawyers, if they can find any meaning other than I did in these words, that it is a solicitation to be ~~paid~~ paid off. ~~and~~ Not one disagreed with me or could see any other possible meaning in her words.

(Stone had been passing money out in large chunks to an assortment of assassination-conspiracy nuts, like the Dallas Assassination Information Center, ~~the name it took for itself~~, to which ~~he~~ <sup>it recommended to him</sup> gave an initial \$80,000 and ~~that after~~ the transparently impossible story of Rickey White, that his dead father had been a Grassy Anoll assassin, <sup>It was sold</sup> had back-fired and been exposed as a fake cum plagiarism <sup>the intellectual sinners of</sup> that ~~sole~~ part of its scenario from a novel. Stone avoided the authentic scholars and he and his Rusconi dredged ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> swears of rabid assassination theorizing <sup>st: for their other consultants.</sup>.)

Gill Smith. In a non-  
response because all I had  
asked Stone is to stop  
trading on my name + not  
say I was helping him.  
She rendered the ~~Shylock~~  
~~Shylock Shylock~~ and  
learned opinion on that

LAW OFFICES OF  
GREENBERG, GLUSKER, FIELDS, CLAMAN & MACHTINGER

ARTHUR N. GREENBERG  
PHILIP GLUSKER  
SIDNEY J. MACHTINGER  
STEPHEN CLAMAN  
BERTRAM FIELDS  
HARVEY R. FRIEDMAN  
BERNARD SHEARER  
JON J. GALLO  
PAULA J. PETERS  
MICHAEL K. COLLINS  
JOHN L. CHILD  
C. BRUCE LEVINE  
MICHAEL A. GREENE  
JOSEPH M. CAHN  
GARRETT L. HANKEN  
NORMAN H. LEVINE  
WILLIAM A. HALAMA  
JAMES E. HORNSTEIN  
ROBERT S. CHAPMAN  
ROBERT F. MARSHALL  
ROBERT E. BENNETT, JR.  
MARC S. COHEN  
CHARLES N. SHEPARD  
DENNIS B. ELLMAN  
GARY L. KAPLAN  
ROBERT W. BARNES  
LAWRENCE Y. ISER

E. BARRY HALDEMAN  
MARK A. STANKEVICH  
MARTIN H. WEBSTER  
MICHAEL V. BALES  
HENRY D. FINKELSTEIN  
ROBERT L. MURPHY  
DIANE J. CRUMPACKER  
JEAN MORRIS  
ELIZABETH WATSON  
ELIZABETH G. CHILTON  
JILL A. COSSMAN  
LILIANNE G. CHAUMONT  
PETER J. NIEMIEC  
ROGER L. FUNK  
RICHARD A. KALE  
DEBBY R. ZURZOLO  
CHRISTINA M. JACOBS  
LEE A. DRESIE  
DAVID C. KLEIN  
JEFFREY SPITZ  
MARK A. GOCHMAN  
NANCY C. HSIEH  
THEODORE F. KAHAN  
JILL L. SMITH  
EVE H. WAGNER  
MICHAEL R. BENNETT  
SANDRA A. DEWEY

GLENN A. DRYFOOS  
ANDREA L. MERSEL  
CARRIE A. LEVINSON  
LAWRENCE A. EPTER  
ANDREW S. GABRIEL  
STEVEN J. LURIE  
CHRISTINA E. METCALF  
ROBERTA M. WOLFF  
BRIAN L. EDWARDS  
GERALD L. SAUER  
JILL E. BURDIS  
DARRYL W. CLUSTER  
KELLY A. COLEMAN  
NANETTE L. FELDMAN  
GLENN E. LERMAN  
ELIZABETH M. PRIESTLEY  
ELIZABETH H. PUGH  
TERESA O. PREISING  
CAROL W. DAVIES  
STEVEN H. FEDER  
STEVEN M. FOGELSON  
LORI A. LOO  
CHRISTINE B. MERSTEN  
DAVID R. MERSTEN  
PATRICIA A. MILLETT  
NANCY A. SCHNEIDER  
BONNIE E. ESKENAZI

1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS  
SUITE 2000  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067

TELEPHONE: (213) 553-3610  
TELEX (TWX): 910-490-1129  
FAX: (213) 553-0687

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(213) 201-7442

OUR FILE NUMBER:

81758-000.66

October 28, 1991

**REGISTERED MAIL/  
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

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

Re: "JFK"/Camelot Productions Corp. and Oliver Stone

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Your letter to Mr. Stone dated October 5, 1991 has been referred to us for response.

Please be advised that "JFK" is not based on, and does not use, any of your materials. On the contrary, the film is based on extensive research encompassing numerous historical writings and source materials, including two well-known books in which Mr. Stone acquired the motion picture rights.

Further, we are informed that none of the facts and ideas to be presented in the film was brought to light or developed exclusively by you. Those events and ideas were derived from other or multiple sources. In any event since historical events, ideas and theories cannot be the subject of ownership, we could not recognize any claim by you to have "rights" in them -- even if you were the person who discovered or developed them.

This will also conform, as you requested, that neither Mr. Stone nor Camelot Productions will credit you as an author or having any creative involvement with the Picture.

8175800066-94577.194



21 I had no interest in being bribed. I had accomplished what I set out to do, made a public record for at least the future and our <sup>in</sup> history about the true character of Stone's version of this history and who killed the President, why and how.

As Stone and Rusconi both knew and as I was quite specific in telling her, I would not in any way support or have anything to do with them and their movie.

Nonetheless, Stone being Stone, without any bribe, he found his own means, consistent with his personal and professional ethics, to "salvage something constructive" and "to make the best of our situation."

He and his people, including co-author Zachary Sklar, editor of Garrison's book, wrote and told reporters and columnists that I was helping them!

that he stop t adding on my name

My written demands/went without response except for a letter from one of his lawyers in which she said that history cannot be copyrighted! (quote directly later.)

21  
22 This is but a peek at the man f/paised by the three participants in what AHR calls a "forum" and Michael Rogin "a symposium" when in fact not one addressed the basis for the controversy and criticisms and all three constituted themselves his clique.