

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

6/8/91

Dear George,

The copy of your letter to Chase at Macmillan of the 2d came yesterday. It does not represent what we had agreed to, it has flaws I regard as serious and I do not want to be part of it. I'll try to give you a full explanation.

This has been a difficult week for me. Yesterday I had the fourth test of the clotting time of my blood in five days. The week began with it dangerous^{ly}/rapid despite my taking a higher level of anticoagulant than most people can safely tolerate. With an even higher dosage, which can entail the danger of hemorrhaging, it is approaching the desired clotting time. Before getting the result I spent two hours (painless) in the dentist's chair, then had to consult the doctor over the test results and after lunch was examined by the orthopaedist to whom I was sent by the family doctor. He suspected that part of the pain and difficulty I have in walking comes from arthritis. The orthopaedist decided not to take X-rays now because if I do have arthritis the anticoagulant that keeps me alive precludes use of any of the medications he could prescribe.

With these concerns in mind I did not want to respond when I got home. Moreover, when I got out the car at the orthopaedist's office I grew faint for no apparent reason and there was an ache in the ~~neck~~ heart area accompanied by a feeling of weakness. This lingered until I went to sleep.

So you can better understand me and my attitudes and beliefs I go back 25 years to two decisions that, in making, I was controlling the kind of life I'd and I thereafter had.

W.W. Norton thought enough about Whitewash to consider it for about four months. The president wanted to speak to me ^{and} did ~~and~~ the vice president, also the chief editor. ^{He} wrote me that it would be a "singularly important" book they'd be glad to publish if I would reorganize it around what I said at a specified point. That meant that I would be making a broad attack on the government I could not justify. I refused to do it and then proceeded immediately to publish it myself, when I was broke, in debt, and could give the printer only a \$500 down payment. He declined the offer of my taking a mortgage on the farm we then owned.

After it became its own kind of success and after Feltrinelli published it in Italy and after I met him by accident in New York, ^{he} wrote me asking that I write a book along the lines of Norton's desires. I remember that in speaking of the government he used the words "cut and slash" and referred to my writing a "J'accuse?" I would not do that.

In each of these refusals I rejected the promise of considerable income and opted for what was a precarious, debt-ridden existence during which I continued to work as best I could. There were times in New Orleans when I slept on a mattress on the floor. Once I ~~lost~~

15 pounds in two weeks. Maybe a little bit more than two weeks. Needing a place to stay and unable to pay for it I accepted the invitation of a college professor I knew was an FBI informant to use a hideaway he had ostensibly to be able to work undisturbed by his noisy children but actually for his time with his mistress. His wife had me as a dinner guest for one of the four real meals I had that trip. When I was invited by the mother of a man who'd escape the asylum at "andeville armed and intending to kill Garrison, I accepted her invitation to use the former slave quarters she had had rebuilt into a comfortable small home. Garrison, Ivon and others thought I was crazy to stay there but it was the quietest accommodations I ever had there, and convenient. I also had the use of a Fiat sports sedan loaned me by the dealer for whom a Bay of Pigs veteran had been sales manager. He was present when I refused that man's request that I ghost his attack on the CIA for specified reasons that ^{it included} it was against his personal interest. Respecting that, he would not rent the Fiat to me. ^{No charge.} Each morning when I got up I went into the kitchen of this woman's home for the synthetic breakfast ^{she left out} to which milk was added. When I had lunch it was one of the small pies then selling for a dime. Other than the two additional times I was invited to supper on returning to those slave quarters I stopped at a Burger Chef ^{for a hamburger} then 19 cents. I ate it driving there so that I could spend my time there ^{working} before going out to work again at night working.

Neither of the two other supper invitations was from Garrison. One was by a step brother, the other a wealthy woman I had met in Washington when she visited her daughter and sog-in-law there.

While except for the Fiat these were my worst living and working conditions, that close to entirely broke, it is not an unfair description of how for the most part I lived and worked there.

There were other hardships. I never got what Dell owed me that I was to have gotten in September, 1967 and based on which I bought this place, wholesalers did not pay me for books they'd bought and sold. They all knew that the cost of successful litigation would exceed what they owed me.

During this time I also declined what could have yielded a little income. I remember refusing to write for the ⁱⁿ Times of London about those allegedly "mysterious deaths."

I made some mistakes and I did not repeat them.

I tried to be fair and responsible. You are among those who once exclaimed, "Why you are defending the FBI!" Quin Shea said the same thing at least once. On another occasion, when I was in Dallas, where I could not get often, I refused at least three requests from ABC-TV to fly at their expense to New York to be on Good Morning America. That was when Ray had escaped. Jim Lesar finally persuaded me to go. When Steve Bell asked me hard questions from Washington at the end he said almost the same thing. I did use my one such opportunity to defend the FBI against grossly wrong charges by Ray and Mark Lane.

As you know, I was the only critic who had nothing to do with those House assassins and was your source, Wendell Rawls' and that of others in exposing them.

I also refused to be on a CBS-TV King special after agreeing to appear because as I wrote Rather ^{up} what they were doing gave me a conflict of interest, having been Ray's investigator.

We all make mistakes. I think, I hope, I've made relatively few. You are aware of my recent effort to rectify what may be my worst mistake. You also have the proof of my refusal to seek the readily-available vengeance. I have sought to avoid personalization and what could be interpreted as personal attacks.

The notes I made on Garrison's On the Trail of the Assassins and what you know I have ought make this clear.

For years I did not write ^{what} was the records I got by FOIA litigation made possibly because I was not physically able to retrieve the records and would not write from memory, fearing both error and unfairness. I hope you can believe that this represents an effort, really a determination, not to risk on the one hand being unfair and on the other any possibility of misleading anyone about what I regard as so significant an event in our history.

As you also know, I've made all I've gotten under FOIA litigation available to all. For the most part they were those with whom I knew in advance I did not agree. When I regarded what I got as of more than average significance I help press conferences and gave it away long before I could expect to be able to use it. The story Bill ~~Scott~~ Claiborne wrote about one Commission executive session is one illustration and I gave you and other reporters the last of those disclosed transcripts. I did not even try to get magazine stories from them for the income I needed.

From the time of my first venous thrombosis in 1975 until recently I used the only help I had to see to it that the records I got via FOIA would be arranged for maximum possible access to others and for history.

I with her assent refused an annuity for \$41 in return for them and instead have given them all with no quid pro quo to local Hood College for when I am no longer able to use them or make them available.

When a friend provided part-time help I returned to one of the books I'd begun. My first uses of this help was to locate and make copies of records that could be used by others if I am not able to complete this book. I had just gotten to the point where I could resume work on the book when I learned that Oliver Stone was doing a movie based on Garrison's book. Telling you that what time remains for me is limited and I wanted to continue working on that book I offered you a collaboration on the Stone/ Garrison book. You agreed. This did not visualize or include a news story but I do not question your statement that you could not avoid it and I know you could not avoid what ensued. They

did, however, take relatively much of my time and energy when I can't expect much time and have so little energy.

The proposal I made and you accepted is that you would recover all your expenses off the top from the income from the book and we'd thereafter split 50-50. I said nothing and asked nothing about my costs. Not counting my time and not including the not inconsiderable costs of getting what I have gotten, what I have done under our agreement has taken about half of my only regular income, Social Security. This includes all of the help I've had for that period of time, for retrieval, copying and refiling. Some of which I also have done.

We had a general agreement on the approach and content of the book, that it would be based on an expose of the Garrison book and of Stone's use of it plus what I have documented about what Garrison could have done, at the time of his "probe" and later, before he wrote and published his book, and what Stone could have done and did not do. I understood and the word I used was it would be "neutral" with regard to such things as the Warren Commission's conclusions and whether or not there had been a conspiracy to kill the President. I understood this neutrality to be true of all of the book, including Garrison and Stone. At no time did you disagree on this.

The story you did for the Post the delay in appearance of which you are not responsible for is as I said and believe excellent. You also are not in any sense responsible for what the Post did, I believe felt impelled to do, in last Sunday's Outlook. I believe that is not what you wanted.

However, as I believe I wrote you, it does create serious problems for a book that is not going to be liked by Stone and the enormous wealth and influence he represents and is behind him.

Earlier ^{than (?)} this week we agreed to omit the script from the book and on Stone would limit the book to what he has said and what has been published.

Having spoken to him I told you I had a friend who could introduce the book to Simon & Schuster and that an agent is a necessity. Knowing that successful collaboration requires minimizing those inevitable ~~big~~ disagreements that cannot be entirely avoided, without your asking it, I agreed for you to control the writing you were to do as your part of the collaboration, mine being ^{my} the work and materials I had. You did not ask for that. I volunteered it. That did not, however, include the content of the book - what it would say. It was how it would be written. Otherwise I would have been only a source and that was not intended, not what we agreed to and not something you mentioned. In any way.

You did not get an agent and you did not prepare a summary or any outline until what you wrote last weekend and did not mail then to me. You did not discuss the outline with me although you did ask me a few questions when you were writing it. There was nothing I could do about this and I did assume, as I believe I had every right to assume, that what

you submitted would be consistent with both the general agreement we had on content and approach and that it would be what I'd referred to as "neutral."

I was more that merely surprised to learn that it isn't. That it is unnecessarily vulnerable and self-defeating and that it presents unnecessary problems to a publisher if not on reading as soon as his lawyer reads it. You have also imposed a political doctrine for which there is no need and that is other than ^{how} we had agreed to handle that aspect.

You say that "Stone's fascination with the inquiry stems from his preoccupation with Vietnam." There are many things wrong with this, especially when ^{it is} compared with the emphasis on this and what is essentially trivial considering all that is available under "Opportunities Lost."

First of all it is not what Stone has said and secondly you can't prove it. But why even go into it when there is so much that is not questionable and is more germane that you have entirely omitted?

It is one of several things that if I were Stone and Garrison, knowing there would be a critical book, I would want it to include because of the (mis)uses it invites and make possible. I'll come to what we agreed to later.

There are two sides to our Vietnam involvement. Each believes what it believes genuinely and intensely. Why begin by unnecessarily antagonizing a major portion of the potential reading audience, whether or not anyone in any publisher's place or reviewers, by a political argument that is not in any sense necessary and that we did agree to address and handle in a safe, accurate and "neutral" way? *It also plays Stone's game, helps him.*

This is in the second of your two grafs of summary. Your first graf of the outline repeats "Stone's" preoccupation with "Vietnam and as much as says the opposite of what is without question true, whether or not he could have done it, "that Kennedy had decided to pull out of Vietnam....The distortions of ~~this~~ history that this entails." He could have faced the same problems Johnson faced but he had, without reasonable question, made this decision and with the documentation Fletch Prouty, who has been involved with Stone, alone has you make a very big mistake and Stone will love it and find it one of if not his most effective promotion of his terribly bad movie. I know some of what Fletch has, have copies of some, and he did have personal involvement and personal knowledge.

This is to sharpen the axe, hand it to the executioners and then place ^{the} head on the ^{block.} Without any need other than the imposition of a political doctrine and contrary to the way in which we had agreed to handle it, the way you proposed and I agreed to.

In the outline of the second chapter you refer to Garrison having mafia connections, as you repeat later, and connect Ferrie with Marcello personally, "Ferrie was working as a private investigator for New Orleans Mafia kingpin Carlos Marcello...." This just is not true, whether or not, and this is minor, Marcello was of "New Orleans." He was based

in Jefferson Parish. This is one of the many things you did not discuss with me. The fact is that G. Wray Gill, who had used Ferrie and whose office Ferrie also used, recommended to the late Jack Wasserman, the immigration attorney, that they hire Ferrie as an investigator. I have this from Wasserman. Wasserman agreed to Gill's request and Ferrie worked for Gill and Wasserman. *See P. 5.*

Mob all over again in Chapter III: "Ferie's demise freed Garrison of all restraint so long as he didn't touch the mob." This is first to concede that there was or had been any restraint on Garrison, and there is no reason to believe there was or could have been, and it also says that there was a mob involvement in the JFK assassination. You do not have a scintilla of fact for this and there is none. But it also is what the Stone script says, so it gives him what he can use. *misuse.*

In this I digress to note that the ~~script~~ ^{outline} does not in any way anticipate the many and real problems the book faces and goes out of its way, for no need, even reasonable suspicion, to create additional and unnecessary problems for it. *Including lawsuits.*

The last sentence in this chapter summary reads, ambiguously, "The search of the carriage house (Shaw's) in the French Quarter. Whips and chains."

Why it is included when there is so much that is omitted I neither see nor understand but it also is what is not all that easy to ~~do~~ ^{be}, unfair to Garrison. To the best of my knowledge he made no mention of it and I know very well that he did not disclose it. It came to light because a shrewd reporter knew that returns on search warrants are open to the public. He went to the clerk's office, saw the return and wrote his story.

Moreover, Garrison never once mentioned what he knew and I knew from one of the investigators who made that search, that there were hooks in the ceiling of Shaw's bedroom and marks like from sweaty hands all around them. This was never even leaked, to the best of my knowledge, and I then got and clipped the New Orleans papers. *Knew some reporters, too.*

Chapter V begins with one of several references to use of the script that we had agreed we would not use and did not need. I've not made any additional effort to get the shooting script for this reason. What follows is s/m stuff. I do not remember that from the book and it is credited to the only source I can think of, the script.

I skip much that I regard as essentially trivial, especially considering what I have and is not included. The first sentence on the third page is "FBI/WIA role in frustrating the Commission from hiring its own investigators." We did not discuss this, I know of no reason to believe it and do believe that it is not true with regard to what the Commission did not in any event have, its own "investigators." The one case of any such interference did not involve CIA ~~was~~ and was by "cover personally - he blocked Warren's intended appointment of his own selection of Warren Olney for the job J. Lee Rankin then got, to run the committee.

You follow this with but three of Garrison's many significant omissions and the first

7

had no basis in fact of which I am aware, his "Blind eye to the Mafia." As with most of what I find wrong with this outline, you did not discuss it with me. That is what a collaboration both entails and requires. And in the next graf you repeat this still again in saying that ~~Life~~ magazine decided "he was too close to the mob." Whether or not Life did decide that, and it is not what I understood from Dick Billings who wrote also at some length about his/their disenchantment, it beseeches unnecessary trouble. And if the publisher has any sense at all, he'd reject the outline on this basis alone.

Do you for one minute believe that with all the reasons it had for trying to do something about Garrison, for his nonstop defamations of so many people in so many agencies, if it had any case at all it would not have brought him to trial?

The one case it alleged was part of an income-tax case and on that he was found not guilty. *Would he and Stone use that!!!*

The last sentence in this chapter is still another reference to the script that we'd agreed not to make. And that we did not have to make.

In the last graf you as much as say that you are writing a book to bash Garrison. Aside from how any publisher may react to this, and it ordinarily could be expected to at the least raise unnecessary questions, including those of his lawyers, we did not agree to this and as I note earlier with regard to his book, I refused to do this when I could have.

The spirit of your outline is that you intend to bash both of them.

Exposing and bashing are not the same thing and even if you intended it, it was at the least unwise to say it.

Particularly if the outline is rejected and Stone and his associates, including Warner, gets a copy. Which is not at all impossible. Especially if Macmillan wants a favor from Warner, which does reprint, among other corporate activities.

Why you did not do what is normal, really essential in any collaboration, get together with me on the outline I do not know. However, something else you did do gives me an idea that is supported by an interpretation that ~~it~~ is not unreasonable to make after reading this ^{outline} ~~script~~. You at least twice said we had to change our financial agreement. I said we could discuss it, that I could be, if I remember my exact word the second time, "open" on it.

The only legitimate basis for any such request on your part is that, as the ^{outline} ~~script~~ reflects, you have gone off on your own on an entirely different book in which instead of being the collaborator, the word you use in the only mention of me in what you wrote Macmillan, I am to be exploited as a source.

I did not and I do not agree to this and it is not what we did agree to., on ~~it~~ the basis of which I did all that I did and made available to you what I made available to you. In all aspects this is a unilateral and unacceptable revision~~s~~ - really violation-

of our agreement. It also means a book of which I want no part.

I am sorrier than I think you can appreciate, in part because I had such confidence in the book we did agree on and ⁱⁿ its prospects and usefulness and in part because it wasted so much of the time I have left and took all the time it did from the book on which because of it I was able to do nothing. Not even keep the rare help I had working when there is so much work on it for which I do require help.

I am so sorry to have to say ~~it~~ but I must ask for the return of all you got from me under the agreement you have violated and that you not use any of it other than what was published and what I got under FOIA, which I have always made available to everyone. With regard to the FOIA records, you were to copy the long FBI record of more than 100 pages and then return it. You are welcome to copy it.

What I want returned as soon and as securely as possible is all my notes and records, including those I was given by Garrison and his people, the pictures and other such things, really all except the clippings and the FOIA records, as I can now ~~remember~~ recall.

I am not at my calmest in writing this and one thing I should have included above and didn't is what we had agreed on for handling Vietnam and the Stone/Garrison line on it. We did agree that all we would say is that LBJ's intentions were stated in NSAM 273, that they repeat and endorse JFK's in NSAM 263 and that each represents intent, Johnson's being JFK's. You said and I accepted that neither man could anticipate what could or would eventuate. ~~Stone~~ as I recall said that LBJ changed that policy "immediately" and the script is explicit on this. (Yes, you can keep the copy you made of the script.) (See p. 9)

In what I ask you to return I failed to specify, and perhaps I can't at this moment specify other things, the annotated copy of Garrison's book.

One thing I now remember that I forgot in the lengthy explanation with which I begin for which I took time so you could understand better is that I did not ask Garrison to write the Foreword of Oswald in New Orleans. My first knowledge of it was when I asked the publisher why the book was being delayed. I did not see it until I saw the book.

Groden's letter to the Post of May 29 was included in the same envelope. It is ~~worse~~ worse and more inaccurate than I perceived in responding to the excerpts you read to me. I am pleased that it is not included in the letters in today's paper. While I do not anticipate that the Post or you will have any further questions about it, I used a highlighter and can respond more rapidly.

With so very many regrets,

Harold

Harold Weisberg

(.m.w.)

P.S. I have no knowledge either way of any Garrison/~~mafia~~ connection. Same for Marcelão's New Orleans operations. But local reporters, of whom I remember Hoke May was one, told me that they believed any such in Garrison's jurisdiction were minor or relatively minor because he had made so much money and had it invested in so many legitimate businesses in New Orleans they believed he would not and did not run the risk to these businesses by typical mafia stuff.

On p. 8, re Vietnam- ~~going~~ farthur than you yourself proposed is entirely unnecessary and imposes a political doctrine that really has no place in the book and is grist for Stone's mill. *He'll love it and he'll use it!*

I also add for your better understanding what if you reflect you'll see is true or if you prefer probable: when I die there is much that thereafter will not be known, much that I have observed in the records that others have no reason to know is there. I did learn from my experiences in the field and I did decide that it would be better for the country that some things be lost than for them to be misrepresented, for the people to be deceived or misled, for history to be further corrupted.

June 2, 1991

Mr. Ned Chase
Editor
Macmillan Publishing Co.
866 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Dear Mr. Chase:

An old friend from The Washington Post, George Wilson, told me that he called you on my behalf and that he exaggerated enough for you to invite a letter from me.

It's about Oliver Stone and Jim Garrison and the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Stone, not content with oversimplifying history (Platoon, Wall Street), is about to corrupt it. He is taking a publicity-hungry demagogue (former New Orleans District Attorney Garrison) and turning him into a Jimmy-Stewart-type hero (played by Kevin Costner) so that Stone can peddle his theories about the assassination. "A coup d'etat with Lyndon Johnson waiting in the wings," his script calls it.

The incompetence of Garrison's investigation has never fully come to light. He once discovered a "secret entrance" used by one of his chief suspects. It was a fire exit that opened only from the inside. At another point, he tried to outfit an investigator with a tape recorder in a briefcase--which had to be opened to activate the tape recorder. Until his staff rebelled, the DA was even determined to indict for the assassination a man who died a year before it took place. Stone's fascination with the inquiry stems from his preoccupation with Vietnam. What I propose is a book that moves back and forth between Garrison's inquiry, and its dishonesty, and the Stone movie, and its distortions.

Here is a tentative outline:

DALLAS IN WONDERLAND

I. Origins of the Stone movie, tentatively titled "JFK." Meetings with Jim Garrison. Stone's preoccupation with the war in Vietnam. Garrison's contentions in his 1988 book that the immediate cause of the assassination was a secret cabal, worried that Kennedy had decided to pull out of Vietnam and determined to install a pliant LBJ in his place. The distortions of history that this entails.

II. Beginnings of the Garrison investigation, late 1966. A publicity-hungry DA reads critical books on the findings of the Warren Commission and decides that he can do better. His first informants, a duo with the comedy-team names of Martin and Lewis, point fingers at everyone from Kim Philby to a homosexual ex-airline-pilot named David Ferrie.

III. The death of David Ferrie, February 1967. I was(probably) the last man to see him alive. He told me he was afraid Garrison's investigation would prove to be "a witchhunt." He also rambled on at length about how much Kennedy deserved to die, about how unfair Bobby Kennedy had been to Jimmy Hoffa. At the time JFK was killed, Ferrie was working as a private investigator for New Orleans Mafia kingpin Carlos Marcello and his lawyers. That was one angle Garrison never investigated. The DA was on Marcello's "pad" and had been for several years.

IV. Sentence first, verdict later. Ferrie's demise freed Garrison of all sense of restraint, so long as he didn't touch the mob. Immediately following Ferrie's death, Garrison claimed to the world he had solved the JFK assassination "beyond a reasonable doubt." Hours later, he found a man who would, after undergoing hypnotism, be his chief witness for an alleged conspiracy involving Lee Harvey Oswald, Ferrie, and New Orleans businessman Clay Shaw. Shaw's arrest. The search of his carriage house in the French Quarter. Whips and chains.

V. Oliver Stone's sense of history. A scene from his script showing Clay Shaw being whipped by "a young, sexy street chicken" in a leather mask(Actually Shaw liked to be the whipper, not the whippie.) Excerpt from Garrison letter to a critic deploring any exploitation of Shaw's homosexuality. Then a Garrison quote praising the script. Stone's views on moviemaking and criticisms of his work. Examples from other films. Stone calls himself "a cinematic historian," but he feels free to change the facts so long as he remains true to "the spirit" of an event. His penchant, at least in the JFK movie, for guilt by association. E. G., "Shaw was a CIA-related person," Stone says. "So Jim(Garrison) was certainly partly right(to prosecute Shaw), and maybe wholly right."

VI. The Garrison crusade. The DA's Alice-in-Wonderland approach: white is black and black is white. Star witness Perry Russo asks newsmen(including this reporter) to bribe him to change his story. Subsequent Garrison charges against NBC's Walter Sheridan for "trying to bribe" Russo. Garrison on TV, in Playboy, in Der Spiegel, contradicting himself in each new appearance without blushing. The DA's hiring of an ex-CIA agent to provide insights on the agency's "mentality." The agent's and Garrison's attempts to indict a dead man for killing Kennedy(Garrison insisted the man wasn't dead; there was this Venezuelan seaman, see, and his corpse was substituted for that of...). The Shaw trial, an abuse of power.

VII. "Damage control." Takes up more than half of investigation's time. Garrison sees a CIA/FBI plot against him. All they have to do is watch. The wounds are self-inflicted. Garrison insistence on indicting a rightwing Californian as one of the so-called "tramps," a case of double misidentification. DA's search for an anti-Castro guerilla training camp leads to a bunch of chimpanzees: the Tulane Primate Center. Garrison's "discovery" of an antenna sticking out of the hip pocket of a Dealey Plaza witness(actually an imperfection in the photograph). DA's theory about the "seats of conspiracy"(Seattle, the Boeing Co.: Dallas, H. L. Hunt, etc.)

VIII. Opportunities Lost. Failings of the FBI's and the Warren Commission's investigations. J. Edgar Hoover's insistence on a lone assassin. FBI's enlistment of then House Minority Leader Gerry Ford as an informant on the Commission. Bureau's blind eye to contradictions in the

evidence. FBI/CIA role in frustrating the Commission from hiring its own investigators. Shortcomings in the Warren Report. Garrison's omissions. Blind eye to the Mafia. Nothing done about identification of an Oswald buddy as the man who picked up Hands-Off Cuba leaflets. Abrupt abandonment of court fight for JFK autopsy photos and other physical evidence.

IX. The Making of "JFK." Stone's \$80,000 consultants, a trio that never met a conspiracy theory they didn't like. Resistance from other assassination critics. Grumbling in Dallas. PR Hype. Warner Books' \$136,000 purchase of paperback rights to Garrison book, initially issued by an anti-CIA publishing house. The Warner conglomerate's old ties to Garrison: Life magazine gave him \$60,000 to \$80,000 worth of help in 1966-67, before deciding he was too close to the mob. The Stone script and its flaws.

Perhaps the book could be timed to the release of Stone's \$40 million production and the re-release of Garrison's book, tentatively set for next February. Collaborating with me would be Harold Weisberg, a longtime Warren Commission critic who worked closely with Garrison before becoming disillusioned. I've been with the Post since 1963, covering assassinations, politics, organized crime, the FBI, the CIA and various scandals (Chappaquiddick, Watergate, Wedtech, Iran-contra). I think there would be a big audience for a lively, accurate book on Garrison and the Stone movie. Just look at the publicity it's already generated.

I'm enclosing a copy of a May 19 article that I did in the Post's Outlook section, Stone's response and my reply. He's also taken to denouncing me and the Post in other publications. Stone even told the New Orleans Times-Picayune that I was "now writing a book bashing Garrison." I don't know who told him that. But I'd hate to disappoint him.

Sincerely yours,

George Lardner
George Lardner

The Washington Post
1150 15th st. nw.
Washington, D. C. 20071
Office phone: 202-334-7434
Home phone: 202-363-2142