National Editor
The New York Times
229 W 43 St,
New York, N.Y. 10037

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
11/11/91

Dear Editor,

Because controversy over the coming Oliver Stone movie is not going to end, because he has succeeded in misrepresenting the nature and substance of this controversy, as in Bernard Weinraub's 11/7 story, because I am responsible for this controversy, and so that the Times can know the truth and where, if it desires, ~~where it~~ can get accurate information, I write.

The controversy is not about the conclusions of the Warren Commission or whether or not JFK was the victim of a conspiracy, as I'll explain. First, after an apology, a little about me so you can decide whether you can depend on me. The Times has in the past, as Peter Kihss, John Crewdson, Wendell Rawls and Martin Waldron did. The latter three spent considerable time here, Mo also socially. He was to have visited Robert Sherrill and us the weekend he was sent to Florida on the Hoffa-body story and that was followed by the fatal consequences of his illness.

I am a 78-year old former investigative reporter, Senate editor and investigator and Intelligence analyst. I am the author of the first book on the JFK assassination, Whitewash, of six additional such books, and despite serious health impairments, obtained about a third of a million pages of official records by a series of FOIA lawsuits, some precedental and one leading to the amending of the investigatory-files exemption in 1974.

Since 1975 I am required not to stand still and to keep my legs elevated. Thus the typewriter is to the side. That and cracked fingertips, in part the consequence of one of the medications that keep me alive, account for my typos.

Unlike the others writing and speaking about the political assassinations, I am not and never have been a conspiracy theorist. My books are strictly factual, advancing no theories of any kind, and there is no significant error in any of them and very few that are minor.

I believe that FOIA does not give me any property rights but rather makes me surrogate for the people, copies of whose records I obtain. I make these records available to all writers - as Oliver Stone knows - although I know that almost all are conspiracy theorists and will write what I do not agree with.

Knowing this, and not having asked for access to them or for copies of any, he nonetheless has said and received unquestioned acceptance for his deliberate lie, that all these records have been and will be supressed until at least 2039. At the same time he also boasts that he has drawn on "all" the information that has come to light since the Warren Report.

His record is clear: he has trouble telling the truth even by accident. These are only

a few of his almost non-stop lies clearly designed to make it appear that on one hand his research has been exhaustive and on the other that he is persecuted by the major media which he infers is working for the CIA and, in George Lardner's case, stated this unequivocally.

The falsehood that he uses in his film all the information that has come to light when in fact he has ignored all of it, leads to one of the real and basic causes of the criticism of him that I started. The other is that he bases his movie on the fraudulent and knowingly dishonest rewriting of his own history by Jim Garrison in his "On the Trail of the Assassins." The original script makes a hero out of Garrison to such an extent and is based so completely on his book that it is impossible to rewrite that script to eliminate this.

It also is impossible for Stone to withdraw his own repeated description of his movie as non-fiction. He stated over and over again that his movie would record their "history" for the people and that it would tell them "who" killed their President, "why" and "how."

When I learned that he was basing his movie on Garrison's book I wrote him at some length in full detail, from personal knowledge that Garrison's book was a fraud and a travesty. I gave him some documentation and offered him more. That was on 2/8/91. He did not reply. He then had ample opportunity to do a new script. He did not.

Then I was sent a copy of the script. I was aghast, it was that dishonest, that bad a script.

Having known George Lardner for about 25 years and having been his source on innumerable stories, I invited him here and I gave him the script and all the copies he wanted of my Garrison records. This and his personal knowledge from having covered Garrison when that story broke is the solid, factual basis of his completely accurate story.

Parts of the script are so ridiculous that with Stone's representation of his own allegedly exhaustive research, with his co-author Geoffrey Sklar having been editor on Garrison's book and with Garrison having read the script a number of times and told the New Orleans papers how fine and accurate a script it is, it still had two villains holding David Ferrie's head in a toilet by his hair when Ferrie was without a hair on his body from alopaecia totalis!

I should confess my own failure to recognize Garrison for what he was, an egomaniacal fraud and poseur. As did most who were critical of the Warren Report, I assumed that he had the case he charged in court and that his excessive public statements were fighting fire with fire because he was being interfered with by the executive agencies, as he said.

My interest and my work in New Orleans were on Oswald, not on Shaw. I never discussed his Shaw case with him, which I now regret. I did learn more about Oswald but he had no in-

terest in that. In retrospect I realize this should have alerted me to what he was up to. When I did realize this I believed that the case should go to trial. And although I had agreed to be what he called his "Dealey Plaza expert" I was not. Although from what he said the Times reported that I was sitting at the counsel table, in fact I was never in that courtroom and never even laid eyes on Shaw.

Instead, after learning from them what their alleged case really was, I told his two main trial lawyers that they should lose the case, would and why.

The Post gave Stone an exceptional opportunity to correct the incredible statement he had asked it to publish in response to Lardner's acticle. His revised article was smoother and had some of the crude errors eliminated. It was still a monument to infidelity to fact, enhanced by his overt and glib lies.

When it appeared I again wrote him at some length, pointing out his errors and lies.

This time I got a response. Not from him but from the woman who signed herself as his "research coordinator." It was a thinly-hidden attempt to bribe me. I declined and that letter also is without response.

Since then, when he and his coauthor had the gall to tell reporters that I was "helping" them, I've written him each time and asked that he withdraw and not repeat this crude and to me defamatory lies.

He has not responded.

If you would like copies of this correspondence I'll provide them. If you have any question about my accuracy or dependability, I suggest you ask Lardner. If you do not have copies of what the Post published and would like them, you can also get them faxed by the Post and I suggest that the first will be more convenient if you ask for the version published in its weekly. In that form it is of but two pages. I can send you xeroxes of clippings from the Post and the Dallas and New Orleans papers, among others.

In telling Stone in my February letter that Garrison's book is a self-justifying lie from beginning to end, I illustrated this with the most ludicrous of his self-glorifivations, confirmed by the attached FBI report, and the most startling and potentially dangerous, the latter because that lie was about me and because he knew I could be tempted to expose him. I was ill and didn't.

It was about his reason for alleging that the CIA infiltrated Boxley onto his Bill staff to wreck his investigation and his reason for firing Bill Boxley, who he had hired personally over vigorous staff objections. As it turned out, when I got the script this fantasy was also central in it and for the same purposes.

Garrison's petty fabrication was that when Boxley allegedly unexpectedly and for no purpose joined him in Alberquerque Garrison was offended that Boxley would squander Garrison's meager funds and ordered him to return forthwith to New Orleans.

Boxley was not an assistant district attorney, as the script I read says. He was paid by private funds Garrison collected and used for various purposes that would not pass city inspection.

The truth is that the day before Garrison sent his two detectives who were his drivers and bodyguards to ask me to accompany him to the airport. When we got there, in the Pink Panther actuality, Steve Bordelon and Lynn Loisel both parked the car while I walked to the ticket counter with Garrison.

"You have a ticket for me," he said, "My name is Robert Levy."

After a double-take, the six-foot-six Garrison being the best-known man in the city, she gave him the ticket. We waited for the detectives and then the four of us walked to the gate, where we chatted until the door was opened.

"Hold it, boss," one of the detectives said. They said they wanted to check the plane out, They returned to report that all seemed safe and secure, he entered the plane and as soon as he was out of earshot they erupted into laughter.

"We've got the boss fixed up," one of them told me. "We told the hostess who he is and he'll get two steaks for supper."

About 4 a.m. the motel operator had a call for me. It was from a former reporter, Harv Morgan,who then had as responsible and popular s talk-show as there was in San Francisco. I asked her to hold the call and got my tape recorder with a suction microphone used to tape telephone interviews. Believing that he would not have gone to the time and trouble at that time of the morning to reach me without what he regarded as important, I taped our conversation.

He told me about a partly-confirmed plot to kill Garrison. He'd checked some of it with the police.

I awakened Garrison's chief investigator, Louis Ivon, told him what I'd been told, he phoned several assistant DAs and we met them at the office. They listened to the tape and decided to send Boxley, who carried a pistol and who they were glad to have away for a while, to protect Garrison.

Rather than packing Boxley back to New Orleans, as I learned later, Garrison took Boxley with him on a fund-raising trip to ~~New Orleans~~ Los Angeles, where they lived it up for a week or so.

When a package was delivered to Garrison Boxley grabbed it, took it into the bathroom, filled the tub with water and held the package under water until the presumed bomb was ruined. When he then opened it up it contained - a ruined book!

In early 1968 two of Garrison's staff, worried about how he was going to commemorate the coming fifth anniversary of the JFK assassination - by charging two men as assassins - asked my help. He had intended charging more "assassins" but had with difficulty been persuaded to forget all but these two.

One was Robert Perrin, whose wife, Nancy had been a Warren Commission witness. I knew Perrin had killed himself, in New Orleans, in 1962, so on that basis alone he could not have been a 1963 assassin.

The other was Edgar Eugene Bradley, then west coast representative of the ultra-right Cape May preacher, Rev. Carl McIntire. The only alleged reason for including Bradley was that Garrison imagined he was one of three men photographed in Dealey Plaza a little more than an hour and a half after the shooting, in news photographs Garrison dubbed "The Tramp Pictues" because he imagined they were tramps. They were not tramps, although Stone still inists they are and were involved. But before Garrison compromised on "Bradley" he and others had an incredible series of "identifications" that include E. Howard Hunt, General Lansdale (in the script, disguised and not so named, an article of faith to Fletcher Prouty, who knew him and is or was one of Stone's "expert"advisers) and among many others a man they first called "Frenchy" for no reason at all and wound up describing him as Lyndon Johnson's farm manager!

Two professional investigators made independent investigations of those pictures for me, each yielding the identical result. The men were winos. They were drinking it up in a railroad boxcar where they were found about an hour and a half after the assassination when the police checked the entire area out.

The railroad tracks are a block west of the scene of the crime, in front of the Texas School Book Depository Building, and more than two blocks south of it, behind the Central Annex Post Office, hardly a point from which they could have done any of the shooting. Two policemen and a deputy sheriff, taking them to dry out, took the only path possible, north on the tracks and east off of them when they crossed the triple-underpass, when they walked them past the TSBD. There they were photographed by the news photographers, who were taking pictures of everything that moved.

Even pretending that these men were assassins was insane. Unarmed assassins? Not handcuffed? The officers without any pistol or revolver in hand?

They were released when sober, without chagres being filed. Garrison and Stone insist they were arrested and the records destroyed.

As recently as in his Post Article Stone continued to insist on the fiction and that the men were hiding in a passenger car behind the TSBD. No proof. He just states it. The source of this particular nonsense is a buff named Fred Newcomb. It is well known.

Garrison, with his staff of professional police investigators, had not directed them to make any Perrin investigation. Ivon for me sent them out to obtain the evidence I knew had to exist, the hospital records when Perrin poisoned himself, the hand-written morgue book, police reports, etc. I also examined what little of his work Boxley had put on paper. He generally reported verbally to Garrison, who made notes I could not hope to get and did not try to.

Using a borrowed and broken portable I typed up my investigative report and gave it

to Andrew Sciambra, the most junior of the assistant DAs and the one who spent most time with Garrison.

My report begins quite explicitly in stating that Boxley just made up what Garrison had told him, what Garrison himself had made up with no reasonable suspicion that it was true. (That there was no reasonable suspicion, however, does not mean that Garrison himself did not believe his own inventions. I believe that at least to a large degree he really did believe what he had dreamed up and for which he had no factual basis at all.)

I was not present when Sciambra confronted Garrison with my investigative report and its attached documentation. They met at the New Orleans Athletic Club. Garrison used it like his private office in the stupid belief that that he was less subject to surveillance there. Beginning with the switchboard though which all calls went, the opposite is true.

Sciambra was in great excitement when he picked me up to take me to dinner (it was a Sunday) at his home. After exclaiming, "Hal, you've done it!" he added that I'd saved Garrison from being disbarred. I presume he meant in a way I did not understand that this would have related to the Shaw case then pre-trial on appeal.

We both assumed that Garrison would blame Boxley and fire him. He went farther. In his press release, which I have, he attacked the CIA, claiming that it had planted Boxley on him to wreck his "Investigation" from the inside. He says this in his book, as Stone did in the script I read.

On either the next or the following day Garrison convened a lunch at the NOAC. Of his staff I remember that Sciambra, Jim Alock and C Alock were there, as was the former FBI black bag specialist, Bill Turner. Garrison had a blackboard in there for his chalk talk in which, having drawn a rough outline of the United States, he located some of the major "conspirators" of whose guilt he was so convinced, without even claiming evidence to support his allegations. He put a mark in the northwest and identified that as Boeing. In California his "x" was for Lockheed. He also made marks he said were for a Boeing subsidiary in New Orleans, as I now recall the name, Michaud, and then there was another in the Georgia area of his map for Martin-Marietta. And this was only part of his theorized conspiracy.

When Garrison's back was toward us as he made additional marks I remember that Jim Alock made faces to me, reflecting his incredulous reaction.

Sheer idiocy, and just one of many examples of it as well as what Stone and Sklar adopted unquestioningly and without any checking.

With them and in the script as well as the books (Stone also bought the right to use Jim Marrs' "Crossfire") this was not a matter of fact. It was a matter of belief and of belief only and the belief was based on nothing other than whim and desire.

There are quite a few official records that could have been used to make a case of a conspiracy but neither Garrison nor Stone had any interest in fact or documentation.

There was a considerable amount of evidence available in New Orleans, Garrison's

jurisdiction, leaving it without question that Oswald was not as utterly alone as the official story says. I believe there was more than I was able to authenticate. Garrison had no interest in it. It is not in these books or the nutty theories so Stone also had no interest in it. Because Garrison had Oswald charged as a conspirator this is particularly odd for a presecutor. (They do not prove there was any conspiracy. They just allege it.)

The script I have is based on the CIA intrusion concoction, with Garrison as the incorruptible hero. No matter what changes Stone made because of exposures, it is not possible to make enough changes to eliminate this and the other rewritings of history. Stone would have had to junk the script based on which he got Warner's $40 million and all those stars to whom he paid large sums for walk-on parts, thereafter trading on their names.

He didn't.

All his many public statements, many in attempted justification of it, leave it without question that he filmed from a script he knew beyond question was, in the words I used, a literary fraud and a travesty by a man who was in his book a knowing liar.

In his public statements Stone went even further. He alleged not only that all the official records relating to the assassination were suppressed until at least the year 2039, he charged that Garrison had been denied access to the autopsy information and what relates to it, like the Oswald rifle.

Of all the many lies by this pair, this is the most brazen.

Garrison filed suit for this evidence, won, and then abandoned the case as soon as he won it! (I was there as his expert. Quite a story in just this that I do not now go into. It was in Washington's Superior Court before Judge Charles Halleck, and it should be in your morgue.)

By now I hope it is clear that Garrison and Stone just make up anything that at any time seems to serve a purpose and will it into reality, lie deliberately, or both.

There is nothing too palpably false for Stone. Or his "experts."

What calls itself the Assassination Information Center in Dallas was hired to be among Stone's "experts" for $80,000, comfirmed. It held a press conference to introduce Ricky White and present White's effort to commercialize on the assassination by calling his father one of the assassins of JFK and as the assassin of Officer J.D. Tippit who, according to the Warren Commission, was killed by Oswald. The most rudimentary checking made it immediately obvious that White's story was totally false and in part plagiarized.

The basic and completely impossible account of the Tippit killing he presented is a plagiarism from a novel, "Promises to Keep." My immediate exposure of this did nothing to deter Stone or his experts. (As recently as two weeks ago Larry Howard of the Dallas AIC insisted that White's is a truthful account, in a phone call to me.) Stone had spoken to White

who had been flown to California for the consultation by the AIC. The plagiarized fiction is in the script. If Stone had had any authentic expert read the script, he would have known at the least that the account is, beyond question, false and impossible.

Some way to record our "history" for the people!

When the AIC's Larry Howard phoned me (I suspect in an effort to entrap me for Stone but I cannot prove it) he boasted that he had paid Marrs to write his book that is Stone's claimed second major source.

Howard is an expert who boasts that he never reads any of the books on the JFK assassination. Associated with him in the AIC is Gary Shaw, who did write a book about imagined conspiracies. If I recall correctly, Howard was its coauthor. Shaw, working with an investigator, Joe West, developed a theory they disclosed at a press conference, that Sam Giancana and John Roselli plus another mafia types were the actual Grassy Knoll assassins. This fable was remembered by reporters at the AIC's press conference for ~~Ricky~~ Ricky White, whose assassination story is a different one.

Asked by a reporter how the AIC (read Stone's subject experts) seem to espouse two contradictory explanations of the one assassination, West reponded that both were true—that in fact there were two assassination teams on the one Grassy Knoll at the same time!

Even this did not disenchant Stone with those of his experts on his ~~the~~ movie that would record our "history" and tell the people "who" killed the President, "why" and "how." Stone continued their relationship as he did when he later got my first letter.

This relationship still exists, according to Howard in his phone call ~~to~~ to me.

He then boasted to me that he had paid Marrs to write that book, both being interested in conspiracy theories.

~~Marrs~~ Marrs' first words in his 625-page compendium of nutty theories, none proven and virtually all impossible on the ~~basis~~ basis of established fact, are, "Do not trust ~~the~~ this book." These are the only dependable words in his ~~text~~ book.

Probably intending that it be taken to refer to the Warren Report he has on his title page, "The great masses of the people will more easily fall victims to a great lie than to a small one . . .-Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf", It is applicable to Marrs' book. Across the top of his cover is this unatributed quotation, " ... may be the final word until 2039 when the government files on the case can be unlocked." This is what Stone says.

Whether or not Marrs is Stone's source, and both may have had the same one, ~~if~~ both ~~knew~~ know this is false (I began acquiring my 250,000 pages of these "suppressed" records in 1966, when the Times also had access to some because I remember driving your reporter, Apple, from the Archives to your Washington bureau). It was never true.

This alone says much about Stone's recording of our true history for the people and telling them who killed JFK, why and how. It also says much about what kind of "experts" and as he has also described them, "respected" researchers" he uses in his movie.

So also does the last 11 pages in Marrs' book. He cribbed the idea and much of the content from the paranoidal former Texas country weekly publisher, Penn Jones, but Marrs made a slight change in what Jones called "mysterious deaths." Marrs says "convenient" deaths.

Virtually none had any connection with the assassination and none took any secrets to the grave. Most died of natural causes, like J. Edgar Hoover and the judge in the Ruby case. Many if not most do not even appear in the text. I quote a few examples intending them more as a mean of evaluating what Stone is perpetrating than of Marrs' scam. And of what Stone evaluates as relevant in his "history."

Marrs says he does not know the cause of LIFE's C.D. Jackson's death but he lists it as significant because LIFE bought the rights to the Zapruder film of the assassination.

Another kind of conspiracy manifestation is what Marrs says about William Whaley, who had been a Commission witness. His importance is that he "drove Oswald to Oak Cliff." What makes it significant? He was "the only Dallas cab driver to die on duty," in a "motor collision." That is indeed how Whaley died but it can have significance only if the CIA and/or other alleged conspirators employed 82 year old kamikazis because that collision was caused by an 82-year-old man driving the wrong way on a divided highway.

Still another category of conspiratorial death is another Warren Commission witness which Marrs does not say, and then a boy, as he also does not say, Phillip Geraci. Now Geraci did have connection with and relevance to the investigations, but not as Marrs does not say. He also is not mentioned in the text.

According to Marrs his relevance is "Friend of Perry Russo [who was Garrison's main witness against Shaw], told of Oswald/Shaw conversation."

In addition to there having been three Philip Geracis then in New Orleans, Marrs not indicating this, also bearing on the dependability of Stone's second most important source is that fact that no Geraci said any thing about that alleged Oswald/Shaw conversation. Garrison got that allegation from a drug addict, Vernon Bundy.

What makes this alleged Geraci death mysterious and of greater than average significance is that he died of "electrocution."

The relevant Philip Geraci was not electrocuted. His father was, non-conspiratorially, in an industrial accident for which he was responsible.

Garrison was such a vigorous, no-nonsense prosecutor that he did nothing when the youngster ignored three grand jury subpoenas. However, when he was in Viet Nam I had no problem interviewing his parents and when he returned after his father's death he readily agree to the interview that at my insistence was with his family lawyer present.

Garrison, Stone and Marrs haven't the slightest notion of what they missed, too!

Perhaps already longer than you'd like to take time for, this is but a peek at the to me gruesome, the sick and disgusting commercialization and exploitation Stone is about

to perpetrate on the trusting people, on our history and on reviewers, none of whom can have the knowledge required for a fair and independent evaluation.

His production company is "Camelot." His movie title is "JFK" for a movie not about the President. Rearranging and repainting the TSBD and having a strong fight against strong Dallas opposition to do it, getting considerable publicity for his professed determination to be completely faithful to fact. Even signing Garrison for a small part. And retitling the Warner paperback of Garrison's book and making it "JFK," too.

He really did con all those famous actors into bit, walk-on parts for attractively large sums and he did use their names, the only need he had for them. I have a letter he wrote in which he sought to validate what he is up to by asking if the recipient really thought ~~ant~~ that (and ~~hee began~~ he began with ~~for~~ $7,000,000 for Kevin Costner) Ed Asner would have anything at all to do with any remotely questionable production.

I wish I were up to it. What a book this and so much else like it, so very much on Garrison and his book and all the investigations Garrison should have made and didn't make could have ~~yielded~~ yielded and what those I did make ~~do~~ did yield, along with what is ~~unk~~ unknown in all those FBI records I got under FOIA could make. It surely would bring little or entirely unknown aspects of our history to light!

Aside from alerting Stone in my 2/8/91 letter that he would be filming a fraud and a travesty I warned him what he could do to his reputation: "... you have every right to play Mack Sennett's in a Keystone Kops Pink Panther, but ..."

He then had plenty of time to either check out what I told him, which he did not do, not even by phoning me, or to prepare a different script. I believe he saw still another Oscar and was so convinced he did not care.

Parenthetically what kind of journalism professors do they have at Columbia when, as the editor on Garrison's book and as Stone's coauthor, ~~he~~ Stone did no checking at all? What a way to teach journalism, what a role model for future reporters!

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg