Me. Richard Lingeman
The Nation
72 Fifth Ave.,
New York, N.Y. 10011

5/13/92

Dear Mr. Lingeman,

I'm sorry that you apparently did nothing with the copies of my letters to Oliver Stone that I sent you some time ago. How Cockburn could have used them, particularly my first, to respond to the Stone letter about which I enclose a letter to the editor! I enclose another copy I hope you will forward to him with this letter.

Criticizing Stone did not require defending wither the Warren Report or that Commission or its staff. He was not in a position to know that he was correct, and he was not, in writing that "the Commission staffers were conscientious people." My copies of their records and hundreds of thousands of pages of once-withheld records I got via FOIA lawsuits say the opposite.

It also was not necessary to defend the Commission's conclusions to criticize Stone and his movie and the readily available fact, not any theory, leaves it without question that those conclusions were both preconceptions and knowingly incorrect. The actual evidence on this is overwhelming, especially on Arlen Specter's single-bullet theory.

Cockburn is also wrong in saying that <u>all</u> "warren Commission critics" have been forever "whining."

~~Similarly~~, All are not alike. Or even in agreement.

Contrary to Stone's propaganda to promote himself and his movie, a vast volume of JFK ssassination records is available. Those who write about the subject, if they want to be accurate and protect their reputations, ought try to learn whether what they intend to say is in accord with the available fact. Almost nobody ever does, alas.

And thus the sorrowing people are more confused, again misinformed and misled.

Sincerely,

Harold Weusberg.

By the way, this issue just got here today

In attacking Alexander Cockburn (The Nation 5/18/92) Oliver Stone accuses him of "total ignorance" of the JFK assassination. Stone could not have described the state of his own knowledge of fact as distinguished from the nutty theories in which he revelled. He knew so little after his movie JFK was done he had to have his Jane Rusconi prompt him on what to say about such things as "the head shot" before appearing on ABC-TV. The satellite was live, it was transmitted and I have a transcript of it.

Another kickback criticism he aimed at Cockburn is, "it is not enough to 'think' something is true."

On February 8, 1991, before Stone started shooting JFK, I wrote him at length and in detail of personal knowledge telling him that Jim Garrison's book on which he based his movie was knowingly dishonest and wrong, a "fraud and a travesty." But because Stone thought it was right, he proceeded with the movie based on it.

"Don't misinform the public in the name of commerce," Stone moralized to Cockburn.

Misinforming the public for money is a perfect description of what Stone did in his deservedly criticized movie.

He began by announcing his movie would tell the people their history, "who" killed their President, "why" and "how." He knew he could not do that from Garrison's rewriting of his own fiasco or from Jim Marrs' compendium of all the nutty conspiracy theories some of which Marrs did not understand even in the reprinting of his trash.

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg