

Editor
Vogue Magazine
350 Madison Ave.,
New York, N.Y.

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
1/12/92

Dear Editor,

(First this apology for and explanation of my typing. Enfeebled at 78 I must keep my legs elevated when I am sitting. As a result I cannot ^{avoid} ~~avoid~~ striking wrong keys. And I've been a hunt-and-peck typer since my earliest reporting days in the late 1920s. No~~d~~ doubt this alone qualifies me for Andrew Kopkind's characterization of me as a "buff.")

In Vogue's January ~~essay~~ story on Oliver Stone's exploitation and commercialization of the assassination of President Kennedy Andrew Kopkind, whose career in other pages is of JFK-bashing, flaunts the ignorance from which he writes, misleads your readers and maligns me. For anyone to undertake the kind of article Kopkind wrote the first prerequisite of responsible journalism is to know what you are writing about.

Kopkind didn't and didn't bother to make as perfunctory a check as would be expected of a cub reporter.

His mention of me begins by referring to me as "one of the earliest of conspiracy buffs."

What I suppose makes me a "buff" is having been a reporter, an investigative reporter, a Senate investigator and editor and a professional intelligence analyst (OSS) before writing my six books on the JFK assassination and one on that of Martin Luther King, Jr., which are unique in not espousing any conspiracy theory.

Or, perhaps, I am whatever he means by a "buff" because I filed about a dozen lawsuits under the Freedom of Information Act, some precedental and one leading to the 1974 amending of the investigatory files exemption to open FBI, CIA and similar files, resulting in the disclosure to me of about a third of a million pages of once-withheld government records.

It is the exact opposite of the truth that I "was for a time in amiable contact with" ^{Oliver} Stone but "turned against the movie-maker ^{for} ~~got~~ some theoretical deviation and attacked the JFK script in an interview with the Washington Post."

I am the one who started the exposure of Stone's exploitation and commercialization of the assassination when he did not respond to my February 8, 1990 lengthy and detailed letter informing him that in basing his movie on Garrison's book he would be filming a "fraud and a travesty."

When I was in New Orleans trying to learn more about Lee Harvey Oswald I did from time to time have contact with Garrison that was "amicable" but toward the end I once expected him and the assistant district attorney with him to assault me for what I said and at the very end I prevented his planned obscenity of commemorating the fifth anniversary of the assassination by charging two more innocent men with being assassins.

One of these men, Robert L. Perrin, had killed himself, to Garrison's knowledge, 15 months before the murder with which Stone's hero was going to charge him!

If this is not what Kopkind means by "some theoretical deviation," then perhaps it is that I decided to expose Stone's exploitation after his repeated proclamations that based on as thoroughly dishonest a book as I have read in 78 years he was going to record their history for the people, telling them who killed their President, why and how, his own words. I told him he could not possibly do that with Garrison's book, provided some documentation, offered more and to respond to any questions he might ask.

My alleged "amicable contact" with Stone consisted of his never responding to any letter I wrote him.

He knew I had all those records I make freely available, he knew very well what I told him about Garrison, and he was either so certain it was true or so indifferent to decency and truthfulness that he did not dispute what I said or ask for any more.

When I was given a copy of a copy of a script that Stone himself gave away, in return for which Stone calls me a thief, and read that penny-dreadful, I gave it and access to my Garrison records to George Lardner.

The story was his. It was not what Kopkind says, an "interview."

And as Kopkind should have known from working with him at the Post, Lardner is not its "long-time Pentagon correspondent".

It happens that Lardner is one of the few reporters not conned by Stone and his flacks and sycophants. His article was completely accurate. Kopkind ~~again~~ displays the ~~ignorance~~ ignorance based on which he "informs" your readers in writing that Stone "answered" what Lardner wrote "with a detailed defense of his theory and Garrison's evidence."

What "evidence?" Garrison either made it up as he went or made up out of nothing what he cribbed from others.

But "defense" and "answered" are hardly applicable to the revised and corrected nonsense Stone provided and the Post published.

The very next day I sent Stone another lengthy and ~~detail~~^{ed} commentary on it that justified what I had already said of him ~~xxxxxxx~~, that like Garrison, "you have trouble telling the truth even by accident."

To that there was a response - a snotty letter from his, pardon the expression, "research coordinator." It concluded with a thinly-veiled invitation to be bribed.

Stone and his gang knew nothing about the established fact of the assassination and did not want to. They devoted themselves ^{to} the multitude of theories most of which are not tenable and some really crazy. But nothing was too crazy for Stone, who actually used some of the least ~~cred~~ credible connections.

Why else would he not have had any questions when I told him the realities about Garrison and his book and about the ^{Jim} ~~Mrs~~ book he also used? Why would he not have wanted

3
even a peek at all those records he preferred lying about to promote himself and his movie, describing them as "suppressed" and that until at least the year 2039!

Of this, of Stone's refusal to look at real evidence, not nutty theories, Kopkind writes that Stone "called on everyone he could find who had an angle on the assassination."

~~Kop~~ Kopkind included, Stone conned most of the reporters who wrote about the furor I stated in almost everything he said. If he said it, Kopkind and others accepted it as true and reported it as fact. *Usually it wasn't.*

This controversy, which I started and therefore know about very well, is because Stone said repeatedly that he was making a non-fiction film, recording our real history, when he had no such intention.

It did not begin with any version of any Viet Nam theory. I never mentioned "Viet Nam." Or the Warren Report. I merely proved beyond question that he could not record our history from those two trashy and un factual books.

If he had said from the first that his was a work of fiction, he would have been entitled to say anything he wanted to. But he said the opposite and there is nothing he can now do to change it. He has no right to rewrite our history.

Except to gull the ^hopkinds and others who should have known better.

Who should have perceived immediately that Stone was unhidden in his exploitation and commercialization, beginning with his inventing a new name for his ~~Extran~~ Ixtlan Productions, calling it "Came~~lot~~" until the film was finished. It is "Ixtlan" on the screen.

Who should have seen and reported that this commercialization and exploitation of the assassination was also intended as a vehicle for his adding another dimension to his Viet Nam hangup.


Instead, ^hopkind and the others who failed to meet their responsibilities as reporters, belittle me for having brought more information - not ~~conspirac~~y~~~~ theories - information to light than anyone else in all these books without a single theory in them and through all those costly- and time-consuming FOIA lawsuits; and then they berate The Post and Lardner for opening the subject with completely accurate and more than fair reporting of paranoia and dreamed-up ^{fact} "fact" palmed off on the still sorrowing people as a truthful account of this great tragedy.

If ^hopkind had done any checking at all - and a number of reporters from California to Germany did phone me - he could have learned the truth and avoided shaming himself and Vogue.

If you would like any documentation, please ask.

I was asked ^{to be} by several of Garrison's staff, who'd tried and failed to talk him out of charging Perrin and the other man, and I still have a carbon of my investigative report and some of the documentation. A copy of the morgue book listing Perrin's suicide that I had on my desk is enclosed. Also an incomplete copy of Garrison's copy of the police report on it.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg