

Elaine Hudhko (?) LARimes phoned me yesterday afternoon (9/13/91) in response to my letter to her written after I got a copy of her article that gives Stone virtual free range to misrepresent both his movie and criticism of it.

In the course of trying to explain herself and her story, and I'd not expected to hear from her and intended only as I now recall to inform her for when the movie is out, she complained about being inundate^d with a flood of arcane alleged ^{in finest detail} evidence from what she represented as critics who are critical of Stone. *Many of them.*

In the course of our conversation it became apparent that these people were arguing their theories in contradiction to Stone's.

She had the notion that criticism of Stone includes that he should not be allowed or permitted to make such a movie. I said that was not the issue at all, nor was it that the movie should be immune to criticism until it is out. There is no question of his right to make any movie he wants and no permission is required. However, when he launched his project with the representation that it would be history in which he told the people ~~who~~ killed their President, why and how, and when it is not possible to alter the script to eliminate this and when he persisted in this representation after criticism, although sometimes seeming to back off, it will be too late to criticize the movie after it is completed and shown and because he is rewriting the history he claims to be recording he waived any possible immunity from criticism by his false representation and description.

She was not aware of these representation so non-fiction nor was she of his continued reference to it, as in "agniappe", of which she had not heard and at her request I identifies it to her.

She regarded it as a significant admission to her and for her piece that Stone had acknowledged that Garrison had made some mistakes. She was not aware of the meaningless of this at this juncture or that he had not begun that with her. *(He still has Garrison heroes)*

It is apparent that she wrote her piece without making even a perfunctory effort to learn what Stone had said at almost any time. All she did was let Stone talk and report ^{it} without being able to compare what he told her with what he had said earlier and to others, which is to say that she became his vehicle for self-justification in the most influential voice in the area where movies are made. I find it incredible that she and her paper would first do this, eliminating all research, and then permit themselves to be so used.

It is obvious that those to whom she spoke did not include the one who started it all which is apparent in the Lardner article, me (also quoted in TIME) and rather strange that so long after she got my letter she decided to phone and defend herself and her concept of journalism.