

Dear Dick,

6/16/91

As in haste I've been trying to put on paper what may enable you to answer any questions you may get and thus have been intending to have and document ~~what~~ⁱⁿ the writer I hoped would be available to do the writing - in addition to what I'll enclose I have about 8,000 words more to read and correct - it came to me this morning that unless we do have a writer pretty soon I'll have just about everything on paper first.

That reminded me of something David said when you were here, that you have an excellent editor available.

This makes me wonder whether that editor would be willing to rewrite and edit and in return be full coauthor. If so, OK in advance. I think this would be faster and could very well be profitable to the editor/rewriter/coauthor.

I've been putting on paper what appears to me to be illustrations of the kind of information and documentation a publisher may want.

Not in any logical sequence, merely what appears to be of this nature that I can do with some rapidity.

When I finish what is started in these 8,000 words I think I'll go back over the many quotes by and for Stone and get that on paper. It should, I think, be close to the beginning of the book.

For some other things I await the return of a memo and the annotated Garrison book from Gardner. As of after 1 today no additional word from him. This should mean he got my letter of the 8th. I need those things for drafting other parts.

I have more (family) interruptions today, a few I can anticipate several days this coming week, and I'll be at Hopkins all day Thursday for regular checkups.

But I'll get as much on paper and documented as I can.

I hope this is not an imposition on you. And that it is not too difficult to read and is interesting.

Thanks and best to all,

Harold

It helps ^{to} understand ^{and} Jim Garrison to know that he was not only fond of quoting "Alice in Wonderland," particularly "Through the Looking Glass", where up is down, in is out, he practised it.

Oliver Stone is no less an ardent, unabashed, uninhibited practitioner. Probably neither invented it. For all Stone's professed liking ^{of} and respect for Garrison's ^{work and} book, there is no reason to assume he first learned of the art from the "Jolly Green Giant," ^{Garrison's} ^{nick name} Garrison's charged conspiracy, the case he took to court so disastrously, had three conspirators, Lee Harvey Oswald, Clay Shaw and David Ferrie. The charge was conspiracy. To be sure mere talk, Constitutionally protected, did not lead overzealous prosecutors to charge those who just talked about doing what the law prohibits, the conspiracy charge ^{requires} an overt step in pursuance of the plotted crime.

David Ferrie and Clay Shaw, without any question, were not in Dallas when JFK was ^{on November 22, 1963.} assassinated there. ^{the killing} Lee Harvey Oswald was. So, what overt step in pursuance of the crime could there have been in Garrison's case except by Lee Harvey Oswald?

Yet from the first Garrison insisted that Oswald had shot nobody.

Thus, in Garrison's gumbo, the innocent Oswald was guilty. Otherwise he had no case to take to court, and he was so determined to solve the crime!

So was Oliver Stone, but understanding him requires playing a different game. On ~~the TV of the past~~ TV of the past it was called, "What's My Name?" In it three people one of whom had some real or imaginary claim to fame appeared and were asked and answered questions. At the end the host intoned, "Will the ^{deal} this time we'll have it Oliver Stone, please stand up?"

On that TV game there was a real person whose name was used and at the end that person, smiling, rose and was applauded.

In the JFK assassination game and both Garrison and Stone make a game, albeit a very commercial game, of ~~it~~.

Watching this game in real life, not on TV, there is no real Oliver Stone to stand up.

(Select older quotes from file of clippings here and quote them.)

Then, headed "Dallas in Wonderland", with the sub^{h/}head "How Oliver Stone's Version of the Kennedy Assassination Exploits the Edge of Paranoia" George Lardner's expose cum ridicule was the lead story in the ~~Sund~~^{May 19 1991} Sunday Washington Post's Outlook section."

Stone was upset. He demanded an opportunity to respond. First, however, he got his lawyers into the game. Not Shylock, Shylock, Shylock and Henlock but ~~Frankiger~~ Greenberg, Glusker, ^{id} Felds. Claman & Machtinger. Its letterhead list, 84 partners. Its Robert F. Marshall issued an unknown number of threats, reported ^A large number, from coast to coast. Including ~~me~~^{to} the Post and me.

These threats were based on quotation of the script before the movie appeared. To the Post, ~~stanzel~~ to which I'd given the copy I had, Stone declared that I stole it. I didn't. He was careful not to say this - or anything at all - to me. Nor did his of those ~~stanzel~~ 84 Greenberg-to-Machtinger partners, Robert F. Marshall.

The claim, through ^{his} the looking glass, is that Oliver Stone has a right to rewrite the most significant events in our history and under the First Amendment to the hallowed Constitution nobody is allowed to say so until after he has gotten away with it.

Aided and abetted by Marshall and others Stone's half-page of response was printed in the ^{Post's} June 2 Outlook. In it he boasted that ~~his~~ his film "speaks a higher truth," words the Post ^{id} used in its headline.

^{Stone's} "Higher Truth," among other personal self-indictments, is a flaunting of the grossest ignorance of the actualities of the JFK assassination and its investigations.

As a minor example - and a bit past "the edge of paranoia" ~~to~~ he intoned:

"Even today our film is having to rely on bits and pieces of information because the Warren Commission urged that its material be sealed and kept from the public until the year 2039. Even then, the CIA has the option of continuing this censorship until the year 2118. Are the interests of the American public served by waiting this long?"

This deserves and will receive detailed examination but for the moment if we turn our eyes from his looking glass we can see those quarter of a million ~~s~~ pages, hardly "bits and pieces", in my basement, to which he was offered access and did not accept the offer ^{to} nobody doing any work in the field is unaware of this standing offer in any event ^{to} and

There also are

~~these~~ several hundred cubic feet of Warren Commission records it began to transfer to the National Archives as soon as it completed publication. At the archives they were processed for public access with reasonable promptness and "the American public" did not have to wait any longer than the next year, ~~not~~ 1965, ^{Stone's} not 2039, before being able to examine them as they were processed.

(There is need for processing under the laws and regulations that apply to all ranging from preventing government records, ~~to prevent~~ harm to the innocent who can be defamed, ^{and} to avoid intrusion into ongoing or anticipated litigation all the way through the protection of the identification of confidential informants and secret intelligence sources ^{both too} ~~to~~ the often inflated and exaggerated but nonetheless real and necessarily confidential ^{domestic police and} foreign intelligence sources.)

I published facsimiles of this supposedly "sealed" information in all ~~my books~~ ^{my books} the books I published beginning with the very first, the one his own research director, ^{June} ~~June~~ ^{Rusoni,} told me she and he were familiar with and respected ~~as~~ ^{so} much. ^{In his Post article,} Latching himself securely all over again to the Garrison investigation as ^{his} film's ^{vehicle} ~~for~~ to explore the various credible assassination theories," here using that looking glass again for "credibility", ^{Stone} ~~he~~ describes his film as "an entertainment project." No more.

In the very next paragraph in which he has one of his ^(incorrect) readings of my mind without ever having spoken to me, forgetting all that jazz about the "sealing" of all those records until ^{the} ~~to~~ years 2039 or past 2118, he writes that I had "done more harm to the Warren Commission than any other researcher through his persistent Freedom of Information Act suits."

In this he states his knowledge of the existence of the available records to him long before 2039 and his knowledge that he did not have "to rely on bits and pieces of information." ^{Nonetheless, he said it. It served his immediate interest as he saw it, so he said it.}

If in saying his film is no more than entertainment ~~it be taken~~ that he is actually ^{which is what he has been quoted as saying} describing it as fiction, ^{this is what he told the} New Orleans Times-Picayune's "agniappe" movie writer, David ^{ew} ~~Baron~~ in the interview published May 24, 1991, "...I cannot say -

that this is a true story."

In the same interview he said of the very same film, moderating his earlier absolute definitiveness with two words, "we thing", that it is "the larger story, which is why Kennedy was killed, and how we thing it was done and who did it."

Not since Cartoonist Al Capp's Senator Claghorn has any man had as many corners out of which to speak from a single mouth.

As I told him in a letter June 3 letter addressing this article, There is no real Oliver Stone to stand up.

But we do know what he means by "higher truth.!"

he is whatever at any moment strikes him it is in his interest to appear to be.

Note to self- somewhere in what + have he did use the word "fiction" to describe his film. Find and insert it.

And he has gotten away with it. In ^{this} a single interview ^{alone} he told Baron that he can't even say his film is truthful and at the same time that it is non-fiction that will tell the still-sorrowing people ~~wg~~"who" killed their President, "why" and "how."

If there is a real Oliver Stone, then this is he, the man who says anything at any time if at that time he perceives it as serving whatever he ^{then} conceives his immediate interest to be.

This means a man whose word cannot be taken for anything he says or writes.

No other kind of man ~~was~~ would risk the reputation he earned and spend Warner Brothers reported \$40 million buying the rights to Garrison's disgraceful fraud of a book that is really his attempt at rewriting his own history by blaming all his faults and flaws on others, up to and including the CIA. ~~On~~ Contract the right to heap further indignity on the greatest of national tragedies as he commercializes and exploits it by ~~using~~ by adding to Garrison's inventions, distortions and outright, deliberate lies the accumulated ^{Cochran's} nuttiness of two and a half decades of assassination theorizing and then repeating over and over again while also denying it that he is recording ^{true} the history of that great tragedy.

Insert where appropriate

But of all the extraordinarily important factual material, this description to distinguish the official records from the dreams, conjectures, inventions, fabrications and other non-factual material on which Stone depends, those ~~real~~ readily available records he and Garrison both knew I had and both declined to examine, perhaps the one that most advances their unsupported and unsupportable CIA-did-it theories is the statement of their ^{President,} Number 1 villain, Lyndon Baines Johnson, *himself*.

#LBJ

He believed there was a conspiracy and that the CIA was part of it!

In his April 4, 1967, memorandum to Hoover through his channel, the only man between them, Cartha DeLoach, then assistant to the director, wrote Clyde Tolson, Hoover's closest personal friend and his associate director, with copies so few they were directed only to three of the assistant directors, DeLoach reported this.

The memo is on what Jack Anderson had told DeLoach after interviewing Garrison. To it DeLoach added:

In this connection Marvin Watson (longtime friend and close assistant to LBJ) called me late last night and stated that the President had told him, in an off moment, that he was now convinced that there was a plot in connection with the assassination. Watson stated the President felt that the CIA had something to do with this plot. Watson requested ^{that} any further information we could furnish in this connection would be most appreciated by him and the President."(sic)

This conspiracy couple was so wrapped up in dreams and theories and was so ignorant of the fact of the assassination, including the factual evidence that established that there had been a conspiracy, they missed this of several quotations of LBJ's belief that the CIA was involved in ^a the conspiracy that killed JFK!

When as they did they can just make it up, why bother to read official records?

It is easier to say they are suppressed.

Knowing it not to be true, as both did.

There is more to this one of the uncountable illustrations of ^{much, as/} ~~just~~ how Stone wrote, his film incorporates everything that has been discovered..."

Maybe Stone lucked out on this one because it is hard to believe that even the Stone who has made it so clear the kind of person Oliver Stone is could have given either Garrison

or his book a second glance after reading what "Loach reported that Anderson told him of what Garrison ^{said that} told Anderson found "convincing" and with "some authenticity."

*ident /*isp "...the entire assassination plot stemmed from David W. Ferrie, who was the genius who masterminded the whole thing, and with Clay Shaw, who was in the beginning subsidized by the Central Intelligence Agency. ...Lee Harvey Oswald came to the attention of Ferrie and Shaw when Oswald first arrived in New Orleans. [Both] recognized the fact that Oswaldhad ties and background which would lend themselves to gaining easy access to Cuba. Shaw at that point had already been approved by the CIA, through an appropriate cut-out, to engineer a plot that would result in the assassination of Fidel Castro. ...Ferrie and Shaw arranged for Oswald to obtain an office which ~~was~~ formerly ^{had} been rented by an anti-Castro organization. Ferrie and Shaw also conceived the idea of sending Oswald to Mexico in a fake attempt to obtain permission to re-enter the Soviet Union. Garrison, according to Anderson, can prove that Oswald did this merely to establish a good atmosphere so that he could gain ready access to Cuba, ...Oswald became disillusioned and refused to go through with the plot to assassinate Castro. Upon returning to New Orleans from Mexico, Oswald advised both Ferrie and Shaw that he would not go through with their plans. ^{.... then} Shaw and Ferrie conceived the idea (mostly because of the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs) of assassinating President Kennedy. Ferrie and Shaw believed that Oswald could be the 'patsy' and instructed him to go to Dallas for the purpose of the assassination. Garrison has witnesses who will testify that Jack Ruby was the eyes and ears for Ferrie at all times. ...Ruby was definitely in on the plot and was later instructed by Ferrie and Shaw to take care of Oswald. ..."

Not a word of this ~~is~~ is true - not a single word! There isn't even a rational reason even for suspecting that any of it is ^{possible} ~~true~~. Garrison, as was his wont, just made it all up and as soon as ^{he} ~~it~~ did, to him it became instant fact and he was, indeed, persuasive ~~and~~ ^{because} as he did he conned the shrewd and experienced Jack Anderson. Garrison did not have "facts ~~and~~" and he did not have "witnesses" to prove a single word of this gibberish.

Without even attempting to connect Ferrie with the CIA he has Ferrie as "the genius and mastermind of the entire thing ~~and~~" for the CIA. Not even the cheapest of spook

novels would conjecture such utter nonsense about the CIA or any other intelligence agency.

Oswald's known ~~ties~~ ^{ties} and background" were the opposite of what "would lend themselves to gaining easy access to Cuba." In fact, in those days, there was ~~no~~ no such thing as "easy access to Cuba."

~~XXXXXXXX~~ "Ferrie and Shaw arranged for Oswald to obtain ^{an} office ~~which was~~"

They didn't and he didn't.

Garrison is referring to the building since demolished at 544 Camp Street. In his book, pretending to have made a personal investigation, he is 100 percent wrong about what he says about that building.

(Pick up when book is returned and check what follows.)

He has Guy Banister ^{was} ~~for whom~~ in his later inventions he has Oswald working, not but in Banister for Ferrie and Shaw ~~and his office~~ - (the former FBI agent and former third man on the New Orleans Police Department, ^{Banister} who did have a detective agency of sorts, with his office on the ~~second floor~~ and Garrison describes climbing the steps to the second floor ^{from} the Lafayette Street ~~side~~ ^{entrance}.

In fact, Banister's office was on the first floor, with a private entrance, the only entrance to that building from Lafayette Street, and there ~~was~~ were no stairs ~~from~~ from it to anywhere. The ^{stairs} ~~stairs~~ were wide, ~~woodens~~ ~~stairs~~ immediately inside the Camp Street main entrance.

Moreover, Oswald did not "obtain an office." If instead of making up whatever appealed to him at any of his many utterly irrational moments he had used his phone or walked down the corridor from his own office to that of Criminal Sheriff Heyd and had spoke ^N to Sam Newman, who ~~had~~ owned that building, as I did, he would have known that Newman did not rent that office after ^{- a year earlier -} the Cubans moved out, and that Oswald had no office there at all.

Garrison appears to have made this up because on some of his literature that he distributed Oswald stamped the 544 Camp Street address, as I brought to light in Oswald in New Orleans ~~and earlier~~ ^{earlier and}.

At the time Garrison was filling Anderson with all his fabricated nonsense the

man Newman had tending to that building, known only as "Arthur", was living in that two-room office, sleeping in the smaller, inner room.

So much for Garrison^{is} writing in his book that he went there and made a personal investigation speaking to Banister - on the second floor yet!

When Oswald was in Mexico he sought permission to enter Cuba, well known and omitted either by Anderson or by DeLoach. "...sending Oswald to Mexico in a fake attempt to re-enter the Soviet Union" is a ridiculous invention. It was more difficult to get to the Soviet Union via Cuba than ~~almost by any other means~~ ^{from any place in this hemisphere.}. There was about one plane a week, and a Soviet plane at that.

So far as the silliness of Garrison being able to "prove that this was merely to establish a good atmosphere so that he could gain ready access to Cuba" (which did not in any event exist) goes, what actually happened that it did not take Garrison and his alleged witnesses to prove is extraordinarily well known! Oswald was denied a visa on the spot and he started what degenerated into a real ruckus and was denounced and put out by the Cubans in that consulate. "Good atmosphere" indeed!

All of this is quite explicit and beyond question in those 26 volumes Garrison examined repeatedly seeking the conspiracies not in them. He cannot have been unaware of the actualities when he fed that stuff to Anderson.

"Upon returning to New Orleans from Mexico" ^{is} a real doozy. Oswald did no such thing. He went from Mexico ^{to Dallas, not New Orleans.} ~~city from Mexico, and few things are as thoroughly and unquestionably~~ documents, especially in those 26 volumes with which Garrison virtually lived.

So, according to Stone's hero/protagonist Garrison, "Ferrie and Shaw... instructed him to go to Dallas" - from ^{New} Orleans, mind you, where Oswald wasn't - "for the purpose of the assassination."

Some assassination ^{bosses} ~~chiefs~~ in Garrison's quoted version - sending a man there "for the purpose of the assassination" without showing that they then knew that JFK would be there to be assassinated - and that if he were he would be where Oswald would be able to shoot him.

Garrison did not have and could not have had "witnesses who will testify that Ruby was

the eyes and ears for "errie at all times." This means, in this vintage Garrisonia, that Ruby was "the eyes and ears" for "the genius and mastermind of the entire thing."

Ruby, the punk who aspired to be a thug was ^{not} and could not have been anybody's "eyes and ears" for what nobody knew could impend. Of all Garrison's innumerable inventions that are so childishly ridiculous, this is close to taking the cake!

And Garrison himself is the living proof of it.

If he had the "Witnesses who would testify" to this, which made Ruby a key part of the conspiracy he ~~understood~~ charged, why did he not include that in his indictments?

Why did he not produce those "witnesses" to testify at the trial he did have?

To describe this as merely nonsense is to praise it. It is made up in its entirety, without even incompetent witnesses to testify to any of it, the whole schmeer, and Garrison did not produce any such witness when he went to trial.

They do not and never did exist.

It is entirely fabricated and on the basis of what was well known it was stupid to utter a single word of it.

It was, as Garrison certainly had to know, proven to be false when he unloaded it on the very much impressed Anderson.

Stone mis^d more than a chance to invoke LBJ in support of Garrison's and his theory they present as fact, that the CIA conspired to kill JFK.

He mis^d this fine opportunity to avoid ruining the reputation he had earned and is represented by his two scars.

Only time can tell what else it might cost him.

Most ^{pathetic} ~~pathetic~~ of all is that business of sending Oswald to Cuba to assassinate Castro, so well protected that the CIA's innumerable efforts all failed. Oswald knew only a smattering of Spanish and when last he was known to have fired a rifle, ^{accurate} the firing of ^{which} requires regular practise, the Marines certified that he then was a lousy shot. ^{It} Almost penniless in Mexico, what was he going to live on in Cuba? Or pay his fare there?