

Dear Dick,

7/4/91

Don't take time to respond to my question, how would you recommend I be with CNN, as I'll explain.

I don't know whether you or David had time for what I sent on the Langold book or whether it was of any interest but it was no trouble to make the extra copies. I took time to prepare the hasty memos and to annotate the book for history but also for what I will have on file relating to "Agent Oswald?". If you did read those things perhaps you can also see that related to his officially-suppressed exceptionally high security clearances it is at least provocative. More with what else there is and is not known generally. Like the CIA's having extensive files on him prior to the assassination and the allegedly mysterious disappearance of them to which Helms admitted in his HSCA testimony, claiming he could not explain it.

Some of your publishers, like Carroll & Graf, might well, I think, consider what of the excellent writings of some of The Hollywood Ten could find a profitable market today.

Just as I was about to take a nap yesterday, having been up since before 2:30, the CNN producer phoned from Hollywood to postpone the date he'd made for interviewing me, a week from tomorrow, and to explain why. Lardner (who has not yet returned what I'd asked for and he said he'd return) had convinced him he had too much to learn about the assassination. Our conversation lasted about an hour and a half. I think he now sees that to do whatever they do on the Stone movie does not require knowledge of the assassination but rather requires knowledge of Garrison's book (out of print) and of another book Stone says he is using, Carrol & Graf's "Crossfire". Plus as full a collection as he can get of what Stone has said in the past about his movie, not the self-serving irrelevancies he has been getting from Stone's flack.

I was as informative and as open as I could be. While I have no knowledge of how much time is ordinarily invested in such TV news and features now, it does appear to me that they are making a large investment. I think this indicates the intent for it to be major when they air it. (We do not have cable.) What effect, if any, that may have remains to be learned. In part this depends on what they do. But whatever that turns out to be I do think it will add to subject interest.

So also does every Stone twist and turn as he continues to defend himself, each time with a virtuoso display of factual ingobance and disregard for fact and truth - making it up as he goes, in fact. If nothing else he is condemning himself for history. I think he is indifferent to that. One of the more interesting recent ones is his writing a New Orleans paper that Garrison was denied access to the JFK autopsy pictures and X-rays. In fact he went to court to get them I was part of it (Post Mortem, Part II), he won, and the very day he won he abandoned it claiming publicly that it was a CIA conspiracy to entrap him!

Best,

*Harold*