

odds and ends to be inserted

There is an old saying, "the stuck pig<sup>a/</sup> squeals." Beginning with the Washington Post's exposure of Stone's use of Garrison's book as the basis for his movie despite its dishonesties, ~~and~~ innumerable errors and outright lies, Stone squealed<sup>a/</sup> in his own defense ~~to~~ <sup>tr</sup> that papers and to other publications and through his lawyers.

They claimed in their <sup>May 22, 1991</sup> letter ~~to me~~ <sup>me</sup> that "the script is a confidential property" and "a protectable trade secret" and that even my having a copy of the script is "illegal."

They claimed also that "any use or disclosure of the contents of the script" was hurtful to Stone (Emphasis added)

In another such letter of which I have knowledge this was made stronger, that even a short use of the script could ruin the movie. <sup>That</sup> ~~this~~ was accompanied by a more forcefully expressed legal threat than the one I received.

When it serves Stone's purposes he does state for publication what the script of his movie will say and do, quoted elsewhere. If he discloses what is "confidential" that does not hurt him or his movie but if anyone else does, of course, that hurts.

Jeff Flach (right), referred to by Laura Miller as Stone's <sup>(in D Magazine)</sup> "location ~~production~~ manager" in Dallas since July, 1990, has been <sup>script</sup> giving "secrets" away. When it served Stone's interest.

Faced with public complaints that, in Miller's words, "Stone plans to recreate that splendid political atmosphere that prevailed here <sup>m/</sup> <sup>[in Dallas]</sup> back then - the one that encouraged people to spit on Lyndon Johnson and attack Adlai Stevenson and place hateful, sneering full-page ads" denouncing JFK as a villain <sup>and traitor</sup> the day he was assassinated, "'Flach', Miller reports, "'says that will be quickly forgotten once we get to the part where Lee Harvey Oswald doesn't kill Kennedy'."

"his should surprise <sup>many</sup> ~~most~~ American, a movie of the "history" of that assassination in which Oswald is not <sup>an</sup> assassin. Which is, of course, the exact opposite of what Garrison did. He charged Oswald with being part of the conspiracy that did kill JFK, and Stone's book is based on Garrison's movie.

So, according to Stone's ~~to~~ Flach, how does Stone, allegedly, anyway, take the hate out of his movie?

Miller continues: "Flach says, 'by taking Oswald out of the picture you take that away

from Dallas, and it's no longer the kook from Dallas who killed Kennedy'."

No matter that it still happened in Dallas, that Oswald didn't place those virulent hate ads or spit on Johnson or attack Stevenson.

"Taking Oswald out of the picture?"

And still produce a movie giving the people the "history" of that tragedy?

Aside from the fact that this would appear to be a big secret and when Stone's man say it there is no hurt, only when someone else says something about the script is there hurt, how can there be a movie with "Oswald out of the picture?"

Isn't that like China without tea?

With Stone et al not necessarily.

As Stone is so facile in saying opposites about the same thing, depending on what he thinks his need is when he says it, so can his Flach be speaking figuratively.

But he has given away ~~on~~ part of the supposedly "confidential" script disclosure of any part of which hurt's Stone and his movie, *according to Stone and his lawyers.*

When that is convenient for him to ~~allege~~ say.

What it amounts to, however, is that Stone can get extensive national and international attention for his assurances that his movie will record "history" and that it will tell the people "who" killed their President, "why" and "how" and if it is all fiction, as it assuredly will be, nobody can say a word about it until it is too late, until after his movie is in theaters all over the country misleading and misinforming all who pay to see it.

Well, Hollywood is Hollywood, Stone is Stone, he says lies are truth and what is not so is so, what did not happen is what did happen and nobody can say a word about it.

Now if he had not already said that he is recording history, the actualities, and is being specific about the how, who and why; if he has said from the outset, as soon as he started promoting this scam coinciding with his promotion of his movie "Doors", that it was all a work of fiction, that would be one thing. *different. Entirely different.* As a movie on a novel he has that right - to say anything he wants to say, no matter how outrageous and false it may be.

But he did not! He said the exact opposite!

As he did when his "Born on the Fourth of July" appeared, when he told the Los Angeles Times, "I'm not screwing with the facts." (quoted from Dallas Times Herald 2/28/90)

By "JFK" he is "screwing with the facts." And skewing those he does not screw.

And at the same time he asserts that nobody can say a word about it.

Stone is a Johnny-Come-Lately to the understanding that the assassination of President Kennedy turned the country and the world around. (Not that you'd know even this from his self- and movie-promotions.)

He is owed nothing for his commercializing and exploitation of his belated understanding that comes just when he is looking for another "vehicle" to make him greater wealth because he belatedly came to an understanding and is running wild with it.

He has no right to demand that he be immune from any criticism until there is little or no point in that criticism.

No matter how he seeks to fudge it over, this is precisely what he claims - immunity in the rewriting of American history, not as fiction but as non-fiction.

Are he and his lawyers rewriting the Constitution while he is rewriting history?

Have they wiped the First Amendment out in wiping out the actualities of the JFK assassination and its investigations?

I raised this question with him in a lengthy letter on June 2, 1991.

he did not respond.