

Editor,
Washington City Paper
724 Ninth St., NW
Washington, D.C.

11/24/91

Dear Editor,

If I had had the remotest notion when Alex Heard phoned me that he and you would trivialize the JFK assassination and all criticism of the official "solution" to it I would not have wasted the time I did talking to him.

He gave me no indication at all that you intended other than a serious treatment.

He did not send me a copy but someone else did.

As soon as I read it I wrote the enclosed.

I ask that you publish it in a gesture at fairness to the subject matter and your readers.

You have every right to publish whatever you want to publish but I do not think that this extends to misleading those whose time you take in interviews.

Not telling me you intended anything at all like what you published and leading me to believe quite the opposite did mislead me.

Thus in my view you made me part of something indecent -unclean -without letting me decide whether or not I want to be part of it.

Had I known I would not have been.

If this reflects what you think of your readers I am sorry for them.

As I am for you with what this reflects of your judgement and taste.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

The City Paper is unique in its commemoration of the 28th anniversary of the JFK assassination, ^{trivializing and} making a farce of it and of all criticism of ^{its} the official mythology.

However, Alex ~~Har~~ Heard, paraphrasing "friendly, bearded, veteran journalist"

Jim Marrs, pays me a high compliment that I cherish more because if only by suggestion he separates me and my (unmentioned, undescribed) work from the ^h ~~mish~~ mash of gibberish to which the paper ^e ~~devotes~~ all that space:

"Theorywise, he (I) comes up short."

~~ament~~ "Short?" "I'm not there at all!"

Heard endorses Marrs' work and opien opinions for all the world as though either he or Marrs had the remotest notion of whether or not they deal with reality. From this article neither does. But I knew that about Marrs earlier, from his book.

As ^{side} from the friendly portrait of him ^{Heard tells you} and ~~later~~ telling his readers "you really should read all of it to judge Marrs' evidence (sic) on its merit (ugh!)."

Marrs' book, Heard says, is the result of "almost ~~2~~ 30 years of research."

This is also what ^{to use it} Oliver Stone says to explain his buying the right to supplement his movie ostensibly on the assassination, ~~but~~ titled "J.F.K." (never let it be said that Stone misses any exploitation or commercialization) ^{and} yet based ^{Jim} on Garrison's ^{fictional self-justification} "On the Trail of the Assassins." I know of personal knowledge that is the one trail ^{Garrison} never took.

In its normal meaning as used by normal people, research relates to facts, to actualities, to what is real. Heard, who uses it often to describe the motley assortment of zanies to whom his lengthy article is dedicated and their ~~work~~ "work," abuses the word and the trust of his readers.

Of course theories can also be the subject of research but only ~~if~~ those theories are based on fact. There is a considerable volume of uncontestable fact about the assassination in those 250,000 once-withheld pages of government records I got by a series of FOIA lawsuits to which Heard makes passing reference. But Marrs, of whom we have no record of his getting any of my seven books, which are entirely devoted to fact and are entirely devoid of assassination mythology dignified by calling it "theories," has not asked for access to them or for a single page from them.

In this he is like Oliver Stone, who bought the rights to Marrs' compendium of all the assassination nuttiness - ~~and not a single thing else~~ - to amplify Garrison's fantasy in which he ^{doesn't} ~~can't~~ even tell the truth about himself. Stone has proclaimed from the first - and I quote him from an article of two months after he knew the truth, which means that he knew exactly how untruthful what he said was, "We~~h~~ added the researches of about 28 years atop Jim."

(In earlier versions, including after the Washington Post's completely accurate expose of his fraud and deception, he said he used ^{Stone} ~~everything~~ "that came to light. But ^{his} ~~everything~~ ~~did not include~~ ~~in not asking to see~~ any of my quarter of a million pages ~~he was avoid exposing himself,~~ ^{Instead he stated repeatedly} ~~because he also~~ ^{and obviously falsely} persisted in declaring that "all" the governments records were suppressed until at least the year 2039.)

In the normal sense of ^{"research" is understood} ~~the word as used~~ by normal people ^{and is used} ~~by~~ normal writers ^{with} ~~who~~ ^{relates to fact and truth} have normal purposes, ~~like informing their readers,~~ Heard's use of the word "research" to describe the concoctions of those who regard fact as an impediment and shun it like the plague, is like the word "love" in the mouth of a whore.

As is Stone's use of "honesty" in his denunciation of those who without any exception ^{only accurate and fair} of which I know levelled ~~any~~ criticism of him: reporters "should go back to school ^{and} to learn honesty." This is not only in the text, ^{it} is in the bold-faced, fourline subhead ^{at} page 25.

Heard, who knew of my FOIA litigation and its ~~yield~~ ^{yield} and that I'd published six books of fact, without a single ~~theor~~ "theory," prepares his read ^{er} ~~for his~~ plug of Marrs' fictions by telling ^{them} his readers that those who made up all that the government did not itself invent ^{the ones} are those "who have done the digging."

(Marrs is like these penny-dreadful authors who, when they ^{did} not avoid some fact, ^{took} ~~take~~ ^(omitted) it from others. In Marrs' case he did not shun direct plagiarism from "High Treason.")

So, having vested his and City Paper's integrity in it, what is Heard really recommending in telling your readers that "you really should read all" of Marrs' book?

Marrs' garbage collection extends to 625 pages. It would take more time than a doctoral thesis to list and be truthful about each malodorous bit, but a fair ^{illustrations that follow is} ~~smpling~~ ^{is} ~~readily~~ available, ~~typical~~ and informative. One of the two ~~samples~~ ^{illustrations that follow is} I have selected is a fair

an account:

reflection of Marrs as a "veteran journalist." The other illuminates the ^{dark}gossiness of his ignorance and his contempt for ^{his}the reader.

He cribbed Penn Jones, Jr.'s list of "mysterious deaths," ^{which are not at all sinister} and in amplifying it enormously retitled it "Convenient Deaths." ^{Marrs}He still means that they are somehow mysterious, somehow sinister, ^{Other words that have neither meaning nor relevance} to close mouths. ^{And} ^{most}he has more than eight pages of them.

No matter that by his own admission ^{most}they come from "natural causes," with separate listings of such spook dirtywork as "heart attack" and "cancer."

Of William Whaley he says ^{Whaley's}his importance is that he was the "Cabdriver who reportedly drove Oswald to Oak Cliff." Cause of death? "Motor Collision (the only cab driver to die on duty)" It is comforting to know that from the time Dallas got its first cab until Marrs wrote his book only one cab driver died "on duty."

What this "veteran journalist" ^{of}does not say is a word about that collision so widely believed to have been arranged by the CIA - and for what other ~~was~~ reason would Marrs list him?

Whaley was killed in a headon collision ~~on a divided highway~~ when struck by a car driven by an 82-year old man - who was driving the wrong way on ~~it~~ ^{a divided highway.}

Maybe "ones and Marrs know what I do not, that the CIA has 82-year old kamikazis, but has it perfected the science ^{in its demons} required to know when Whaley would be where and for its kamikazi not only to be at the right place and at the right time, but also able to either avoid all other vehicles or be ^{able} able to elude them?

From kamikazis to "Electrocution," the "cause of death" ^{of Philip Geraci whose greater than average significance Marrs denotes with an asterisk.} of Philip Geraci whose greater than average significance Marrs denotes with an asterisk. ^{Geraci's importance Marrs}Of ~~this~~ ^{he}he says, "Friend of Perry Russo, told of Oswald/Shaw conversation."

Not a word of this is true ^{and that} and this "electrocution" ^{are}was so very important that Marrs does not mention Geraci's name in his 600 plus pages.

Confusion is not unusual in this book Heard urges your readers to read. In this instance that dubious report, ^{which was} of more than merely Shaw and Oswald ^{merely}talking, was given to ^{who presented it to}Garrison and the jury, which did not believe it, by an addict, Vernon Bundy, who confessed he was taking his fix when he allegedly saw this ["]conversation."

"Veteran journalist" that Marris is (take Heard's word for it) he is ~~is a~~ dependable reporter ~~Marris~~ does not trouble his reader with the knowledge that ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ at the time of the assassination there were three philip Geracis in the New Orleans ~~are~~ area.

Not that this ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ in any way diminshes ^{Marris'} ~~this~~ book. Nothing can.

One was an electrician who ~~killed himself~~ ^{did electrocute} in an indistrial accident.

But can this mean anything unless that particular Philip Geraci has some, no matter ^{or ten years} how contrived, a connection with the assassination?

I knew him and his wife. He ~~didn't~~. ^{had no connection at all. A Bill who son also was killed.}

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Geraci XIII, and his friend, not Perry Russo but Vance~~ ^{Blalock,} ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Warren Commission witnesses.~~ ^{with}

If Marris were not so ignorant of and indifferent to established fact about the assassination that is beyond question, so enamored of the vapid ^{of} conspiracy theories he seeks to will into the reality they do not ^{and cannot} have, he would have known that Philip Geraci III (and his friend, who ^{is} ^{is} not Perry Russo but Vance Blalock) was a Warren Commission witness.

Philip Geraci III, a boy at the time of the assassination, ignored three grand jury ~~XXXXXX~~ ^{XXXXXX} subpoenas issued by Garrison. ^{When he was 21, and he did} ~~But~~ he did agree to be interviewed by me. The Garrison was entirely indifferently when he was offered something solid to go on. His story, confirmed by his mother ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and in the presence of the stunned family lawyer, whose presence I had insisted upon, led to two other Warren Commission witnesses, one ^{of} ~~whom~~ was a schoolmate of Lee Harvey Oswald and ^{a friend of the supposedly mysterious} ~~of~~ ^{it was the} David Ferrie, and is the ~~one~~ who recruited Oswald into the CAP in which Ferrie had been active. The other, ~~by~~ ^{by} Geraci's testimony, supported by his mother, was a perjurer.

There is more I do not go into piecemeal but what a truly "veteran reporter" this shows Marris to be!

And what a demon investigator Stone's hero, Jim Garrison!

^{This is a mere peek at}
The authors of the two books on which Stone boasts he bases his movie, the movie he repeated over and over ~~again~~ ^{again} (how could ~~Heard~~ ^{Heard} have missed this, too?) would record their "history" for the people and ^{who} should tell them "who" killed their President, "why"

and how."

"his is what Warners advanced \$40 million dollars for!

I wonder how much they would give for the Brooklyn Bridge?

After ~~the~~ reading ^{Heard's} ~~this~~ demeaning of ^{this} ~~that~~ great ~~trage~~ tragedy that at great length tells the reader ^{about it or} nothing about Oliver Stone and his movie (except, of course, that they ^{Heard praises / lit alone of the books} really should go out and buy and read a monstrous disinformation ^{praised so highly} this making of a farce of that tragedy and pretending to the reader that the only available literature is of theories ~~and that they~~ each of which is disinformational ^{albeit} when ^{by} represented, as Stone ~~has represented~~, as the actual history, in Heard's words quoted from Marris, "have proved the basic facts" with "theories" yet! - I am perplexed.

~~XXXX~~ At 78 I see a young fogie ^{inb} deceiving and mislead those who turn to the alternative press for what they do not get from the major media.

What other need is there for any alternative press?

Your readers can learn more ^{about the assassination} by reading the Warren Report. It does hold some truth.

On his part, ^{perhaps} Oliver Stone will mislead more people than the Warren Report because to begin with about half did not believe it and in the most recent poll more than three-quarters didn't.

~~And~~ ^{as} in this miserable scribbling you ~~have~~ encouraged your reader to go out and get their minds ripped off along with their pockets!

I'm not at all displeased that you omitted ^{as "useful"} my six books on the Kennedy assassination among those you describe as "useful." One is a novel, ~~and~~ I prefer no association at all with some of the others.

Can you see why I'm pleased after reading this that Heard and Marris believe and say that theorywise I come up short?

You said it all, about yourselves, at least, in saying that because I have restricted myself to fact, to study of all those documents dealing with realities of one kind or another, I am "unable to see the entire mosaic."

Your and Marris' "mosaics" and Stone's to come protect those ^{errant} officials who failed to meet their public obligations. You will convince sane readers that all criticism of the official mythology is worse than the "junk" that I called it ~~and it is~~.