

Foreword (or, Foreword: "Though the Heavens Falls, Let Justice Be Done")

This is a book about Norman Mailer's book on the assassination of President Kennedy, but it is more than that. *finite should (entirely on this?)*

His book is more about himself and others than it is ~~on~~ ^{about} the assassination.

It may well be, as it in every sense richly deserves to be the literary failure of the decade. As the flop it is in every sense it is truly sensational. As a book on the assassination it is a farce of uninhibited ego-indulgence. It tells us nothing new about the assassination ^{or} about the alleged sole assassin, "see Harvey Oswald and what it says is rarely dependable. *often it is false.* When it can be depended upon it tells us nothing that was not long known. Mostly it tells us what is not true and in that it is little more than a regurgitation ^{it is} of books of the same genre. This we see in what I believe is adequate detail.

It is not even what its title represents it is, a book about Oswald. Rather is it ~~what~~, beginning with his preconception, what Mailer wants it believed is the Oswald story. It is more Mailer's story than Oswald's, and what it is of Oswald's ^{story} is Mailer's ^{made up.} rehash of earlier versions that, like his, have no relationship to reality, ^{and what he just}

The only real value this dolorous, ~~is~~ verbose, boring and amateurish ^o ~~time~~ has was not intended by Mailer or his publisher, Random House. That one value is as ^{the} commentary neither had in mind, as commentary of what can and cannot be published about that greatest of national tragedies that had the effect of a coup d'etat. All assassinations of all heads of state have this effect, whether or not that was the design of the assassins.

The Random House publishing empire, which is an empire inside a much larger publishing empire, lavished on this pathetic caricature of a serious work, an unprecedented effort to draw attention to it, to sell it and its content, what it says. If there has ever been this great a failure in advertising and public relations in book publishing I look back on most of ~~more than eighty years~~ ^{this century} and can not think of any.

What is not generally recognized about my work on the assassination, and it is by far the greatest in ~~of~~ volume and scope ~~on~~ the subject, is that in recounting the story of the assassination and its investigations in terms of the official evidence only

an obviously unacceptable "solution" that most people refuse to accept.

Polls taken ^{in 1943} after Random House published Gerald Posner's mistitled Case ~~Closed~~ Closed, after the major advertising and public relations for it, reflected that nine out of every ^{ten} Americans refused to believe ~~that~~ what I have always referred to as the official assassination mythology. Despite this Random House published Mailer's book and made an even greater effort to advertise and promote it. Normally that would not be considered a good or a wise business judgement.

it does this, as no other work does, in terms of the failure of all our basic institutions at the time of the assassination and ever since then.

It is, I believe, a great danger to us that this can and did happen, that when confronted with an actual coup d'etat, if not the first in our history in intent, the only one in what we now regard as the modern world, ~~and our basic institutions suffered~~ ^{as here}

In my NEVER AGAIN! (Carroll & Graf/Richard Gallen, 1995) I report, based on official documents, the government conspiracy on the highest level not to investigate the crime itself. I wrote this seven months after that book appeared. In those seven months I have not had a word of protest ^{or} of complaint from any of those I identify as being party to that conspiracy.

If it is beyond belief that a President could be assassinated and the government he had headed would not, ~~decided~~ ^{conspired} not to investigate that most subversive of crimes in a society like ours, ~~it~~ ^{This} is also beyond question. That is what was decided, that is what ensued, and all of our basic institutions, official and unofficial, combined not to let that be known and to keep it unknown.

This in itself ~~is~~ is a great subversion in our society, as least as it was conceived and created by those I regard as the greatest political thinkers in the world's history, those respectfully, ~~referred~~ ^{if not as often, as} referred to as "our founding fathers."

It was their belief that essential in the new world they created at great ~~and~~ personal risk informing the people fully and truthfully was the most basic need for perpetuating their new kind of society with the new rights and freedoms it created and sought to assure in perpetuity.

To assure this they protected all forms of expression from government.

What they did not visualize- could not, not being able to see the enormous changes the future held for communication with the people or who would control them - is the self-corruption of their brave new world by those who would come to control the means of communicating information to the people.

They did assume that governments would do wrong.

They did not know that and they certainly did not intend that this could and

I later learned that the most conservative Member of this Commission, Senator Richard B. Russell, came to realize that the Members were forced to detail too much to and to have to depend too much on their staff. I report this in some detail for the first time publicly in this book. Earlier, without a word of complaint from anyone, including the all of whom survived - then surviving members and all the Commission's staff lawyers ~~who survived~~ - more than two ^ddecades ago - I encapsulated this in Whitewash IV. That Johnson contrived this is beyond question.

would be kept secret from the people and that there would be-could be- a de facto conspiracy to keep the truth from the people.

The people who in their ^{revolutionary} theory would control the government.

Lyndon Baines Johnson, who became President by this ~~case~~ assassination alone, again as I detail in NEVER AGAIN!, appointed a commission of the most eminent to investigate and report on that crime. He selected those who were too heavily committed to other responsibilities, with one exception, to begin to think of ~~doing~~ doing the work, of assuming the responsibilities he saw to it they had little choice but to accept. 3A

It is without precedent in our history that the majority party created a body overwhelmingly of the minority party, but Johnson did that, ^{too.} Five of his seven Commissioners were Republicans. The two Democrats were not political supporters of President Kennedy.

This assured that no Republicans would be able to disagree with what the Commission Johnson appointed would conclude. The absence of any ^{political} ^(of President Kennedy) ~~(supporter)~~ among the minority of Democrats assured that they would not seek to point the investigation in any direction other than decided by the majority.

That commission began, as I document in my earlier books with the initially-suppressed official evidence, with the intent of telling the people that there had been no conspiracy, that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin. At no point and in no way did the Commission ever think or work other than under ^{this} ~~(its~~ beginning preconception.

It began determined to ordain Oswald the lone assassin and despite its own evidence that it could not help developing that proved its preconception to be impossible, that is what it concluded.

That the majority of this Commission were members of the political party that opposed President Kennedy and that its tiny minority of two of the seven members from his party were not his supporters was not secret yet the media whose responsibility is to ^{in form} ~~inform~~ the people did not report this, complain about it or interpret it for the people.

When this Commission decided to proceed^c in the most complete secrecy that also led to no complaint by the media. Had there been a trial of Oswald that would have been ~~entirely~~ entirely in public. There was no legitimate need for secrecy of any kind. There was, in fact, every reason for all proceedings to be entirely public so that there would never be any basis for not believing ~~it~~ what it would conclude.

The media did not complain and, in fact, it went so far as to not tell the people how unusual, how very wrong this was. *4/14/68*

Eventually the Commission published the transcripts of the testimony it took.

This alone proves there was no need for secrecy - other than to hide the fact that the Commission, like the FBI before it, never investigated and never intended to investigate the crime itself. *not it, almost always was really* This really means to protect the Commission from its deliberate, intended intent to do wrong, its intent not to do what it was appointed to do. And in plain English that means to perpetrate a fraud upon the people and upon our history when its sacred obligation was to investigate and report on the coup d' ~~etat~~ etat that the assassination of President Kennedy was.

As the media accepted the wrongful composition of this Commission without a peep of protest, without even reporting on it; as it accepted the very wrong Commission ~~decision~~ decision to proceed entirely in secrecy and did that without complaint of any kind; as it did not let the people know that during its life the Commission denied access to the stenographic transcripts of the testimony it took and its exhibits allegedly in ~~its~~ support of that testimony, so also was it without complaint when the Commission issued its ~~the~~ Report.

Instead of giving that Report the careful consideration and analysis required of our media so that the people could know the truth - the truth it was Constitutionally protected so that it could report that truth - the media, without a single exception, joined in ^h ~~its~~ ^{not} ~~de facto~~ conspiracy to let ~~to~~ ^{know the truth} the people about that assassination. *about the coup d'etat* all of the media combined in this even though there is no reason to believe that there was any meeting to decide to support the official conclusions.

It was automatic- spontaneous.

Because any assassination of any president ~~is~~ under our political system ~~is~~
~~in fact~~ is inevitably a coup d'etat, asking no questions about that, not even mentioning
 it leave alone analyzing it, became a de facto part of that coup d'etat.

Then there was the possibility that the ^{ass}assassination was an intended coup d'etat.

Much of the world, especially in Europe, believed that.
 Our medi^a ridiculed that, ^{help} again as though ordered to, with ~~that completeness~~.

From the time presidential candidates were selected at party conventions, each
 of them selected to run with him ^{one} a man who could appeal to a different part of the
 electorate, ^{one} a man of different political beliefs and programs.

Would-be presidents get no assistance in elections from those who espouse the
 same beliefs. They select as their would-be vice presidents those who can appeal to
 that part of the electorate to whom they ^{presidential candidate} have little or no appeal.

That any official proceeding was conducted in such ~~extreme~~ total secrecy
 was in itself enough to cause the deepest media suspicion. The media ^{provides} ~~prizes~~ itself
 on not accepting improper secrecy and it had often gone to court to protect its
 right to report what had been kept secret, The Pentagon Paper for one ^{example}, ~~and it~~
~~to open to it secret judicial proceedings~~. When the ^{california} court was considering banning the

television coverage of the sensational murder trial of O.J.Simpson, the star athlete
 who in the end was acquitted of murdering his former wife and a man believed to have
 been a friend of hers, even though the media was permitted to continue to be present in
 the courtroom and to report on a pool basis, ~~with so relatively few who wanted to be~~
~~present in the court room able to be there~~, even though there would not have been a
 secret proceeding, even though the media would have been able to report the ^{bully} trial, it ^{hired}
^{and} sent counsel to represent it before that judge and to assure that all of it would have
 access ^{to the trial} by the TV camera already installed in the courtroom and already telecasting
 those proceedings.

Yet when a President was assassinated the media accepted total secrecy and a
 total inability to report what the evidence was ^e as it was adduced.

(in the proceedings of the Warren Commission.)

There was no need for any secrecy. There was no reason given for it. But the media that would have howled had it been any other kind of proceeding was entirely silent. It accepted a secret proceeding as though that were as right as in fact it ^was so very ^wrong.

With all knowledge denied the media and with it, atypically, having conducted no independent investigation of its own, the media had no way of knowing if the Commission was conducting a whitewash or a cover-up, to use my title and one of my ^ysubtitles. It had no way of knowing whether there had been in fact an intended coup d'etat that the Commission was covering up or ~~one~~ that it was refusing to investigate.

The media's acceptance of this situation ^{(was itself unprecedented. It made} ~~made it~~ ^{own media} pretty much like Hitler's or Stalin's media, content to ~~see~~ accept what it was told, content to report the official truth that might well not have been the truth and in this case, as is now beyond any reasonable question, was not the truth.

With Lyndon Johnson automatically the President made President by the assassination, the assassination was not a coup from the ^{left} ~~right~~.

This alone meant that if there had been a conscious effort to overthrow one government and install another one, with the media silent about that and content to accept it, ~~that~~ the media itself was content with what ~~was~~ would have been a conscious move to create a more authoritarian government by the assassination.

This would have meant that we had had a revolution and the media had accepted that possibility in utter and abject silence.

^{This} ~~That~~ has been the effect of the assassination of President Kennedy.

Without his assassination, the great love and respect the people had for him got to be manifested in so many ways, it is clear that Richard Nixon would not have been President. And that he would not have been able to select Gerald Ford to succeed him. The Ford who had been a member of the Warren Commission and ^d could not get elected in his own right.

Nor is it at all likely that those who followed would or even could have been President.

The political situation ~~that~~ made the election of Ronald Reagan possible would not have existed and he would not have been able to in effect appoint his successor, the George Bush who had headed the ~~the~~ CIA in silence for those years ^{about} of its seeking to fix more authoritarian governments on other countries, the George Bush who had belittled what Reagan promised the country as "voodoo economics" and then practised them himself. The combinat^{com}e of the two of them who in twelve years more than trebled ^{all} the ~~total~~ debt incurred by all those many presidents who had preceeded them.

All to the refrain dutifully and totally unquestionably ^{ing} reported by the media, the Republican claims that it was th~~re~~democrats who were the "tax and spend" party.

This hardly encapsulates the totality of the media abdication when the President as killed, the totality of its failing to meet its obligations so ~~obviously~~ quintessential in a country like ours ^{that} after the assassination, too.

This was stunning to me when it happened virtually the moment of the assassination and it continued stunning when it did not change. Perhaps that effect was exaggerated on me because of my background beginning as a reporter and including as a professional intelligence analyst for the government ^{as part of its effort to} so it could understand what happened in other countries.

This
 And all media components were part of this spontaneous de facto conspiracy to deny the people the truth.

There is nothing in our history that is so completely opposed to all basic American concepts.

But it was total.

There was no element of the ^{major} media that did not conform to this spontaneous conspiracy not to tell the people the truth. *5A-c here*

The Commission issued its Report in September, 1964. It issued the alleged support for its Report two ^{1/2} months later. That support was of twenty-six large volumes of testimony and of documents ~~and~~ of various kinds, including pictures and a few charts. The media's enthusiastic and unquestioning endorsement of the Report was equalled by its unquestioning endorsement of the Commission's massive appendix to its Report.

Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report ^{ed. volumes}
 I wrote the first book on the Commission and its work. What I wrote is based entirely on that Report and its appendix. There is no theory of any kind in it, as there is not in anything I've published since then. Although the assassination of any President and its official investigation would ordinarily be considered to be of greatest news value, the first book on them ordinarily expecting the same kind of ^{welcomes} reception, I had more than a hundred international rejections for that book ~~before~~ ^{- without a single adverse critical comment -} before I decided to publish it myself. It was completed by the middle of February 1965. That was only five months after the Report appeared, three months after those ⁴ twenty-six volumes were published. That first book remains the basic book on the assassination and its investigations. It is used in college and university teaching. It is cited in many if not most of the books written on both extremes (but not by Mailer). It's not a single newspaper reviewed it.

Not one! *Q This despite the fact that*

Although it was the first book written about that most serious, most subversive of crimes in a society like ours. At least as like ours is supposed to be.

I've published seven more books on that assassination and its investigations and not one of them was reviewed by any major component of the media.

In the ^{more than} three decades since my Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report

Staff book reviewers know this.

Compare this monolithic refusal to review books of fact that endured without complaint about their ~~his~~ fairness and accuracy with what is said later about the Washington Post and its adulating review of this Mailer trash. ^{what / wrote about it}

In 1966 the Post's then staff reviewer read and wrote a ^{favorable} review of Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report, the first book on the subject. The paper's editors killed it.

In 1995 when I offered ~~two~~ copies of NEVER AGAIN! to several Post reporters not one wanted it. They knew they could not write about it.

I wrote the staff book reviewer and asked him not if he would review it but if he would read it if I sent him a copy. ~~He~~ ^H did not want it.

appeared, not a single one of the hundreds and hundred of those of whom I have written critically has written or phoned to complain that I wrote of him unfairly or in any way inaccurately. Rare as this endorsement is, it was added to by the Department of Justice and the FBI. ^H ~~They~~ told the federal district court for the District of Columbia in one of my Freedom of Information lawsuits, Civil Action (CA) 75-226 ~~that~~ twenty years ago that I am "more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's ^{assassination} than anyone now employed by the FBI."

Could there be a more authoritative accrediting of any work than this?

Not only was it not news when it happened, it led to no reviews of the books I had by then published or published thereafter.

If one might ordinarily expect books publishers to seek out and publish books that have this rarest of credentials ^{awarded} by the most authoritative of officialdom, it did not happen.

This adds, I believe, to what is reflected in the refusal of book publishers to publish the first book on the subject. It tells us what is and is not publishable about this most dangerous and ^d most subversive of crimes in our country.

There is a monolithic refusal to publish the actual fact about the assassination and its investigations, the fact that is the ^{actual} official fact.

Without the book publishers getting together and conspiring to see to it that the people would not have access to that official fact and to its meaning. *GA here*

It is, I believe, more dangerous to us, more deeply subversive, for this to be the present norm in book publishing than if it resulted from an actual conspiracy by them.

Compare ~~it~~ this with the attention in all the media, the unprecedented attention that ~~is~~ greeted Mailer's tome that in its better moments is merely trash.

It is hardly possible than many Americans have not been subjected to his corruption of our tragic history, all intended to coax the people into buying and reading it, all telling them ^{to believe} what he said in ^{boning} his tome that is contrary to the readily available official information that has been so determinedly and so totally mis-

represented by all the media.

The worse the book - and this is true of both extremes - the more the people are told about it and the more they are encouraged to buy and read it and be misled and misinformed by it.

It was this reality that, combined with the limitations imposed upon ^{me} by age and its infirmities and by the number of serious medical problems I have been fortunate to survive that led me several years ~~ago~~ ago to begin writing ~~what~~ what has grown into a very large work with the working title, Inside the JFK Assassination Industry. This work, as a record for our history, the nonpublishing history of responsible, truthful and factual reporting on the assassination and its investigations being as firmly established as it is, addresses and reports on both of the extreme sides of the controversy ² that has existed about the assassination and books supposedly about it.

However, ^{in late 1993} when Random House published Gerald Posner's mistitled Case Closed, a book of the most cunningly conceived dishonesty, I decided that particularly because of the major effort Random House was making to propagandize the country and much of the world with it, it was worthy more attention than a chapter or two in a very large book. Case

^{open} About ^a ~~in~~ three-quarters of what I wrote was published in early in April, 1994 ~~in~~ (Carroll & Graf/Richard Allen). ~~Case Open~~ What was eliminated from it, consistent with this long history was the major part of that book in which I addressed Posner's contrived and dishonest prosecutor-type brief as a defense lawyer would have. In what was butchered out was my mustering of the official evidence to do what had not been done before, to exculpate Oswald, as without any question at all, that ^{misrepresented} official evidence does do.

Using Posner's own publisher's definition of the words I called him both a plagiarist and a shyster. I documented this in what was published. Without a word of complaint by him or by Random House. I referred to him as a writer who has ^{trouble} telling the truth even by accident and when in August, 1994 his book was reprinted in paperback he made no effort to refute this or anything else ^{the} said about him. In fact, with a slight ^{wrote} addition he ~~made~~ ^{what I had written} for the paperback he proved that even by accident the truth is beyond him.

In book publishing this is ordinarily news but on this subject it ~~is~~ ^{was} not.

I know of no single review of Case Open, no single mention in any of the media of what I said, without contradiction or protest, about Posner, his book or his publisher, who is also Mailer's publisher.

So, when Mailer's ^{in many more words} amateurish retreading of the essence of what Posner said was issued by Random House and with its publication launched an even more massive campaign to sell it ~~and~~ and to communicate its lies, deceptions and misrepresentations to an even larger percentage of Americans, I decided to ~~write~~ use that to add to the documentation for our history of the continuing and determined ~~refusal~~ ^{refusal} of all of the media, not of book publishers alone, not only to refuse to meet ~~their~~ ^{its} obligations but of ~~its~~ ^{its} ~~their~~ continuing to mislead and ~~misinform~~ ^{misinform} misinform the people - to perpetuate the official assassination mythology.

That is what this book manuscript is ~~intended~~ ^{do believe do} to be and I think ~~is~~ ^{is}.

It is a book on Mailer's book but it is more than ~~than~~ that.

As I did with Posner's book, I use Mailer's to tell more of the story of the assassination and ~~of~~ ^{of} its investigations. I use his distortions and misrepresentations to report the actualities. I use his lies to tell the truth. The truth from published and, overall, document more of the failure of all of our basic institutions when the President was assassinated and ever since then.

and publicly-available official sources, ^{was} that was readily available to all, including Mailer and that Mailer and the others ignored, ~~we~~ were too ignorant to know or knew and then suppressed or lied about.

With Mailer there is this difference and it is a very big difference: he is the most honored of modern ^A American writers. For his earlier work he was awarded two Pulitzer prizes. Being awarded one is rare enough but he got two of them.

That puts him ~~a~~ in a ^{special} category in which he is all alone.

Let also, I believe, imposed added and greater responsibilities on him as a writer and as an American.

One is not to belittle the ^o importance and value of that highest of American

literary honors. Another is not to exploit it and to use it ^{not to misuse} ~~improperly, to use it to~~ ~~accredit~~ dishonest work that ^{also} ~~is~~ otherwise serio^ysly faulted.

Mailer also exceeded the not inconsiderable excesses of those of like mind and as preconception ~~and~~ this book sets forth, ~~some~~ of it in considerable detail and length.

History should record ~~that~~ ^{this} ~~as~~ ^{so} I do that.

~~Mailer~~ Mailer did not in his long literary life distinguish himself with good taste. ~~Although~~ the ancient Romans had ~~it~~ right in believing De Gustibus non Disputandum est, and as a generality it is true, that in matters of taste there is no dispute, "that is not always ~~a~~ true is in all matters of taste. ~~Some are~~ ^{so} so disgusting they cannot be accepted. We examine several of ~~these~~ ^{Mailers'} that by any reasonable concepts are disgusting.

There is also that other wisdom of those ancient Romans, what they said that our lawyers are so ~~prone to~~ prone to prate, many of them prating it loudly because it is not their desire, their record, their intent, "Though the heavens fall, let justice be done."

As with all sayings, this one is also subject to misuse.

I believe it is not misused as applied to the assassination, its investigations and to what is written about them. I believe it is not misused in applying it to Mailer and his book.

So, Norman Mailer, though the heavens falls, this justice to you!

And to our history!