

IV. *Mailer, The KGB's Dostoyevsky*

Oliver Stone's ^{mass} ~~mass~~ hit, the movie JFK was, an instant threat to Mailer's coming Ossald's Tales. Mailer therefor was as critical of it as he dared be in his seven-page article in the Vanity Fair dated February, 1992.

Magazines are distributed prior to their date of issue. And JFK was not in the theaters until the end of 1991, Mailer therefore wrote his piece no later than as soon as the movie appeared. Because in his article Mailer wondered whether JFK would be the hit it became immediately there is reason to believe that Mailer rushed this article, unlike his books (which gestate longer than the elephants most are in size) to ~~be~~ be able to influence reaction go it as much ^{as} he could with the written word,

Vanity Fair's title for Mailer's story is of black capital letters an inch high:

FODIFALLS
IN THE CRYPT (center both lines)

Under ^{is} it/Mailer's name, just as black and not quite as large.

Beneath Mailer's name is a photograph of the Presidential limousine taken from the south side of Elm Street looking toward the Grassy knoll. ^(, in the small type used in the story,) The caption reads, "President Kennedy slumps forward, mortally wounded."

This sets the tone faithfully: it is in error, error well known to anyone who has made any study at all of ~~the~~ either the assassination or the pictures taken during it. At that point the President, who had been mortally wounded only an instant before the picture was snapped, was, as the ^{even} the picture itself makes clear, not slumping forward. He was falling over onto his wife Jackie, who was to his left side. He did not ^{slump} "slump" or fall "forward."

Consistent with this display of ignorance, contempt for fact or both is what next ~~file~~ follows follows in smaller headline-size type:

"Oliver Stone's new movie, JFK, has something to alienate every ^{one} ~~body~~, from Establishment theorists to the gamut of conspiracy buffs...."

Many millions of ^{most by far} Americans were not in any way alienated. And Mailer's "gamut of conspiracy buffs" rather than being alienated by the movie, were enthusiastic about it.

One ^{of} person known as a critic of the official mythology was critical of ~~it~~ the movie. He was not "alienated" and he is not a buff but a recognized expert. He is

From Mailer's article itself, from what it says and does not say, for the very, very little it contains about the movie itself, the case can be made that Mailer ~~wrote this article~~ ^{criticize the movie} without having seen ~~the movie~~ ^{it}. If this is so it puts him in the position that would be strange for most writers, if not for him, of writing ~~what~~ about a movie he had not seen. If this is true he also mocks himself in it because as we shall see he is inaccurately critical of the Washington Post for criticizing the movie based in part - and in part only - on the movie's script.

This is not unusual for Mailer because as we have already seen what is wrong for others is right for ~~Mailer~~ ^{him as he sees} Mailer, as Mailer see it and writes and speaks.

Whether or not it is true, Mailer uses this article to propadandize for his uninformed beliefs about the JFK assassination and as advance propaganda for his book the appearance of which was then three years in the future.

bud (bud)
 bōō/'kō-
 kō vē/-
 n in N
 y conce
 with
 na. 2.
 ucovi-
 a.



(byōō-
 l. -ni-a (-nē ə). (In classical architec-
 ture, esp. on a frieze, having the form of
 Also, **bu-crane** (byōō krān'). [*< L.L. boukrān(i)on an ox-head, equiv. to s)ox + krānion CRANIUM]*
 kōō resht'), *n.* Rumanian name of

bud-ded, bud-ding. —*n.* 1. *Bot.* a. a terminal protuberance on a plant, secondary foliage (leafimentary inflorescence or both (mixed bud). b. or rudimentary stem or c. *Zool.* (in certain animalization) a prominence into a new individual, recently attached to the times becoming detached; d. any small rounded part, e. a gustatory bud. 4. an undeveloped person or thing, an immature or undeveloped *mechanic may be a future t.* Also, in **bud**. 6. **nip** in something in the beginning of it: *The business recession bud.* —*v.t.* 7. to put forth as a plant. 8. to begin to grow. 9. to be in an early ment. —*v.t.* 10. to cause to bud by inserting a single bud into the stock, pray, pod; akin to *G (Hage)butle hip, dial. Sw bodd head, D buidel bag, purse, llen]* —**bud/der, n.** —**bud/less, adj.**



Leaf buds of the elm

formal. 1. brother. 2. a familiar term for a boy, usually when his name is not known. [*back formation from BUDDY*] —**boy's given name.**

bu'da pest', bōō/'dā pest'; *Hung. böö-*
 city in Hun-
 al part,
 River:
 m two
 bank of
 'da and
 on the
 807,299



Buddha

a boy's
 (bōōd/-
 a novel
 s Mann.
), bōō/-
 called
 , **Gau-**
 (Prince
 thartha)
 Indian
 founder
 any of
 hers in
 m Gau-
 st, who
 enlight-
 wisdom.

Buddhism, one who has attained enlightenment; Arhat. [*< Skt: awak-e, understand + -ta ptp. suffix]*
 (bōōd'ə höōd', bōō/'dā-), *n.* the state of Buddha. [*BUDDHA + -HOOD*]
 (bōōd' gə yā'), a village in central India; site of tree under which Siddhartha was born.

budh (budh), *n.* *Hinduism, Buddhism.* an intuitive faculty giving increased wisdom. [*< Skt; cf. bodhati he awakes*]

buddhism, bōō/'diz-), *n.* a religion, founded by Buddha (Gautama) and later spread to India, Burma, Japan, Tibet, and parts of China, where it is full of suffering caused by karma, the way to end this suffering is enlightenment that enables one to halt the cycle of births and deaths to which one is bound. Cf. **Eightfold Path, Four Noble Truths, Mahayana.** [*BUDDH(A) + -ISM*], *adj.* —**Bud-dhis/tic, Bud-dhis/ti-cal, Bud-dhis/ti-cal-ly, adv.**

buddhology, (bōō dol'ə jē, bōō-), *n.* the study of the nature and various forms of Buddhism. [*+ -ology*]

buddy, (bōōd/-), *n.* a boy's given name. Also, **Buddy**, (bōōd/-), *n., v., -dled, -dling.* *Mining.* a trough in which metalliferous ore is separated by means of running water. [*(ore) in a budde.*] —**bud/dler, n.**

bud-dle, (bōōd'le ə), *n.* any loganiaceous insect, esp. *Buddleia*, comprising the butterfly after Adam Buddle (d. 1715), English

budgerigar, (bōō den'və; *Russ. bud'gerig'), n.* *Semnopithecus leucotis* (se myōn' mi kōō'lo vich), born 1883, Russian general in 1917 revolution and World War II.

budge (buj), *v., budged, budg-ing.* (usually used negatively) —*v.t.* 1. to move slightly; begin to move: *He pressed the starter and stepped on the gas; the car didn't budge.* 2. to change one's opinion or stated position; yield: *Once her father had said "no," he wouldn't budge.* —*v.t.* 3. to cause to move; begin to move: *The three of them couldn't budge the rock.* 4. to cause (someone) to reconsider or change an opinion, decision, or stated position: *They couldn't budge the lawyer to take the case.* [*< MF boug(er) (to) stir < VL *bullicare to bubble, freq. of L bullire to boil!*] —**budg'er, n.**

budge (buj), *n.* 1. a fur made from lambskin with the wool dressed outward, used esp. as an inexpensive trimming on academic or official gowns. —*adj.* 2. made from, trimmed, or lined with budge. 3. *Obs.* pompous; solemn. [*ME bugee, perh. akin to BUDGE*]

Budge (buj), *n.* (John) Donald, born 1915, U.S. tennis player.

budg-er-ee (buj'ə rē), *adj.* 1. *Australian.* good; fine. 2. pretty. [*< native Austral*]

budg-er-i-gar (buj'ə rē gār'), an Australian parakeet, *Melopsittacus undulatus*, having greenish plumage with black and yellow markings, bred as a pet in a variety of colors. Also, **budg-er-ee-gah, budg-er-y-gah** (buj'ə rē gā'). Also called **shell parakeet.** [*< native Austral*]

budg-et (buj'it), *n., v., -et-ed, -et-ing.* —*n.* 1. an estimate, often itemized, of expected income and expense, or operating results, for a given period in the future. 2. a plan of operations based on such an estimate. 3. an itemized allotment of funds for a given period. 4. the total sum of money set aside or needed for a specific purpose: *The budget for the new factory building was three million dollars.* 5. a limited stock or supply of something: *His budget of good will was running out.* 6. *Obs.* a small bag; pouch. —*v.t.* 7. to plan allotment of (funds, time, etc.). 8. to deal with (specific funds) in a budget. [*late ME bougett < MF bougette (bougé bag (< L bulga; see BULGE) + -ette -ETTE)*] —**budg-et-ar-y** (buj'it er'ē), *adj.* —**budg-et-er, n.**

budg-et plan, U.S. See **installment plan.**

budg-ie (buj'ē), *n.* *Informal.* budgerigar. [*BUDG-ERIGAR + -IE*]

bud/ mut-a-tion, a variation produced by a genetic change in the bud, such that the seeds produced by the resulting growth perpetuate the change in succeeding generations.

bud/ scale, scale' (def. 3a).

bud/ sport, a sport resulting from a bud mutation or bud variation.

bud/ stick, *Hort.* a shoot of a plant from which buds are cut for the propagation of that plant.

bud/ varia-tion, any variation in a bud due to changes in either or both its genetic composition or environment, such that the resulting flower, fruit, or shoot differs from others of the same plant or species.

Bud-weis (*Ger.* bööt/vīs), *n.* a city in W Czechoslovakia, on the Moldau River. 67,944 (1963). Czech, *České Budějovice.*

Bu-ell (byōō'əl), *n.* Don Carlos (kār'lōs), 1818-98, Union general in the U.S. Civil War.

Bue-na (byōō'nə), *n.* a town in S New Jersey. 3243 (1960).

Bue-na Park (bwā'nə), a city in SW California. 46,401 (1960).

bue-nas no-ches (bwe'näs nō'ches), *Spanish.* good night.

Bue-na-ven-tu-ra (bwā'nə ven tōō'rə, -tyōō'rə; *Sp.* bwe'nä ven tōō'rä), *n.* a seaport in W Colombia. 35,087 (1951).

Bue-na Vis-ta (bwe'nä vēs'tä for 1; byōō'nə vis'tə for 2), 1. a village in NE Mexico, near Saltillo: American victory in battle (1847) during the Mexican War. 2. a town in W Virginia. 6300 (1960).

bue-no (bwe'nō), *interj.* *Spanish.* good; all right.

Bue-nos Ai-res (bwā'nōs fr'iz, bō'nōs fr'ēz; *Sp.* bwe'nōs fr'ies), a seaport in and the capital of Argentina, in the E part, on the Río de la Plata. 3,240,000 (est. 1965).

bue-nos di-as (bwe'nōs dē'ās), *Spanish.* good morning; good day.

buff (buf), *n.* 1. a kind of thick leather, originally and properly made of buffalo skin but later also of other skins, light yellow with napped surface, used for making belts, pouches, etc. 2. a buff stick or buff wheel. 3. a thick, short coat of buffalo leather, worn esp. by soldiers in 17th-century England and by American colonists. 4. yellowish-brown; medium or dark tan. 5. *Informal.* the bare skin. 6. *Informal.* a devotee or well-informed student of some activity or subject: *Civil War buffs avidly read the new biography of Grant. He's always been a trolley-car buff.* 7. *Informal.* a buffalo. —*adj.* 8. made of buff leather. 9. having the color of buff. —*v.t.* 10. to clean or polish (metal) or give a grainless finish of high luster to (plated surfaces) with or as with a buff stick or buff wheel. 11. to dye or stain in a buff color. 12. to polish or shine, esp. with a buffer: *to buff shoes; to buff a waxed floor.* [*earlier buffe wild ox, back formation from buffle < F < L.L. būfalus; see BUFFALO*] —**buff/a-bil/i-ty, n.** —**buff/-able, adj.** —**Syn.** 10. burnish, polish, shine.

buff (buf), *v.t.* 1. to reduce or deaden the force of; act as a buffer. —*n.* 2. *Chiefly Dial.* a blow; slap. [*late ME buffe, back formation from BUFFET*]

buf-fa (bōō'fə; *It.* bōōf'fä), *n., pl. -fe (-fä; It. -fe).* 1. a woman who sings comic roles in opera. 2. See **opera buffa.** [*< It; fem. of buffo*]

bu-ver, örder, oil, böök, öoze, out; up, cus; a as in **button** (but'ən), **fire** (fir'), **örge; chief; sing; shoe; thin, that; zh** as in **measure, cradle** (krād'əl). See the full key inside the front cover.

In ~~term~~ terms of this part of the definition, Mailer is very conspicuously less "well-informed" than those he tries to put down. *He* is more ignorant of the fact of the crime itself than any of those I know or whose writings I have seen.

so much the expert that the Department of Justice itself told the Judge John Pratt in the federal district court ~~of~~ the District of Columbia that he knew more about the assassination than anyone working for the FBI. It made this statement in writing and when it represented the FBI in ^{one of his many} that lawsuit in which he said the FBI, CA 75-226

The word buff was early on resorted to as a putdown of all those who criticized the official assassination mythology. Random House published Oswald's Tale. Its ^{unabridged dictionary's} definition of "buff" ^{as} and Mailer and Vanity Fair use it qualifies as impatril: "a devotee or well-informed student of some activity or subject."

~~Perhaps~~ Perhaps as "devotees" most of those Mailer has in mind and Mailer himself can correctly be referred to as "buffs." But most of them and Mailer above almost all do not even qualify for the other part of the definition, ^Vwell-informed."

Mailer never displayed any interest in or knowledge of the assassination. ^{itself.} In this he is doubly like most of those he sought to put down. And like them ~~he~~ he has no more than a ^h theory about the assassination. His allegation that Oswald was the assassin is not even a theory. It is an unproven assumption that is disproven by the very official evidence that is ignored by, Vanity Fair's headline's words, "everyone, from the Establishmentarian theorists to the gamut of conspiracy buffs..."

Like most of them Mailer is ignorant of that evidence. ^{who} ~~he is~~ unlike some of them ~~in~~ their having ^e come to understand some of that the official evidence of the crime itself, whereas ^{has} ~~has~~ doggedly of which Mailer (preserved his pristine state of total ignorance. ^{of the crime itself.}

By this part of that definition, Mailer is even below his putdown of all others.

^{36A here} Intended putdown, that is. ^{his}

With ignorance of the established and readily-available fact of the crime, Mailer's only credentials for writing anything at all about it, Mailer-like he pontificates from his imagined ~~at~~ Olympus and with a sure instinct for the inappropriate that will be shocking on various degrees ^{he} begins to ~~case~~ ^{case} into his supposed subject, that movie. This is only after he has held forth for almost a fifth of the length of his article on some of Stone's earlier movies:

^{might suggest} "Subjects heroic in scope as J.F.K. can be as uniquely suited as a good kill

He told me he had been given the script by a New York City literary agent.

If there were any stolen copies of that script, I have not heard of a ~~single~~
one.
 single stolen copy.

Perhaps this is as good a point as any to note that Mailer never once in all this long article reports the explicit basis for all those early criticisms of Stone's script.

All the publications he names recalled only too clearly Garrison's endless excesses. They reported them contemporaneously. They knew also that after two years of a constant barrage of criticisms of the government in general and of various agencies, mostly the CIA (whose defender Mailer later became), after all of Garrison's claims to have his case for a conspiracy in the JFK assassination, *and to have solved it,* the jury in his case, which believed that there had been a conspiracy, took less than an hour to decide unanimously that Garrison had not proven it. *That he had no case at all.*

Yet Stone's script, as did his movie, made a hero of the failed Garrison, the Garrison who had for those two years said anything at all that popped into his mind without regard for truth, fact or even reasonableness.

The fact is that the Post reporter was the first to spot Garrison's dishonesty.

Garrison had stated publicly and often that his interest was triggered by a conversation with ~~Senator~~ Louisiana Senator ~~Long~~ Long, who according to Garrison, told Garrison of his doubts about the Warren Commission. *Report.* That reporter, George Lardner, spoke to Long. Long denied to him that he had ever had any such conversation with Garrison.

What Lardner then wrote I used on the back cover of my third book on the assassination, Photographic Whitewash:

"The ~~se~~ scenario guiding New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in his investigation of President Kennedy's assassination can be glimpsed in any bookstore.

The investigation is Garrison's but the script apparently started with Harold Weisberg, former Senate investigator and author of "Whitewash"...

Lardner and the Post were not alone in this observation. The prestigious Times of London, England, said the same thing even more explicitly.

*didn't
 really
 speak*

So all the media had ample reason to be critical of Stone for believing a single word Garrison ~~and~~ ^{and of} said rather than basing his ~~mob~~ ^{mob} movie on it, and to be even more critical of Stone's making a hero of the phony Garrison who deceived and misled so many Americans.

Long as Mailer's article is, much space as ~~it~~ ^a devotes to the totally irrevelant, like ^{that} ~~that~~ imagined hunters and their game and how they prepared it ~~if~~ ^{if} they did - he has not a word about the actual basis of the actual criticisms of Stone's script.

indent
up
space

to a tribe of ^N hunters, and if the prize was obtained at considerable peril to the chief hunter, then it barely matters how the meat was cooked."

The wonder is that Mailer did not say "if the meat ^{was} is cooked."

Mailer stretching for sensation and shock without regard to appropriateness.

And so a hunt for primitive peoples is like a movie.

How there was "considerable peril" to Stone, which ^{Mailer} he infers but falls short of saying, he did not say because he could not say it.

It was well-known that there was no "peril" to Stone-that is was not even his own ^{money} millions he was spending lavishly. He was using Warner Brothers' millions.

Making a bad guess and perhaps reflecting that he ^wrote this drivel before he could see the movie he next says ~~was~~ what was proven false abundantly before that issue of Vanity Fair was printed,

indent
up
space

"JFK is bound to receive some atrocious reviews, perhaps even a preponderance of unfavorable ones, and as has been the case already, more than a small outrage has been atoused in the Washington ^{Club} ~~VC~~ (that is, The Washington Post, Newsweek, Time, the CIA the FBI, the Pentagon, the White House and the TV nets...."

How he dragged in the FBI, the CIA, the Pentagon and the White House only Mailer knows because publicly what he says is not true. In fact, what he is talking about began with me before Stone ~~even~~ started to shot his movie, two months before then.

It is safe to assume that with the controversy started Newsweek gave it some ^{attention} space. Time's later story ^{was} independent of the one for which I was responsible in the Post.

A Time reporter had been given a copy of the Stone script, as I was. He phoned me and spoke to me about why I had decided to go public with Stone's misrepresentation of his ^{the basis of my criticism} movies nonfiction. I did not give him the script he had, either.

37A hae

So, Mailer being Mailer and so publishable without peer review when he ^e pretends that he is ~~writing~~ writing nonfiction, he was wrong ^{predicted} about the unfavorable reviews, most of the reviewers expressing ^{er ed respect} respect for what Stone did and how he did it, ^{of Mailer also was} and he was wrong ^{great} about his Washington Club and what got it started.

As we slip ^{and} slide through Mailer's goo we'll return to that script and ^{to} me as part of ~~the~~ Mailer's Washington Club- which has yet to review any of my seven

published books on the JFK assassination - ~~it is~~ that much part of it or that dear to it.

"The Establishment," Mailer continues, has found that Oswald as the lone assassin serves a multitude of useful purposes in much the same way that a public figure wraps himself in propriety, no matter how greasy his private life may be, had a dependable political seat."

Aside from whether Mailer's life is "greasy" after going through six wives and being charged with knifing one of them, he no less than his Establishment "found that Oswald-as-the-lone-assassin serves a multitude of useful purposes."

Free with his indictments right and left as he is Mailer here indicts himself. Whether of not he was aware of it he here compares himself with those politicians who "wrap themselves in propriety" because, he, like his Establishment and his Washington Club about which he ^{was} and he knew he as not quite accurate, assume that Oswald was the assassin.

(To here pages 125-6)

After more irrelevancy about the Senate and the confirmation hearings for reactionary Justice Thomas Mailer compares those hearings with the JFK assassination, ^{not troubling} ~~not troubling~~ either his readers or his editors at Vanity Fair with any connection between them other than lies:

"Ditto for the lone assassin. The F.B.I was the first to endorse the idea, and this but two weeks after the death of J.F.K. In 1964 the Warren Commission came down four square behind that finding (sic)."
As ever since then Norman mailer has, too.

But again he flaunts his ignorance of reality, of the well-established official fact.

This is also to say of all those FBI reports to which I offered him free access.

The F.B.I was "not" the first to endorse the idea of Oswald as the lone assassin, which happens to be the 1995 basis of Mailer's Oswald ~~the~~ Oswald's Tales. Without it he has not even an excuse for a book. Without it who gives a damn about Oswald and his life in the USSR?

The FBI was not the first to "endorse" the ^{idea} ~~idea~~ because it invented that "idea."

(The FBI uses this file classification for hiding its records on its lobbying, polite and not so polite blackmail, its records on the media and people in it, copies of Hoover's correspondence and other records it claims not to keep. It never searches for any records in these 94 files claiming that they are only research matters and *thus are* not relevant. In the field offices the 80 file classification is used this way. The 80 file classification is for "Laboratory Research Matters." In the ~~file~~ field offices all such records are filed in the main files of the case in which they are relevant.)

the FBI's sainted founding director, Hoover, made it up all by himself and then he saw to it that ^{this} it was recorded for posterity. One such place in the FBI's disclosed files is Hoover's note-taker's ^{memo} report on the interview he granted William Manchester while he ^{was} preparing to write his Camelotization of the assassination, The Death of a President (Harper & Row, 1967) The original of Cartha DeLoach's June 4, ~~1967~~ 1964 ^{of} memo is in one of those mysterious FBI ⁹⁴ classification files. That classification is for "Crime Records," which most of those known files certainly are not. As best I can make its 94 number out from the copy I have from the FBI's ^{man} JFK assassination file, 62-109060, it appears to be 94-~~42~~ ⁹⁴⁻⁴⁸⁷⁶⁸⁻⁵²² ~~168-522~~. ⁹⁴⁻⁴⁸⁷⁶⁸⁻⁵²²

39A While Hoover was worrying himself into a hysteria that lasted for several weeks because he feared that the FBI's and his reputation would be ruined forever over the assassination, within two hours of the assassination the Army's since-disbanded 112th domestic intelligence unit in ~~Texas~~ Texas put out the story that Oswald was a red who had defected to the USSR,

That was all Hoover needed to solve his problem that he had created with all the publicity about he and his FBI always being on top of every crime. He ordained Oswald the lone Red assassin and the FBI has not since in any way abandoned that fiction of Hoover's instant creation.

Hoover and his FBI began the campaign to label Oswald as a Communist knowing as ^{they} did that Oswald was both anti-United States Communist and anti-USSR.

(I brought Oswald's politics to light in my 1965 book, Whitewash, the Report on the Warren Report, particularly on page 122, from the Commission records obtained by and gone over for it by the FBI. In NEVER AGAIN! there is more on how this Hoover fiction got started.) It simultaneously labelled him the lone assassin. So in all particulars Mailer is his usual inaccurate self.

What Mailer is perhaps referring to if he had anything other than what he had been told in mind is that on December 9, 1963, which was 17 days after the assassination, the five volumes of the report Lyndon Johnson ordered of the FBI reached the Commission. For a week before that the FBI had been leaking its contents when only the FBI was in a position to ^{do that} leak them.

It also is typical of Mailer. He neither knows nor wants to know what is true because he much prefers what is not true. In order to say what is not true he had kept himself in a state of determined ignorance. Not knowing a thing about what he is writing about he then makes it up. When he makes it up it is consitent with what he wants to be rather than with what is. Once he makes up what he wants to be regardless of how untrue it is is it becomes the reality to him no matter how obviously incor- rect it is. This is bt one of innumerable illustrations.

In his next paragraph Mailer has another blooper. He says of the House assassins committee that ~~when~~ its life was not extended by the Congress and "Instead, the Department of Justice ~~is~~ was handed its files." *That did not happen. It*

~~That~~ could not have happened without it being voted by the full ~~the~~ House membership. The House standing rules require that all unpublished records of all committee's be kept secret for 50 years. *There are legitimate reasons for this*

All the House assassins gave the Department of Justice was the scientific work done for it on ~~analy~~ analyzing sounds on recordings of the police radio broadcasts of the time of the ~~assassination~~ *assassination*. The committee had already made that work ~~public~~ public. When the Department of Justice asked the FBI to do ~~that~~ *on those recordings* new scientific work, it refused. So, recorded in a gleeful memo by the guy who got the bright idea, it was referred to the National Academy of Science which, the cause of the glee, is outside the Freedom of Information and ~~and~~ thus no assassination devil seeking scripture could get it from the NAS.

When after more rambling and vacuities about Castro, the ~~Mfa~~ ^a ~~air~~ ^{rogue} Mafia, "rogue elephants" and "ballet dancers" and more conjectures about Mailer's invention of the Washington Club, he gets back a ~~little~~ ^{my} more or less anyway, to Stone's movie. ~~He~~ ^{Miller} said

"When Oliver Stone charged in full ~~panoply~~ panoply with all his filmmaking teams and equipment into the valley of assassination enlightenment, there were heavy guns emplaced on the right, and on his left were all the inflamed ragtag assassination buffs. They had been working in relative solitude for decades, laboring on in the private, inspired and isolated hope that one day they would uncover the mystery and be reknowned forever.

40x This is fiction. There was only one who is a critic and who ~~publicly exposed~~ said a word critical of the movie. All the ~~fohens~~ ^{fohens} who could beat a path to Stone's door and those who could not inundated him with their notions. He put not a few on them on his payroll and depended on them when they knew ~~no~~ more about the actualities of the assassination than Stone did.

After more cracks at his "buffs" and further displays of his ignorance in seriously understating the published Stone budget for the movie, he says what is meaningless, that

Stone had "no ~~no~~ great willingness to become enmeshed with the majority of assassination buffs" so he "naturally encountered trouble with both flanks."

The need he created.

goes to satisfy himself at least that he has met

Mailer is forever the novelist, ~~and~~ making it up as he ~~went~~. It was a physical impossibility for Stone to "become enmeshed with the majority of assassination buffs" because they are so many and so widely scattered. The fact is that in preparing his movie he depended on his selection of them. He had, in fact, a woman styled his "research coordinator" to be his contact and liaison with those on his ~~payroll~~ payroll and those ^{many} not on it. *with whom he and she had extensive contacts.*

Still novelizing, Mailer added that "some of them," his imagined disenchanting buffs who did not exist, "were ready to collaborate with the big guns of the right."

And here, ^{at} ~~three pages into~~ (his article), almost the middle of it, he finally gets to the phony basis he made up for all of his jabberjabber about his ^u Washington Club and how it got after Stone and his movie:

"The attack began before movie shooting even commenced. George ^u Lardner, the resident writer on intelligence matters for The Washington Post (which is to say the friend and confidant of many an F.B.I. and C.I.A. man), obtained a stolen copy of the JFK script and did a long piece about Stone for the Club on May 19, 1991." Not one of those ^{put down as 'buffs' was} Mailer castigated, as ready to "collaborate" with ~~his~~ his "big guns of the right did so. ^{They do not} even exist."

The attack did not begin "before movie shooting even commenced." Before he ^u wrote a word ^{when Stone was shooting. He chased from and} Lardner went to Dallas and was promptly banned from the grassy knoll, public property, by Stone's private guards, hardly the way to get along with reporter.

Lardner is not and then was not "the resident ^u riter on intelligence matters" for the Post. He was its expert on the assassination. He was one of a number who write about intelligence matters and he rarely wrote about the FBI. The Post had ^{the} its ~~own~~ own reporters assigned to cover the CIA and the FBI as it and other papers do with all ~~government~~ government agencies. And far from being palsy walsy and the confidant of the FBI and the CIA employees involved in intelligence matters, Lardner and the Post were not liked by the ~~FBI~~ FBI. It regards the ~~Post~~ Post as "liberal" and "over instilled hatred of all

Rather than being "the confidant" of the FBI, although he is of conservative belief and not a liberal, the FBI did not trust him. Or any other Post reporters whose names I have seen in its ~~best~~ records I have. Or any editor, either. Its records hold nasty,

Still again, Mailer is ignorant, makes no effort to learn the truth, has no interest in learning it, as with this he could have by a phone call, and instead makes it all up to suit what he wants to be rather than what is, to conform with what he thinks would be nice and useful and therefore makes up.

(dirty cracks about them.

things he regarded as liberal. Which was anything to the left of Genghis Khan.

42 A here If Stone had read Lardner's story with any attention to fact at all he would not have said-indeed, he had no basis for saying - either that Lardner "obtained" a ^{copy} ~~copy~~ of the script or that it was "a stolen copy" of that script.

Lardner's story does in fact credit me as his source. It does not say that ~~the~~ the story idea originated with Lardner ~~or~~ ^{with} Mailer's "the Washington Club." And it didn't.

As Mailer would have learned for himself if he cared about putting anything on paper other than ~~what~~ ^{what} what he wants to be regardless of how untrue it ^{is} ~~is~~. As long as Mailer likes it, no matter how false or ~~inconceivable~~ ^{what he makes up is instant fact to him} incorrect it may be, ~~it is to him and to his publisher~~ ^{as it is to} who for the most part seem to ~~care~~ ^{care and support of the official assassination myth} only about money, ~~instant fact~~ ^{copy}.

Like Mailer Stone knows the value of ^{he} publicity and knows how to get it, as Mailer does. So before he started shooting his film he announced that it would be on the assassination, that in it he would "record their history for the people" ~~and~~ and tell them in it "who killed their President, ~~how~~ ^{who} why and how."

Stone also announced that his movie would be based on ~~the~~ ^{the} New former New Orleans district attorney Jim Garrison's book, On the Trail of the Assassins (which is the ~~the~~ ^{the} trail tragic jim never took) and on J. Edgar Hoover's Crossfire. ^{it's} Hoover's book is not even on the assassination, of which he had never tried to ~~learn~~ ^{learn} anything in any event. It is on the so-called "theories" and on what he took from Penn Jones, who called them ~~the~~ ^{the} "the mysterious deaths." ^{it's} Hoover retold that "the convenient deaths" ~~but~~ ^{but} he not only treated them as ~~mysterious~~ ^{when not one really was} and by the conspiracy, he ~~even~~ ^{even} put an asterisk on ^{those} ~~those~~ that were most mysterious. And poor Hoover could not even get that silliness straight. It is overloaded with factual errors even about the trash that ~~it~~ ^{it's} is subject matter.

On February 8, 1991, and that was two months before Stone started shooting, I wrote him at considerable length. In at least 4,000 words I explained to him, assuming he really wanted to film their history for the people and wanted to put the truth on film, how he could not do that with Garrison's book. 42 B Feb

~~What had happened when I was about to leave New Orleans shortly after the~~

just before I was to leave for the airport

Shortly after the 1968 election, as I was about to catch the ^a plane home from New Orleans, I learned from the

43 jobs

election from two of Garrison's staff closest to him is that he was about to pull another insanity ^H ~~that~~ would have reacted much more against him and anyone who did not agree with the official assassination mythology much more than happened when in less than an hour the jury that believed there ~~had~~ ^{to} been a conspiracy to assassinate JFK acquitted Garrison's sole ^{alleged} living conspirator, Clay Shaw.

Louis Ivon was a regular New Orleans policeman ^{& detective} ~~investigator~~ assigned to the DA's office as its chief investigator. Louis was then ^{going to} in college earning a degree in criminalistics ~~by~~ Andrew Sciambra, whose nickname was "oo," was the assistant DA who Garrison had spend more time with him than any of the others. From them I learned that Garrison had cooked up ~~assassination~~ an "identification" of the actual grassy knoll assassins and that he was ^{going to} charge them with the shooting to mark the ^{fifth} ~~eight~~ assassination anniversary ~~that then was close~~. Garrison had had more in mind but the staff had talked him out of all except ~~in~~ his determination to charge Edgar Eugene Bradley and Robert Lee Perrin with ^{being} the actual JFK assassins.

For that adventure ~~for~~ Garrison had pretty much froze his regular staff of city employees out. Instead his ^{right} ~~right~~-hand man was the late William Wood who used the name Bill Boxley. Boxley was Garrison ^{only} ~~investigator~~ for his coming charging of those he said were the actual JFK assassins.

Telling me they and the others on Garrison's regular staff could do no more than they had, Ivon and Sciambra asked me to ^{try} ~~undertake~~ to talk Garrison out of it.

I had then been on a long trip that had me ~~away~~ ^{gone} from home for a full month. I told them after I ^{went} ~~was~~ home and did a few things I ~~had~~ ^{had} to do I would return and try.

I knew, and I knew that Garrison had to know, that Perrin had killed himself in ^{New} ~~New~~ Orleans ^{about} 14 months before Garrison said he was one of those who killed Kennedy. I figured that might be a tough one. I expected less trouble with Garrison's Bradley mythology. He, lustily assisted ^{first} ~~by~~ Mark Lane and then by ^{many of} ~~all~~ those scattered "buffs" of which Mailer's ^{vision} ~~which~~ said so much ~~knowing nothing at all about what he was saying~~, had announced that Bradley had been "identified" in those total irrelevancies of what were known as "the Dealey Plaza tramp pictures."

As I write this another of those tramp fictions is about to appear as a book. ^{my} The debunking of the essence of that ~~concrete~~ concoction long ago had no effect unless the man and wife team of writers changed what they had written to work around the ^{my} criticisms ~~they~~ wrote. The general idea ^a is that Oswald was a police ~~informer~~ ^{snitch} who "talked" and exposed a gunrunning conspiracy. That the alleged source, ~~of~~ one of those winos, had denied it the year before on coast-to-coast ~~television~~ TV did not discourage the authors of their publisher.

There is always a fertile imagination to invent meanings that do not exist if there is fame or money in it.

The fantasies woven around those ^{of} innocent men probably will never end.

These makeup artists find their art easier if they do as Mailer did, see to it that they have no knowledge of the crime itself, especially no of the established ^{of} evidence in it, the official evidence.

That the Dallas police had disclosed the actual identities of those men several years a earlier ~~was~~ made no difference. One of the few critical comments about my Case Open was by a self-important Michigander who lives theories for all the world as though they are the reality. His ^{of} criticism was that I had not dealt with those tramps the way he believed they should be dealt with, ^{me} as having some epherial connection with the crime. In his phony concept I should ^a even have identified them. For ~~not~~ doing that he did criticize me. That they had no relevance made no difference to him and to the other assassintion nuts who want unreality accepted as reality and irrelebace to be ~~so~~ treated and accepted as relevant.

Every time I debunked a new "identification" and a new interpretation of those pictures that had nothing at all to do with the assassination, still new "identifications" were made up, more childishly unreal assassination explanations came into existence and were widely distributed more or less underground, and even special names were given to those men who were photographed about an hour and a half after the assassination. The police ^{then} ~~made~~ ^{took} them past the Texas Schoolbook Depository Building in which Oswald worked and from which the FBI and the Commission said ~~all the he fire~~ ^{all the} three admitted shots fired during the assassination. I expected less trouble with that one.

One of those three wins, which is what they were, was even called "Frenchy" because his ^y rimples clothes were said to have a French cut. He was also "identified" as Lyndon Johnson's farm manager.

44A → I asked Ivin to give me two sets of those pictures when in a few ^{minutes} ~~moment~~ ^y I would return on my way to ^{Missant} the airport. It was a Saturday afternoon. Ivin had one full set and one incomplete set. He also had for me the two plain envelopes I'd ^{asked} ~~skied~~ him for that would hold these 8x10 prints without ^{them.} bending. At the airport I addressed the envelopes to two former FBI agents with whom I had a friendly relationship. With each was a hasty note written on a ~~pa~~ ^{pa} pages from the notebook I carried. I asked each to st investigate those pictures and tell ~~y~~ me what they learned about them as soon as they could.

Although I did not know the results of it then, when six months or so earlier one of those men figured in what was said to be the ^{FBI} hunt for the killer of Martin Luther King, Jr., I had put the FBI in a position that left it little choice but to ^{yes} investigate those pictures.

Neither of the men I asked to make the investigation for me knew I'd asked the other. Each phoned me with the results within a few days. Their reports coincided in all details. When ten years later I got the FBI's result, they differed only in placing those innocent wins a little farther from the scene of the crime.

After the assassination the police shook the entire area down. When they got south of the triple underpass that is to the west of the ~~TSBD~~ TSBD, three bridges that carried a vast expanse of railroad tracks across the confluence of Elm, Main and Commerce

His "boys" louis put on this were experienced, veteran investigators. Some were my age or older. I remember that it was Frank Melocho ^{of} who brought me the records of Perrin's admission, ^{identification} and ~~to~~ death from Charity Hospital. I think but I am not ^{not it was who} certain ^{was} (he also brought me the morgue book. There as in most places the morgue book is ledger-like but of different dimensions. It ^{was} lined, had a sewed binding and ^{was} handwritten with the names ^{posted} (in order of their ^{of the copies.} receipt). It is not easy to fake the ^{That one had not been altered} morgue book without detection. I still have xeroxes of that page and of the Charity Hospital records.

The "boys" brought me ^{this evidence} ~~these~~ and more, all I'd asked for.

^{streets} ^{these}
 they found those three unfortunate ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~guzzling~~ ^{guzzling} cheap wine ~~was~~ inside a parked railroad boxcar that was not attached to anything at either end. It was parked out on the tracks behind the Central Annex Post Office. Its address is 217 South Houston Street. That meant that those men were more than a block to the west of the scene of the crime and more than two blocks to the south of it.

The only way for the police to walk them out was to walk them back north more than two blocks on those tracks, across the triple underpass and then to the east, past the front of the TSBD. The plaza was full of people and news photographers. The photographers were shooting picture of anything that moved. Thus there were those "tramp pictures."

I do not take time for a full account here. It is written in the long, unpublished manuscript I have written with the working title Inside the JFK Assassination Industry.

When I returned to New Orleans Ivon was as good as his word. He had copies of each of the few reports Boxley had written for Garrison. They both preferred for those reports to be verbal whenever that was possible. As he said he would, he sent the boys," his regular police criminal investigators, out to get whatever I asked for. None of what addressed any reality was in the papers ^{Boxley prepared for} as the results of his ^{own} "investigation" for him. With Perrin a suicide, for example, there had to be hospital records and an entry in the morgue book along with police records. ^{46A} The "the boys" brought me all of that. ~~And~~ There was no question at all about it, Perrin had taken poison and a full set of official records existed, records Garrison had not asked Boxley to get and that Boxley had not gotten on his own.

It took a little more than a very hard and disagreeable week for me to complete the long report I gave Sciambra on a Saturday evening. I had attached to the ribbon copy those records "the boys" had gotten for me. ~~(At least one of them was older than I and I was then almost 60 years old.~~

The cute part, if the word can be used for something as grim as faking a "solution" to the assassination of a President and charging two innocent men with the actual shooting, ^{is} how Garrison skirted ^{around} ~~around~~ the certain fact that Perrin had killed himself more than a year before Garrison said he had done his part of the assassination shooting.

I think that although he enjoyed doing that story, ^dLardner enjoyed most what following the appearance of his story Stone yanked from the script and the film.

Stone's coauthor on the script was Zachary Sklar of New York. Sklar had ~~been~~ been the ^{on that trail he never took of the assassins.} editor on Garrison's book. (So, supposedly Sklar, like Garrison, was an expert on the so-called Garrison "case.")

David Ferrie was Garrison's third conspirator. Ferrie was well known as a strange and very eccentric homosexual. When he lost all his hair, as I published in Oswald in New Orleans, he had gone to my late brother-in-law ^{Dr.} Jack Kety. Jack ~~was~~ practised in Covington, a small town across Lake Pontchartrain from New Orleans. Ferrie had alopecia. When he decided to treat himself it ~~was~~ turned into alopecia totalis. It was well and internationally known that not only did Ferrie not have a hair on his body, ~~he~~ he also wore outlandish wigs of his own making.

This was well-known internationally but not to Sklar or to Stone. ^{or to Garrison!}

In their script they have some baddies putting pressure on Ferrie by holding his head in a toilet bowl - ^{his} by ~~the~~ hair!

If Mailer read Lardner's story, and he does quote it, he knows this story. He also knows much that ~~was~~ Lardner spoofed. He certainly knew that it did not require ~~that~~ his "Washington Club" to see a story and a very funny one in what I gave Lardner.

Stone also knew, because I told him, that

~~Garrir~~ ^GGarrison, who had a feeling for little touches, as does Mailer, made up the story that the conspiracy, working so far in advance of the President's assassination, had killed an unknown Venezuelan seaman who had no friends in the country and would not be missed or ^{whose disappearance would} the cause of any official investigation, and then they had buried this seaman under Perrin's name. Perrin in the Garrison mythology duly ^{affirmed} and affirmed by Boxley, said that Perrin had thereafter thrived as a pulp ^{fiction} fiction writer using the name Starr. Boxley had added details to this career that ^GGarrison had just made up.

When Sciambra gave Garrison my report and its attached documentation ^GGarrison was boxed in. He was not about to fire himself. Nor was he about to admit that he had put Boxley up to ^{what he had made up as} the faithful Boxley had made up for him. So, he fired Boxley instead, with a fictitious account of it all in the press release, he issued ^{He actually said that what he had made up himself was a CIA plot to wreck his investigation. This fiction is in Garrison's supposed nonfiction book and Stone had it in his script in the book that Stone was using as the basis for his movie.} and

I provided Stone with a full account of ^{Garrison's} his irrationality with some documentation. I offered to answer any questions he had, provide more documentation, and I even offered him free access to all the FBI records I had by then, about a quarter of a million pages of them,

There was, of course, much more than this in what I sent Stone but for our present purposes it suffices.

Stone did not respond. I knew he had gotten my letter because his so-called ^{Jane Rusceni,} research coordinator, phoned to tell me how glad they were to have it. ^{before she read it.} ^{It was addressed to Stone so she had not opened it.}

When two months passed without any response from Stone I phoned Lardner and offered him the story. He came up. He went through my file on that prevented atrocity and my ^{report} report that had one the job. I then handed him the script that had been given to me.

Mailer ^{cribbed} cribbed the ~~line~~ line that it was a "stogin" script from ~~Dr~~ Stone, who had just made it up. But it suited Mailer's purposes so he used it as his own information.

In fact it was one of the innumerable copies Stone had himself given out to get all the help he needed ranging from funding to technical assistance, to actors and actresses.

46A — here It was then unsafe for me to drive out of Frederick and I had not since 1977.

It was an obvious impossibility for me to have gone to Hollywood and stolen that script.

It likewise was impossible for me to have been ^{what} what Mailer says I was, an

^{although}
~~Even with~~ Mailer and his book ~~he~~ ignores them there are two basic questions: was
 oswald an assassin^u and as there a conspiracy. With the crime never investigated
 officially there is no probability of ever solving it. But there is the official evi-
 dence and it proves beyond question that the crime was beyond the capability of any
 one shooter. On this basis alone, there was a conspiracy. So all that cheap prejudicial
 nonsense^{e is} designed to prejudice and to be a substitute to for ~~the~~ evidence reflect the
 bankruptcy to which Mailer ^{reduced} ~~lowered~~ himself in assuming what makes a real difference
 so he has that as the basis for his book. Nobody would care at all about Oswald, would
 never have heard of him, if he had not been accused of being the assassin.

^{Mailer}
 Instead ~~he~~ resorts to this prejudicial nonsense as

adjunct of his Washington Club of the right in its attack on Stone and his movie. ^Q And I was all alone on the other side.

But without phoning me to ask me a single question about any of this when Lardner with my agreement fully identified me ^{in his story} as his source, Mailer in his long campaign to prove that history is the same as fiction and that they both lie said of the foregoing, "The manuscript was smuggled to Lardner." (page 128)

With his own coming mythology of Oswald as the assassin to justify Mailer also wrote of Stone,

"He has not made cinematic history, ~~indeed~~ and indeed to hell with that! He has dared something more dangerous: he has entered the echoing halls of the largest paranoid myth of our time - the undeclared national belief that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was killed by the concentrated forces of malign power in the land. It is not only the unspoken myth, but our national obsession... Do we descend into paranoia or suffer the tedium of an apathy that tells us we will never know and so may as well accept the theory of Oswald as the lone killer?"

under + original space

There is more of this ucky ughstuff but there is no need for it. Mailer carries on as I quote him above in condemnation of all those who disagree with the official mythology and with his only to repeat what I quote him as writing in more Mailer-like lingo as he fights his way to the end of this self-denunciation and self-exposure. This is how he writes of what is to be the basic assumption of his coming Oswald's Tale, that Tale, that ^{allegedly} Oswald was the lone assassin:

47A

"Several generations ^{have} ~~grown~~ already grown up with the mind-stultifying myth of the lone assassin."

under + original space

Without this "mind-stultifying myth of the lone assassin" Mailer would have had no book at all.

So at least as he spoke of himself, Mailer was on the mark when he told those history majors at Penn that history is the same as novels because both are fiction; and that novels and history both lie.

No man every tried harder to prove it -of himself- than Norman Mailer.

Mailer the be-Pulitzered novels ^{it} turned ^{historians} ~~historians~~ having said that novelists and historians both lie and that history, too, is lies, ^{he need} ~~and~~ have done no more to prove this point. But he did. ^{He} gilded the ~~lily~~ lily he ~~invested~~ invented.

Earlier we quoted Will Stewart's interview of Mailer when he was in Moscow working on Oswald's Tale. Stewart's story is full of details of what those who knew Oswald when he was in the USSR told Mailer about him. He named three of them to Stewart. Stewart's story was published in the International Express for the week of ^{any} ~~January~~ 21/27, ¹⁹⁹³ ~~27~~, ~~1993~~.
~~4~~ 1 pps. 1993.

Mailer and his publisher wanted all the free publicity they could get and they had no special concern about how they got it. So, The Chicago Tribune dispatched its James P. Gallagher to Minsk. Gallagher has a record that Mailer's publisher must love

because of the way he oohed and aahed in ecstasy over Gerald Posner's most deliberately dishonest of all ^{supposedly} serious assassination books ~~two years~~ later that year.

Gallagher's puff job for Mailer and Random House appeared in the Chicago Tribune's January 27, 1993 issue.

In short, Gallagher and Stewart were writing about the same Mailer to whom each had only recently spoken. The Trib's story of more than a column in length is headed, "Literati probing Oswald's days in Minsk" That puts Mailer in the plural and between ~~him~~ what Gallagher and Stewart wrote, that is what ~~the~~ Mailer is, more than one person.

~~That or a deliberate liar who lies when he imagines his lies will do him some good, in this instance get him some favorable publicity for his coming book.~~

Gallagher quotes Mailer as telling him "he was working on a book on Oswald but ~~he~~ declined to be more specific. "I never discuss a book I'm working on, because ~~it~~ I might jinx myself " he ~~qu~~otes Mailer as telling him.

This is the same ^a Mailer who at that very time had given the British reporter all he used about those people he named who had known Oswald told him.

It remains to be seen whether Mailer jinxed himself. I think he did. But not as he told Gallagher. By commercializing and exploiting the JFK assassination when he was not up to the work responsible writing required and instead ~~so~~ adopted the official mythology

without question as as his personal "given information" of which he spoke as we quoted him earlier.

So, In Minsk, Gallagher had no trouble finding those Stewart quoted by name, whether or not that it ^{is} merely coincidence. "All one needed ^{was} the Warren report. It named enough Minskis for any reporter to find and ~~they~~ ^{not one} of them ~~was~~ ^{was} unwilling to talk, ~~fully and freely.~~ ^{as does} And ~~as did~~ Mailer, for all the world as though that makes a book, Gallagher quoted some of them at length.

Pavel ~~a~~ ^{Bel} Golovachev, who had worked at the ~~the~~ radio and TV ^{plant} with Oswald, told Gallagher "Mailer paid him \$50 for an interview."

It seems to have been a ~~pe~~ ^e minor industry in Minsk to get paid for talking about the Oswald they knew. ^{as} Gallagher quotes Golovachev as telling him,

"As the old ~~id~~ ^d saying goes, 'Thank ~~you~~ you' is fine but it doesn't put vodka ~~en~~ in the glass or butter on the bread."
 quoted in

~~That~~ Ernst Titovets, ~~quoted by Stewart~~ in Stewart's article, and a biology professor now, told Gallagher,

"Norman Mailer was here to see me. ... When he offered to pay for an interview I suggested a very high price. We are now negotiating, trying to make a deal."
 Checkbook journalism? Hell no, Mailer as the diligent investigative reporter perfecting our history.

Contrary to the official mythology about Oswald, ~~Titovets~~ Gallagher reports that "Those who knew Oswald best generally speak highly of him," except as a lazy worker." This is no comfort to the official and unofficial mythologizers. As Leonid quote
 Leonid Tsagoikov,
 ~~that~~ Tsagoikov Gallagher quoted him,

But regardless of their personal opinions of Oswald, almost all of those who knew him do not believe he killed Kennedy, as the Warren Commission concluded.
 "Oswald shoot Kennedy? Come on!" Tsagoikov exclaimed. "Oswald could not shoot at all. I went hunting with him once, and when he saw a rabbit, he got so flustered he shot up in the air. There's no way he was capable of the precise marksmanship it would have taken to hit a moving target from up in that building."

indent + single space

indent + single space

indent single space

It surely does appear that what tough-man Mailer was paying for was given away free to others.

Despite his "decision" that Oswald ^(w) as the assassin ^(M) Mailer did agree to be the keynote speaker for the annual assemblage of those who steadfastly refused to believe ^{that} ~~that~~ ^{He was the keynote speaker} at their gather in Dallas to mark the ~~annivers~~ assassination anniversary in 1993. Maybe he wasn't talking about his book and risk jinxing it when he did that. Maybe it did not ~~do~~ jinx him when as Michael Dorman wrote for the Newsday of November 20 ~~of~~ of that year, he said, "Oswald could well have been a lone ~~assassin~~ killer." Dorman also write that Mailer said "Oswald was a congenital liar. He lived for the sheer panache of not telling truths."

Mailer seems to know that feeling and to enjoy it.

Doug Smith, writing in the December 13 issue of The New Republic about what Mailer said "in his keynote address" seems to have Mailer discussing his book and saying of what it says "that Oswald might have been too crazy to have been employed by the CIA, FBI or the Russians - but because those agencies were was ^{culpable} ~~culpable~~ of so many ^{other} ~~crimes~~, ^{such} ... a full investigation of Oswald would have opened a can of worms, the lone nut theory had to be etched in Stone."

Mailer on Mailer: his lone nut ~~theory~~ theory etched in official stone.

Mailer's publisher had no fear of jinxing the book. This item appeared in Newsday of October 5, 1994, under the heading Mailer on Oswald:

Norman Mailer's next book has the working title of "Oswald in Minsk," although Random House publisher Harold M. Evans says he wanted to call the book "Oswald's Ghost."

Either way, it promises to expand mightily on what we know of Lee Harvey Oswald, the presumed assassin of President John F. Kennedy in 1963. Mailer's "portrait of deviation" (Evans' words) draws on the author's fruitful visit to Minsk, where the local office of the KGB obligingly laid out the files on Oswald that it amassed when the American defector was living in the city with his Russian wife, Marina. The trove included tapes of bugged conversations between the couple and helped swell Mailer's book by a third, to an expected 800 pages.

"The KGB's contribution to literature is to give us the way Oswald talked in Minsk and the way Marina talked in Minsk," Evans said. The bugs tuned in on marital spats, for example. "It's amazing stuff. You don't hear Oswald saying, 'I'm going to kill the president.' You hear a man, coming home, who's an American, who's got his own hangups, talking to his Russian wife. It's amazing. It's Dostoyevsky."

Long in his grave, Dostoyevsky will not complain. But when I read him and about him I do not recall him paying grown women to say that when they were young they kissed an Oswald but did not go to bed with him. Or that the secret police of his day about whom he wrote as Mailer does not write in Oswald's Tale opened their files to him.

That, according to Evans, who does not mention that the KGB had done that earlier and several times, including to ABC-TV News which telecast ~~it~~ nationally what it found of interest in those files, is the "KGB's contribution to ~~his~~ literature," what Lee and Marina Oswald, young newlyweds, said to each other in the privacy of their bedroom that was picked up by the KGB's bugs.

That is literature?

That is Dostoyevsky?

If it really was "amazing" to Random House's top executive it remains to be seen

whether ^{he} he was prescient in preferring the title, "Oswald's Ghost."

Which is the Oswald of Mailer's Tale.