

XI. The "game" that was "seriously skewed"

Mailer mentions him often, even at his conclusion.

I came to Mailer's two chapters ^{that focus} on George de Mohrenschildt two days after reading Joseph Funder's lead review in the Washington Post's weekly Book World Section of Sunday, April 30, 1995. Funder, the Post gave us to understand, is an expert on intelligence and foreign affairs. Well, the Post did not put it precisely this way. It said he "writes" about them "often." And there are those who write who think they are experts, on what they ^w ^{in novels} write about (when they really are not. *experts at all. A witness, Mailer do not believe they*

But then that they really are not expert does not mean that they are if they write about, say, intelligence, as Mailer did in his Harlot's Ghost. As we have seen he soon went to the CIA itself with his mea culpa, that he had been ^w wrong about it in Harlot's Ghost because ^{says} they were really the pillars of ^y our democracy, only he thought they should have pulled a few more of those "wet jobs" that sound better than "assassinations" to some "experts." I In some kinds of writing.

So that any wanting to check me out can do so I'd best give the page numbers and not just refer to chapters. Mailer's table of contents does not mention a single chapter. And there is no index.

The book, as we saw, is really two books, the second decided upon after Mailer finished the first, as ^{we} also saw. For his own reasons Mailer does not call these two books Book 1 and Book 2. He called them Volume One and Volume ^{Two} Two. He then divides each Volume into Parts. He identifies the parts with roman ~~numerals~~ numerals. The first has nine ^{"parts"} the second eight. It is these parts that get divided into chapters. But there is no mention of chapters in the table ~~of~~ of contents. The only listing of them is in the notes. ^{They} which are at the end of the book, with no page ^{2/10} numbers mentioned in them.

The two chapters I found illuminating are in Part II, which ^{so} is titled "charity in Fort Worth." Chapter 4 is titled, "The Well-born Friend," Chapter 5, "Not in a ^{Mailer} million Years." The first begins on page 435, the second on page 440.

The first validation we find of Funder's observation in these chapters, ~~is~~ that the years have brought no s/ackening in Mailer's "vaunted powers of observation" is the of the various ways in which he says the name is spelled he gives it as "De Mohrenschildt." Those "vaunted powers of observation" did not extend to him. ^{man himself} the man, spelled

his name. With the man dead and with "ailer finding none of the disclosed hundreds of thousand of official pages worth even mention, leave alone use, he probably never ^{ever} got the name's signature. And, being properly Spook oriented, if not immersed, he did not trust the phone book. If he had weakened and given up his ^{of} faith in what Finders refers to as his good intellect, he would have found the listing of ^{himself} which the man approved ~~himself~~ to read, and I quote from page 237 of the 1963 Dallas phone book," de Mohrenschildt Geo 3607 Charming 521-1309".

But it is, without question the same guy.

Of him these are Mailer's first words in his chapter, "The well-born Friend":

*indent
single
space*

"If there is any place where a narrative of Oswald's life is bound to take on the seductive ambiguity of a spy novel, it is with the entrance into Lee's affairs of Baron George De Mohrenschildt, a tall, well-educated, ^{powerful}, handsome fifty-one-year-old with an incomparable biography."

The key word here is "if" because none of the rest of it is true. *except for Mailer's description of the man, kind, a1*
There was no "entrance into Lee's affairs" by the "baron," who never used that

title. "Seduction," like beauty, is in the mind's eye, or imagination, as it is with Mailer.

There was no way, none of any kind, in which de Mohrenschildt ~~xxxxxx~~ "entered into Lee's affairs. ^{These} and Mailer's "affairs" are in ^{Mailer's} mind, not in any reality.

The Mailer's "if" also applies to this part of Oswald's life. It is a big "if."

"Not in a Million Years" is real for Chapter 5, but not as Mailer intends. The "not in a million years" is apt as a description of Mailer's spy-novel imaginings.

after selective citation of the Commission's testimony about de Mohrenschildt

none indicating that most of the trips he and his wife Jeanne made to the Oswald's was *(as without intending it Mailer proves throughout honest part, particularly on pages 461-3)* to deliver help to Marina or the baby, who were in real need. Mailer gets to de Mohrenschildt's

coming to the United States, at New York, "just before the Second world War began."

Mailer next says that "the following years he tried to join the OSS, and his name pops up in intelligence files of various countries over the next fifteen years, culminating finally with some serious connections with the CIA, most notably on geological surveys he did in Yugoslavia and West Africa to provide an overview of their oil resources."

Mailer bing Mailer, he cites not a single file of a single country, needing none
He does not name any one of those countries. And he does not even mention those ^{files} of
this country that ~~are~~ were long available before he began the writing.

142A
3A

To those who believe Mailer is wonderful no matter how awful he is ~~this is~~
known as "solidly researched" writing ⁱⁿ *The Finders of "Reviews"*

Without doubt many more pages have been disclosed since I forced the FBI to give me
^{in C.A. 78-0322, in 1978 and 1979.}
the first of its de Mohrenschildt files. And, once disclosed to me, the FBI placed them
in its public reading room where they were available to all. All who wanted to see them,
all who unlike mailer wanted fact and truth.

having and giving no sources is "solidly researched" writing to the Finders of "reviews".

Lest the ^{reader} reason, in an unguarded moment of blind faith in Mailer or in the finders who lavished such praise on him take this literally, De Mohrenschildt was not in Yugoslavia or West Africa for the CIA. He was looking for black gold for himself. He was a geologist.

But let us not hasten, as Mailer here hastens. He has no source, not on de Mohrenschildt's "popping up" in the files of various countries. He says nothing about the available files of our country. Of which I have several on him Mailer could have seen here. As ^{others} have. Maybe a thousand pages. *BA has 1424 here*

Mailer skips from application to the ^{OSS} state to the much ^{more} recent past, but the files on him do not. There was more interest in him then than there was until the assassination.

And he did not make the OSS. The FBI suspected he might have some kind of Nazi connection.

Now if Mailer had really wanted to pin a spook tag on de Mohrenschildt, from those files on which he did not waste any time he would have seen the suspicion was that he served the "Free French," those who fought Hitler.

Her^e, if indolence ^{or} ignorance ^{of their existence} do not account for it, whether or not Mailer was aware of it, had he used those readily available files, mostly of the FBI, he might have had much more trouble writing the book he did. There is but cold comfort to his "brilliant" work in them.

Next Mailer says within parens what he does not mean, ^{of} "(Needless to say, ^{it} that geological work) it also involved much mapping of sensitive areas.)" It is not "needless" for Mailer, ^{no}, indeed! And that alleged mapping? Aside from how much he could have covered by foot and by boat, with little possibility what he saw by boat had not been mapped for years, Mailer, lacking it, gives us no reason to believe that any mapping he would like it believed ^{ever} de Mohrenschildt did produced what was not known other than inside Yugoslavia, ^{when it was, of course, well known.}

If there is any reason to believe ^{what Mailer says he} this, Mailer does not tell us. Or even suggest what it might have been. As just above we saw the importance of understanding his "if" when he uses it, here we see the basic importance of his hints-- which are never based on fact, reason or even ^m common sense.

That ~~the~~ Mailer has aged, FINDER tells us, "has not meant a slackening in his vaunted powers of observation."

FINDER also say of the book, it is "The result ^{is something} of ~~something~~ only Mailer could pull have pulled off, a brillaint blend of scholarly ~~obsession~~, journalistic shoe leather and good intellect."

" One of his major sources is even the Warren Commission's investigation ." Even?

The Post tells us that FINDER is an expert on intelligence and international affairs. At least that he "writes" about them "often."

① The tragedy is that FINDER has not the slightest glimmer of what "only Mailer could have pulled off" ^{and} ~~but~~ that he did ~~p~~ "pull off." Not only here but in the concept of the book and throughout it. But Mailer does it all ~~over~~ over again in his very next words, nothing omitted between them and the previous quotation ~~of them~~:

indist single page

"On his return from Yugoslavia in 1957, he was debriefed by J. Walton Moore of the Domestic Contact ~~Service~~ Division (not its exact title) of the CIA in Dallas." (page 441)

In all 828 pages Mailer tells the reader nothing about the CIA domestic-contact work and to compound this literary and historical fraud (which could have come from ignorance rather than ^{end 194} intent) Mailer adds this lie two pages later as part of his making up a case ^e that did not exist:

indist single page

"...Technically ^{not} speaking the CIA was ~~supposed~~ to go ~~near~~ him," meaning Oswald,

The CIA's domestic-contact ^{service} work was overt, unsecret- its offices were even listed under its name in the phone books, as other CIA offices were not.

Its function is to question ^{travelers} ~~travellers~~ when they return. This is a normal and in all ways entirely ^{proper} function of intelligence agencies. It is no more devious or secret than the reading of papers published abroad. And it does not make any kind of "agent" of those it questions.

For his own purposes here and elsewhere Mailer gives it a spooky and sinister role referring to it as "debriefing" ^{viewing} here and elsewhere but it is merely asking people what they saw and heard, ^{ordinary} ~~ordinary~~ ^{interview}

If Mailer were not as ignorant of all fact about the ^a assassination and its investi-

has persisted in being
 gations as he ~~it~~ - and without that "scholarly" ignorance he would have had the great-
 est difficulty ~~writi~~ writing this dishonest work - he could have made his dishonest case
 with the reality: that the CIA claims it did not speak to Oswald on his return. The
 probability is that it did, whatever its ^{reason} for denying it. But that it did not can
 make the case Mailer phonies up and "pulls off" with such "intelligence" experts ^{as} as
 Finder. ^{Domestic contact source (Oswald or) also} That the DCS did not speak to anyone who had spent years living in Minsk during
 the cold war ^{does not} can mean it got that information from him clandestinely rather than overtly.

Which, according to Mailer, ^{is} ^{was} the need the CIA had, as we see.

For J. Walton Moore, who was well-known through the area ~~as~~ as the CIA's domestic ^{and AS}
 contact chief for that area, ~~to~~ to "debrief" de Mohrenschildt on Yugoslavia was not in
 the sense Mailer implies any kind of ~~spooking~~ ^{spying}. And it was far from the dangerous role for
 the CIA that Mailer implies, as ^{we} come to. *It was entirely normal and entirely proper.*

I illustrate with a story the late ^{in their early days of that conflict} "elix Greene, the well-known British author,
 told me. He had just returned from Viet Nam and he was a well-known and articulate op-
 ponent of United States policy there. ^{with Greene was} Now there is an instance of what might give the CIA
 trouble if what Mailer refers to as "a direct ⁺ debriefing" then "turned out badly."

In fact it did "turn out badly," from what Greene told me, ^g because it was incompe-
 tent. "They didn't know what to ask me," he told me, "so I had to tell them what they
 were too dumb to ask me." Greene believed, ^{as} as most people do, that governments should
 be accurately informed because they make decisions, at least in theory, on what they know.

Rather than resenting being questioned, there being no taint of any kind it to,
 despite the childish nonsense Mailer hokes up here, most people cooperate quite willingly.

Witness ^{what} all those who had travelled to the USSR and particularly to Minsk gave the
 CIA, even the pictures ^{as} they took of ^{Oswald} Oswald when they met him.

In fact, so much was learned of Oswald when he was in the USSR there it nothing of
 any significance at all that ⁺ Mailer adds in his account of it. ^{He} adds detail, nothing
 else, as we see. *But he also suppresses much, and lies.*

Having cast ~~the~~ ^{with out} de Mohrenschildt in the role of a spook with ~~neither~~ a single fact to
 support it and when plain common sense refutes it Mailer actually says that he had ~~it~~

an intelligence or CIA "game" to play with Oswald. (page 443) *end 196*

Before going into that, in fairness to Mailer - if reporting that he took somebody else's idea as his own is fairness only - this particular irrationality was not Mailer's. It was old and thoroughly discredited almost 20 years earlier.

The notion that de Mohrenschildt was a CIA spook seems to have originated with assassination theorists in Dallas. Jim Garrison adopted it as his own and as was his practice with what he took from others and presented as his own, he added his own touch to it. He referred to de Mohrenschildt as Oswald's CIA "babysitter." Without using those words that is Mailer's sick notion. It is cheap novelizing of fact, of history and of truth. And, again as we soon see, it led to de Mohrenschildt's death. About which Mailer has another invention he presents as his own when it isn't. Except to intelligence "experts" like Funder, it degenerates into the ridiculous:

Without single space

The FBI by its charter did not deal with foreign affairs and the CIA most certainly did! Of course, by 1964, De Mohrenschildt's game had been seriously skewed because of the assassination, and the CIA could wreck his project in Haiti if he now connected the Agency in any small way with Oswald.

Back in 1962, however, the CIA had had need of someone with real skills to debrief Oswald. Lee was an unknown quantity. Even as the KGB had contemplated the possibility that their Marine defector was some new kind of CIA agent, now the CIA could return the compliment. Was the KGB engaging in a novel ploy? Oswald could have been sent back from Russia for purposes of Soviet propaganda. A direct debriefing, if it turned out badly and Oswald found a newspaper that would not hush it up, could prove internationally embarrassing and, worse, would injure relations once more with J. Edgar Hoover: Oswald was now ostensibly under FBI jurisdiction. Technically speaking, the CIA was not supposed to go near him. Yet, the CIA needed to know what Oswald, after living in the Soviet Union for two and a half years, could tell them about life there. A debriefing in depth could fine-tune their knowledge. The need was real, but the operation, while small, had to be delicate. They would go in for an unwitting debriefing—even as Oswald had been debriefed in Moscow without formal declaration. (page 443)

*GA job
145 fdb*

6A
145A

job 145

end 197
(Oswald was never "debriefed" in Moscow. That he was not led to paranoid CIA suspicions. But as Yuri Nosenko told first the FBI and then the CIA, the KGB's Intourist people told it that Oswald was "undependable" and they thereafter wanted only to get him out of their country.)

146 to job

Even the first words of this direct quotation are false. Whether from Mailer's permeating ignorance of such matters, despite his novel about them, Harlot's Ghost, which he soon invokes as a legitimate ^{source /} authority, or from his dishonesty ⁱⁿ of making up a case out of nothing at all, *he lies, and builds the case he wants that is false on this and on other just plain lies.*

To hide this Mailer uses words that apply to neither the FBI nor the CIA, "foreign affairs," That is not what "the CIA most certainly did" deal with. ^{Foreign affairs} That is the exclusive turf of the State Department.

What the FBI did "most certainly" deal with and the CIA was precluded from is what Mailer is talking about, counterintelligence within the United States.

In referring to what he calls de Mohrenschildt's "game" that was "seriously skewed" Mailer is careful not to say what that "game" is. That was wise of him, it not existing at all.

Likewise Mailer does not undertake to explain the impossible, good as it sounds to the novelist pretending to be writing history and unable to escape thinking and writing as a novelist, how the assassination could have "skewed" it. *If it had existed,*

At the time of the assassination and for many months prior to it de Mohrenschildt was in Haiti, working on a deal that came to nothing. How he could have influenced Oswald in any way from there can be imagined only, and it cannot be even imagined with rationality.

Moreover, neither the government nor Mailer nor any of ^{more} ~~this~~ who had the same childish idea before him, ~~had~~ came up with even a suspicion that there had been any contact between Oswald ^{and} and his "baby sitter" for all those months.

This is dishonest ^writing, nothing better, and when it deceived the Finders it could deceive most readers who tend to trust what they read, particularly from those with big reputations, ~~and~~ whether or not those reputations are deserved.

Wrapped up in ^{himself} ~~his~~ ~~self~~, they in the imaginings of his ^{grossly uninformed} ignorant mind that works as he wants it to work much better when it is ignorant, and phonying up more of his non-existing case, Mailer refers to the KGB's ~~comp~~ ^{is} "contemplating" whether Oswald was "some new kind of CIA agents."

147^{8A}A

(These are also referred to as "agents in place" because they can ~~be~~ be "dormant" for years and then used.)

Here we have, from Mailer himself, the evidence that he is ignorant of both intelligence matters ~~and working~~ and of the disclosed fact of the assassination. ^{United States}

Whatever Mailer may have gotten from the Minsk KGB the official records that were readily available to him of which he does not use a single page in all his 828 pages, and my books which brought them to light and reported on them, would have told Mailer the truth. But the one thing he could not abide if he was to have this book is the truth.

What I reported 20 years earlier, in Post Mortem, is what the KGB headquarters actually suspected and turned over to its people in Minsk. That is, as I wrote it:

incident
single
spell

"...the Russians actually ^{believed} ~~believed~~ that Oswald was a "sleepy" or "dormant" American agent and had him and his mail under surveillance all the time he was in the USSR." (page 627) ~~8/15/74~~

My cited sources are FBI reports on its interviews with the defected KGB Moscow executive Yuri Nosenko.

Not only did Mailer, Schiller et al get no more significant information from the Minsk KGB than Nosenko gave the FBI and then the CIA, but as its obvious to all other than self-styled ^{end 199} intelligence experts and desperate novelist facing a fiasco, a real disaster, ~~plating~~ ~~plating~~ anyone to be able to use him in the future is as old as the bible in intelligence. "Dormant" or "sleeper" agent is not by any stretch of even a Mailer-like imagination "some new kind of CIA agent."

But to the unquestioning, it reads well and is exciting.

As most lies can be made to seem.

What follows in what I quote above from Mailer was the concern not of the CIA but of the FBI and in pursuances of that ~~responsibility~~ ^{it} responsibility to opened cases on both Oswalds. If they had been of any interest to Mailer I got them through ^{those files} ~~ex~~ several FOIA lawsuits and he could have had them as other, including his prized source of Gerald Posner, did have access to them.

What Mailer next says is not even good fiction:

"A direct briefing, if it turned out badly and Oswald found a newspaper that

Whatever the ghost -or is it the ^{harlot?} ~~heroic~~ -of Harlot's Ghost could have had in
 mind-again ~~if~~ anything at all ~~in~~ inventing "an "unwitting debriefing."

Never heard of it in my day in intelligence. ^{Unless it is} ~~is~~ some new kind of computer
 enhancement of ESP. No computers in my day in that work. And we had little use for ESP
 in it, either.

~~At the~~ ² although this kind of tracraft jargon is ~~is~~ also

148
would not hush it up, could prove internationally embarrassing and ~~or~~ worse, would injure relations once more with J. Edgar Hoover."

In none of this does Mailer say how ^{of} expect in ^{his} the ignorance quoted earlier, that "foreign affairs" was the CIA's responsibility under its "charter," which it is not. The questioning of returned travellers was exclusively ~~the~~ CIA's, not the FBI's responsibility, The FBI jurisdiction, and this is what was prohibited the CIA, was ~~can~~ counterintelligence within the United States.

But how this normal, ~~very~~ everyday questioning could have "turned out badly" Mailer does not say. The reason is that it is not true.

There was no news in questioning returned travellers and there was no news in it if any one declined to be interviewed. So, there was nothing to "hush up" and nothing that could possibly "prove internationally embarrassing." if the CIA's DCS questioned Oswald.

Thus Mailer does not explain how any of his penny-dreadful imaginings was or could have been possible. ^{even} They were not, not a single one of his inventions that are so indispensable to his having any book at all.

The rest of the direct quotation above is also not even good fiction.

The CIA had no urgent need to know what Oswald learned ^{of} "after living in the Soviet Union for two and a half years" and what he knew could not really "fine tune," whatever, of anything at all, Mailer may mean by that, the CIA's "knowledge." ¹⁷⁵ The ~~no~~ "need" for a "debriefing in depth" is another invention. What Oswald could have said could have been of a little use, the part that Mailer ^{infers} infers, as we come to, ^{but} and there was no reason even to suspect that the CIA wanted and "would go for an unwitting debriefing."

148A here ~~It is~~ basic to the fiction Mailer "pulls off" as nonfiction ~~but~~ it is not real, not a single word of it.

Mailer had to make it up so he could continue to invent a nonexistent intelligence role for the safely-dead deMohnreschildt, safely so he could not sue, ^{or refute.}

Barrellig along to the delight of other experts who, like Finder, become "experts"

through their own fictions, like ~~Finder~~ ^{INB} Mailer's resume, not omitted in quotation, with an excerpt from de Mohrenschildt's deposition when he was questioned by Commission counsel Elmer Jenner. Jenner wanted to know how many times de Mohrenschildt saw Oswald. For all the world as though ^{and go!} he should have kept book on how many times he drove his wife to the Oswalds when she delivered clothing or food, when all the Dallas-area White Russian community were concerned about what they considered the needs Oswald could not meet of his infant daughter June. Mailer not only makes this appear to be sinister, ~~ex~~ he takes a Jenner question and the answer to invite him to invoke his own eminent authority, his novel ^{sample} That, as we have seen, he confessed to the ~~the~~ CIA was a bunch of crap.

Jenner asked if ^{the last} ~~he made it~~ de Mohrenschildt only by it was both of them, man and wife, ^{- in fact} and it was also the entire White Russian community, ^(the Oswalds) if he "had approached [people] to invite them because there were so lonesome." (page 444) ~~de Mohrenschildt,~~ again saying "because they were so lonesome," said that he did.

That this is a standard intelligence device and nothing else Mailer "proves" with his novel in which he makes a name up for it:

Walter
Singer
Hill

In the novel *Harlot's Ghost*, Hugh Montague, also known as Harlot, gives a lecture on the procedures employed to gain the confidence of a person who has been selected as a target for espionage. "Disinterested seduction," Harlot assures his CIA class, is the underlying mechanism. He then asks:

"Would any of you be familiar with the cardinal law of salesmanship?"
Rosen's hand shot up. "The customer doesn't buy the product until he accepts the salesman." . . .
"Perfect," said Harlot. "I, as the principal, am there to inspire the putative agent—my client—with one idea. It is that I am good for his needs. If my client is a lonely person with a pent-up desire to talk, what should be my calculated response, therefore?"
"Be there to listen," said several of us at once . . .

149 + 10

"Disinterested seduction." [^] My how little we knew about it in my day, which was not all that long after Mailer no longer needed diapers. How the art and the science of it matured and ~~grew~~ ^{flourished} grew since then.

"Seduction"? "Disinterested", too? Disinterested seduction. Hmmm.

Ordinary, everyday seduction is old in intelligence. ~~Not~~ ^{Not} The Mata Hari kind.

Not only the fabled Mata Hari practised it, men did too. Only the performance of some of the male ^{practitioners} seducers sometimes was not quite as good as some of the "customers" anticipated when they ^{men} knew it was being surveilled.

No, Rosens all, surveilling it ~~was~~ ^{was} electronically ~~and~~ ^{and} as well as optically was not invented by ~~the~~ ^{the} Minsk.

While we as well as the Finders may be as impressed by the mind that ^{conceived - invented} ~~conceived~~ this rare concept of effective intelligence we must be careful not to let his ~~disinterested~~ seduction divert us from the realities that do not come from his Harlot's Ghost, unprecedented a source as that is for ~~his~~ ^{his} nonfiction writing. Which in itself is rare for Mailer.

It is, however, a real "first," the kind that Schiller loved and regarded as real accomplishments, with ~~female~~ ^{anyway. it is} pubic hair, at least, a real

150 folo

This is the real jargon of real intelligence. It does not come from Harlot's Ghost
Or is it by now a ghost's harlot~~ise~~?

Whatever it is, from it

490A

That Mailer here rambles on with more quoted from his novel does not mean that we should.

This must be a first in nonfiction writing, using a novel as proof, as fact, as an acceptable source, when that novel was years earlier discredited by its author himself who is the one who cites it as authority for his fabrication of a non-existing case against a dead man who cannot defend himself. Despite this fictionizing to make his case Mailer then plays it down by concluding this passage saying, "Oswald, of course, was not being developed as an agent."

The only possible explanation for this poppycock to victimize de Mohrenschildt and adoring unquestioning reviewers like Finder is what was exclusively the FBI's jurisdiction from which the CIA was excluded, "to determine whether the KGB had turned him into their agent..." (page 445) "Turned, mind you, means that Oswald was a CIA agent, something Mailer can only imply with his novelization of all reality. If Oswald had been an American agent he could not have been "turned."

150A

From this Mailer springs ahead to "the morning of March 27, 1977," saying that

Edward Epstein had just finished his first session with George De Mohrenschildt in Palm Beach. What Mailer does not say, does not even indicate, is what de Mohrenschildt was doing in Palm Beach. If he had what he invented that follows would have been impossible. Well, it was not really his invention. He presents it as his but it had delighted the nuts of the Kennedy assassination mythologies for more than a decade.

In garrisons's day among those who were able to make misuse of de Mohrenschildt was the Dutch TV reporter Willem Oltmans. He interviewed de Mohrenschildt in depth in this country and then, when de Mohrenschildt had failed considerably from the constant pressures of those wild and uninhibited imaginations, in effect kidnapped him and took him to Europe. In de Mohrenschildt's account he escaped and made his way back to the United States. Just before he went to Palm Beach he had been institutionalized in the psychiatric section of Dallas' Parkland Hospital. When he was released and went to Palm Beach to the home of a friend to recuperate the entire community of assassination nuts was warned to leave him alone, by the Dallas Morning News' then top investigative

204

151A

"presumably," huh?

Mailer resorts to qualifications, suppositions, conjectures, inventions, outright fabrications ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{devious} ~~and~~ the other ^{can employ} ~~resort to~~ devices a talented writer with a gift for words ~~one resort to~~ while telling himself and his editors and publisher that ~~he~~ has made a conditional statement, not an unequivocal one, when his writing is designed to ~~make~~ be taken as unequivocal. Here his unconscionable dishonesty has the purpose of attributing motive to de Mohrenschildt other than the motive he had had for killing himself. Mailer contrived this to tell the reader that the real reason de Mohrenschildt killed himself was fear of exposure from the testimony he knew he had to face.

Whatever may have been in Mailer's mind, however confident he may have been about what he wrote, it is unconscionable by any rational standard, ^{or standard of common decency.}

One who writes ^{of} what he says is nonfiction has the minimum responsibility of knowing the fact, the truth, ^b about what he is writing about. ^a

Even Mailer's determined refusal to learn what the established facts are, and no writer could have been any more determined to keep ^{my} himself ignorant of them, could not possibly have left him unaware of the many times de Mohrenschildt had been questioned, had given testimony under oath and subject to the penalties of perjury, with not even a trace ^{emerging} of the wretchedly evil thing Mailer is up ~~to~~ to and is essential to his corruption of our history for money.

^{A Blind men can't see.} Mailer himself in this book quotes de Mohrenschildt's Commission testimony in which he was questioned ^{by} a prestigious lawyer who then was a candidate for the presidency of the American bar association, ^{The commission all of whom were eminent, pretty good lawyers chaired by the chief justice himself} Mailer also cites the FBI's questioning of de Mohrenschildt. It was much more extensive than Mailer indicates and as he also do not indicate, the best FBI agents were sent to ^Haiti to question him there, too.

These questioners alone are inferior to those jerks, often ^{kind} just out of law school, who would question him for the House assassins committee? Can Mailer possibly believe that?

It is not possible to condemn this kind of deliberately dishonest writing ^{more} than it deserves. Although ^wold-class assassination ignoramus that he is Mailer does not have

12B
151B

the ~~re-note~~ ^{remotest} ~~most~~ understanding of the FBI's COINTELPRO ^{operations} ~~operations~~ of which he

writes extensive in this pathetic Mailer's Tales of his, ^{that is} what Mailer ~~is~~ here doe^s to

poor dead de Mohrenschildt ^{It duplicates / most outrageous} is paralleled by one of the FBI COINTELPRO operations of

which I have full accounts from FBI files, its effort to get Martin Luther King, Jr.,

kill himself. ^{They were many many FBI COINTEL PROs, some with awful consequences, all with awful consequences intended? (en & 206)}

The Mailers in that infamous case were those higherups in the FBI who bucked that

proposal up to Hoover; those in its vaunted lab who created a fake tape and composed

^{infamous} an anonymous letter, all without leaving a fingerprint on anything; the ~~the~~ special agent

who died only recently, Lish (right) Whitson, who flew to Tampa and, with extreme care

not to leave a fingerprint on the package, mailed the phony ^{evil} tape and letter to King's

wife.

^{Mailer} All of this execrable writing, all of it based on lies, ignorance, conjectures

and to build a nonexistent case, ~~it~~ had ~~has~~ one purpose only: to make ~~it~~ appear to

trusting readers and phony "experts" like Funder who are so ~~anxious~~ ^{justify} anxious to affirm

their own preconceptions and prejudices while ~~is~~ expressing their admiration of this

fraud overloaded with Pulitzers that De Mohrenschildt was ^{as} guilty and Mailer charged

and for that reason only killed himself.

120
1510

If Mailer were not the world-~~calls~~^{class}, subject-matter ignoramus that along with his ego
and ~~the~~ the promise of ~~none~~ a large sum of money from it are his sole qualifications to
even dreaming of writing on this ^{u/}subject, he would have known that most by far of those
who were interviewed^e by the House assassins committee and its investigators were not
called to testify.

For what Epstein "learned and used in his book that after reformulation was titled ~~an~~ Legend, for which mail_{er} had high regard, Mailer himself had ~~a~~ for ~~his~~ favorite word, "bullshit." It was an earlier Mailerization of our history- another ~~or~~ *Dwight* fiction.

Earl Golz.

reporter and assassination expert, ~~Earl Golz~~. Earl is my source on this. He also warned the House assassins committee of deMohrenschildt's vulnerability.

These are the realities, the ~~well-known~~ realities, that ~~the~~ Mailer misrepresents to ~~make~~ up his phony and ~~defamatory~~ case against the dead deMohrenschildt. And if by some changes, Mailer was unaware of them, ^{realities} does that not in itself disqualify him and his writing- except as the fiction it is and he ~~plans~~ off as nonfiction?

Mailer follows this saying that Epstein was to have returned to ~~a~~ resume his interview after lunch but before then De Mohrenschildt "learned that an investigator from the House ~~the~~ Select Committee on Assassinations wished to meet him and to talk to him. That, presumably, was the preface to ~~the~~ subpoenaing for new testimony," ^{127 here}

Although we resume quotation of Mailer with nothing omitted, here it is ^{also} necessary to point out that the House assassins committee interview did not ^e mean that a subpoena would be issued later. It could, in actuality ~~etc~~ rather than in Mailer's ~~fake~~ fabrication, have meant the opposite, that thereafter the committee would have had no interest in de ^{151 here} Mohrenschildt. ^{But} ~~also~~ here the importance of ^{this} Mailer's corruption of reality, like all of them throughout the book, ^{no, but it is} designed to build up phony cases, ignores de Mohrenschildt's severely distressed emotional state from hospitalization and treatment of which he had just emerged. He was, as Earl ~~Golz~~ and the Dallas Morning News had warned, very, ~~or~~ very ~~is~~ vulnerable. Mailer's Tale continues: ^{end 207}

Walker says space

De Mohrenschildt could control his interview with Epstein to a considerable degree, but that would not be nearly as feasible with the House Select Committee on Assassinations. De Mohrenschildt promptly killed himself with a shotgun. For Epstein's literary purposes, the suicide was a catastrophe. He had already learned quite a bit and was anticipating that he would hear a good deal more. Back in Washington, among those Committee members who believed that elements in the CIA had been responsible for Kennedy's death, De Mohrenschildt's abrupt termination was assumed to be a murder.

^{151D here} The kind of person Mailer is he reflects here by a total absence ^{of} absence of sorrow over the man's death. As we have seen, there is not a word of truth in any of this Mailer writing that comes from the depths of his ignorance and his need. It should also be noted

152x 127x fols

that Mailer has no source ^{of} indicated for any ^{of} this. That is because there is no source for any of it, not a single word of it. ^{in order to refer} To use the word Mailer likes so much, what he says about "those ~~Government~~ Committee members who believed that elements ~~of~~ of the CIA had been responsible for Kennedy's death" is bullshit.

ⁿ Not a single Member of the committee has made any such statement.

Mailer makes this up to advance his fabrication that de Mohrenchildt was CIA, was Oswald's "baby sitter" as Garrison and others called him and to give ^z credibility to all ^{of} of his ^{own} condemnable mendacities,

152 fols

This is like the computer saying, "garbage in, garbage out," but it is worse than garbage. It is manufactured, ^{it} has no legitimate basis at all, ^{it} is not even responsible conjecture. It again is ^{peru} ²⁰⁸ corruption of ^{truth and of} reality for Mailer's attempt to save his book.

There is no way in which de Mohrenschildt "could control his interview with Epstein" that, if he intended to or even ^{tried} ~~tried~~ to, both of which Mailer from the depths of his ^{ve} personal corruption suggests, that he could not have used with anyone else, including the committee - if the committee wanted to ask him what Mailer invented, ^{that} and ~~as an~~ impossibility. De Mohrenschildt could have refused to talk to Epstein at all. He could have ^{refused of that committee investigator, Gaetano Fonzi, would to tell} ~~wid the the same thing to Fonzi if Fonzi spoke to him.~~ If Fonzi then returned with a subpoena, ^{even if} with all that had been falsely ~~as~~ ^{had been true} alleged against him (de Mohrenschildt could have refused to say a word under his Constitutional protection of the Fifth Amendment.

to make something of his failed book

But Mailer makes it up that de Mohrenschildt had something to hide, After all his Commission testimony, all those interviews, all the in-depth FBI interviews. Not only did what Mailer attributes to de Mohrenschildt not exist, ^{it} not only did he have no reason for even an informed suspicion that it or anything like it could exist, there is no possibility that Epstein or Fonzi could have ~~learned~~ learned from him what was not already learned and amply recorded.

The plain and simple truth is ^{it is that these newest} ~~not~~ that he killed himself not to have to ~~open~~ speak to Fonzi. ^{endless} The pressures after all those years of pressures, after his ~~own~~ lengthy hospitalization and ^l ^q treatment for them, were just too much. He could face no more ^{craziness, no more} of such abuses and terrorizations from those of evil mind, of evil intent, ^{and of} gross and intended ~~in~~ ignorance. He could no longer try to tell the truth to recapture his name, his ^{reputation.}

And that, not fear of facing Fonzi, is why he killed himself. *end 209*
^{they and others}

Only to have Finder and the Post kill what ~~these~~ ^{de Mohrenschildt} of evil intent and deliberate ignorance did to kill what had been ^{many} permitted to remain of his reputation.

This is but one illustration of Mailer's deliberate ~~corruptions~~ ^{of} our history for his own selfish, commercial purposes. It is but one of many illustrations ~~of~~ what

of how the major media makes itself party to the corruption of our history by having such unqualified, prejudiced and ignorant sycophants as Funder write reviews that will attract more interest to the corruptions of the Mailers and the like.

It was disgust over this particular plumbing of the lower depths of literary indecency that impelled me to write this chapter ^{out of sequence} when my reading of those two Mailer chapters of attempted literary assassination of the dead and innocent de Mohrenschildt coincided with ~~the~~ Funder atrocity. ^{reading} ~~guised as a literary book review.~~

There is so much of an over-abundance of this in Mailer's Tales he pretends are Oswald's I will not even think of addressing all of them. I ^{have} address more than enough to ~~live~~ leave this without any question at all. The ~~truly~~ great number of them comes from the combination of Mailer's subject matter ignorance he has preserved with such determination over so many years in which he was running off at the mouth about it; by his recognition of the fact that his ~~Oswald in Minsk~~ was a dud he had to try to bring to life somehow; ^{by} his complete lack of scruple in trying that; by his belief that he had a clique of devoted followers who would praise ^{it} no matter how bad a book he did; and among other things, ^{by} that world-class ego of his that would not let him face the ~~actual~~ actuality that he ^{remained} ~~remained~~ ignorant about the assassination and about Oswald and that what ~~had~~ been bought in Belarus, formerly part of the Soviet Union, where it had any worth at all, ^{with trifling added detail to} merely duplicated what had long been publicly available. ^{stabbing} ~~stabbing~~

For the Norman Mailer who was capable of twice ^{stabbing} ~~stabbing~~ his first wife, coming close to killing her, what he ^{in his worthless Oswald in Minsk was} ~~faced~~ confronted ~~him with~~ no challenge he ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~unwilling~~ to confront or was not able to. ^{lie to} then trying to get her to the police about it.

extra space

It might be argued from the following week's Book World that Random House was not unappreciative and not reluctant to express its appreciation as the Washington Post's stockholders ^{editor's} and administrators would appreciate, with what is not all that common in Book World, a full page ad for the book over which FINDER fairly ^{drooled.} raved. With the time spread in publishing sections like Book World that ad had to have been placed before the issue was printed. That, of course, does not rule out the possibility that

Random House knew in advance ^{what FINDER would say, and the Post would publish,}

^{almost two-thirds of that full-page ad is}
~~More than half of the ad consists of more than two-thirds~~

a picture of Mailer ^{the book's dust-jacket} in a warm jacket such as is needed in colder climes imposed on ~~what is the other third~~ ^{of that two-thirds of the full page,} the negative of a photograph of the ^{second-floor of the} house in which ^{that was the} Oswald had in Fort Worth, ^{The negative rather than a positive print, Die nothin is used} to give it ~~all~~ a ghostly appearance. Almost like an x ray.

Again Mailer's name is in large capital letters with the title taking up about as much space. The heading on the short text of the ad reads, "Beyond Myth, Beyond Murder, Beyond Anything You Have Ever ~~Dead.~~" The short text that follows says that nobody before Mailer asked, "Who was Oswald?" Mailer's "brilliant answer." Random House says, comes from ^{his} exclusive access to KGB documents."

It is not new at all that fraudulent advertising includes books and their publishers.

Besides, ^d who could possibly expect Random House to spend this kind of money, amounts ^{per d} ²¹¹ ^{spent on them} few books ever get, to simply it all with a concised truthful statement, "Beyond Belief."
 It is, ^{if not in the sense Random House intends,} "beyond anything you have ever read."
 FINDER and the Post are, or of course, far from alone. The ecstasy was almost universal as was the inability of reviewers, if they had impartial, scholarly intent, to know what of what Mailer wrote is fact, what is fiction, what if anything is new and what did or could have any meaning.

Of the other prepublication reviews Random House used in this ad The Atlantic, ~~Mon~~ Monthly's review is quoted as saying, "Constantly fascinating and clearly important. Journalism at its best."

The Kurkus Reviews, which ^{seem} to exist to ^{evaluate} what can be used in ~~advertising~~ ^{praising} any kind of literary junk at all, has this excerpted from its glorification

of ^{this} the monstrous rewriting of our tragic history, "Impressively textured...Judicious, painstaking, and imaginative..."

Random House used one word only from Booklist: "Magnificent."

^{While} ~~the~~ New York Times was not ~~absolutely~~ ^{sure} ~~schoid~~ it had two different reviewers read a single book by Norman Mailer entitled Oswald's Tale and like those fabled ^{blind} wise Men of Hindustan in the John Godfrey Saxe fable, The Blind Men and the Elephant find that elephant to be anything but an elephant, ~~from~~ ^{to be} a rope, a spear, a snake, a fan a tree and a wall.

(published April 25

In a review of almost half a standard-size newspaper page/Michiko Kakutani condemned Mailer's Tales for what it was, using such words as "cumbersome" a cut-and-paste job, "speculation," "cookie-cutter" writing, boring, pompous, derivative, solipsistic, "difficult ... to believe," "a tiresome rehashing of familiar details and arguments," "eccentric, prepared-don't English" for the Russian spoken to him; "a scissors-and-glue job", "heavily embroidered", portentous, ^d "long-winded and ultimately superfluous book," that at its best is "harmlessly looney."

^{was} But in the lead ~~the~~ cover review of that same Times' Sunday Book Review section off five days later Thomas Powers' ~~review~~ review, headed "The Mind of The Assassin," with the sub-head reading, "Norman Mailer pursues the secrets of Lee Harvey Oswald," while saying of the same book, "There is nothing new in it," ^{is much milder.} ~~does not condemn it.~~ Powers praises Mailer for his use of "the mountains of evidence collected by the Warren Commission" ^N and of Epstein's Legend, Posen's Case Closed and Priscilla Johnson McMillan's Marina and Lee.

He is less flattering in saying that "Mailer the author comes to roaring life only ~~with~~ with his 'speculations' some of which set a new record even for Mailer for ^e defying the law of gravity."

Powers concludes,

"For success Mailer must draw on a reader's reserves of Human empathy here, and

I am afraid mine are not quite up to the job. ... I admire Mailer for his effort...."

^{is not exactly} ~~praise~~ but not at all the ~~the~~ thorough-going ^{trashing} ~~condemnation~~ of the daily Times. Yet can either of these reviewers have read the book read by The Atlantic

is not
single
spare

Monthly's reviewer or the all three monkeys who read it for The Kirkus Reviews ~~or~~
and Booklist? *Or FINDER's and those of many others?*

The earliest ~~ad for~~ ^{review of} Mailer's Tales I have is from Publishers Weekly dated March 20.
As with all Magazines, it appeared before that date. Random House informed that major
publication of the book trade, which depends entirely on publisher advertising, that
publication was to be in May. Other dates in the media indicated the the middle of May.
Random House seems to have rushed appearance after this ad. It is not usual for ~~it~~ ^{Publishers Weekly} to
speak only ~~badly~~ ^{harshly} of books from publishers from whom it wants ad. And Random House is
at the top of a ^{pen 213} major book publishing empire. ~~It~~ ^{yet} along with ridicule this review
~~usually~~ refers to the various kind of conjectures on which Mailer depends and then uses
uses words like "unconvincing," "pretentious" and "plodding" *to describe his book*

I had this ~~was~~ written before that full-page ad ~~in the Post~~ ^{in the Post} appeared) and ~~it~~ ^{that review}
certainly was written ~~well~~ ^{well} after the Publishers Weekly ~~to~~ review was read at the Post
whether or not by FINDER. I therefore see no reason for shifting the focus from FINDER
and the Post, especially not because the uncritical and uninformed praise that FINDER
does not at any point dilute is typical of all the reviews of which I know.

They, too, piss on de Morhenschikdt's grave along with our history and they, too
are responsible for the wider distribution of this commercialized ² corruption of our history
and ~~the~~ for the harm done innocents like Marina, who was involved in nothing, was privy
to nothing, had no ~~the~~ knowledge of any kind about the assassination, and was the victim
of monstrous abuse by our government, the government that under so many different ad-
ministrations condemned the government of the land from which she came and where for
all their abuses nothing like it was visited upon her.

Without the FINDERs and the other reviewers ^{who} vied with each other in describing
this ~~edit~~ ^{fatal} literary dung as manna and with the publications that ~~see to it~~ ^{chose and used them!}; ~~with it~~
without the Random Houses ^{which} ~~who~~ pay for it all and ^{brought} ~~bring~~ it all to pass and the ^{of} ~~the~~ arranged
for maximum attention to it, this ~~part of the~~ corrupting and influential part of the ~~the~~
JFK assassination industry would not exist.

That there are few legitimate subject-matter experts who could be asked to write the review, which is true, does not excuse this massive shouting of hosannahs for Mailer's deviltry ^{page 214} than for Posner's, which, also from Random House, ~~preeded it~~. But they ~~can~~ all, without any indication of a single except, write what they did without consulting those who do have ~~some~~ subject-matter knowledge and yet in such bliss pray ~~ed~~ such unconscionable outrages to the heavens was not inevitable and is no justification of it.

When Publishers Weekly'd reviewer so long in advance of any other review wrote of the book as he did all the others were on informed notice and mostly, like Finder and the Book World editor, they ignored it.

Yet these same elements of the major media ~~and~~ lament nationwide disenchantment with the government while not only contributing to it, by causing it when they try to stuff this awful stuff down the ^{nauseous} national throat.

If any single reviewer or any single TV or radio show host, having read the book and seeing what it says about Oswald in "insk and what it a says/about her phoned Marina to ask her if it is true or if any of it is not true, I spoke to her after the barrage of ~~prog~~ propaganda to promote ~~the~~ Mailer's book and ^{to sell} ~~the sales of~~ it were well begun and she did not indicate ^{call.} that a single ~~wone~~ did that.

It is to be hoped that if and when they learn they will not be proud, no matter how much they were paid or what other benefit they got from their support of this newest version of the official assassination mythology. *1 end 215*

Not one seems to have asked if there were what was once the norm in nonfiction publishing, peer reviews. This ^{book} ~~book~~ could not have been recommended by any legitimate peer review. That also is not ^{now} unusual for Random House.

5/11 /95

Mrs. Marina Porter
1850 FM 550
Rockwall, TX 75807

Dear Marina,

After speaking to Deborah Vrouch yesterday I returned to the writing and when I resumed it again this morning and came to what I'd marked for writing and then forgot about I was puzzled. About ~~se~~ several things that may be of interest to you.

One is that as best a non-lawyer can determine, and I am not a lawyer, I think that Mailer ~~crosses~~ ^{crosses} the line that distinguishes whether any person who can be referred to as a "public persona" can sue for libel. That is malice. If this is true, or ~~is~~ even can merely be argued in court, then it is to wonder why Mailer did it, assuming he is not mad (a question I raised in writing earlier this morning), and why Random House, which has the best lawyers, published it. One can conjecture about this endlessly and not being a lawyer I do not, at least now now.

I do not know how much of that atrocity you have read. Mailer said in an interview I have that you read all the Minsk part and said to him "Tolstoy it isn't." An understatement. If you could bring yourself to read that volume, as he calls what was what he contracted as "Oswald in Minsk," you may have observed what follows.

First Mailer uses Merezhinsky to defame you, saying among other things that you were expelled from Leningrad because you were a whore. He also quotes you as telling ~~the~~ them you were raped. In the part where he uses Merezhinsky he also has what makes a liar of Merezhensky. That alone causes wonder about what ~~he~~ ^{Mailer then} did it. Then later he admits, when near the end of that Volume he reinterviews him, that time with his mother, to refer to him as a "prodigious liar" and to say that, and this is paraphrase, not a word he says can be believed. That alone was more than enough to cause all of that writing to be eliminated. He published the defamation that was based on "prodigious" lying.

While I cannot begin to understand that any decent man would question a woman about anything like that, they did. What you told them in all I have no way of knowing (and I'm not asking) but what Mailer used is more than your telling him it was a rape. What I'd forgotten until I saw the marker I'd put at page 37 is that he had confirmation from the best source in the world that you were raped, Irina, who set you up for it. But what is impressive is that her account confirms that part of what you told them that Mailer used.

I can think of no way any lawyer can finagle around that and that is magnified by his Merezhinsky as that "prodigious liar" use in any form.

I had decided earlier this morning to address this in a different way and I've begun it. In what I've written I wondered how Mailer could have put that on paper and how on just reading it Random House could have published it. They could not have helped notice what I did and I can think of no defense against that. That led me to thinking of other

possible explanations. The only ones I can think of are that you would not sue because that is so costly and could be so embarrassing (They have faced that cost at least twice with Posner's book and I am confident that if it was not a loss to begin with it became that through the legal costs of those two suits alone. One ~~is~~ is up on appeal now, and that escalates their costs.) and that perhaps they have what could be embarrassing to you that they did not use in the book.

I cannot believe that ordinarily Random House would have gone for such vilification that I believe is libel ~~and~~ or that their lawyers would not have counselled against publication if it.

There is the additional factor, that there is no legitimate reason for using it at all in the book which is to tell Oswald's story in the sense that he was impelled to kill the President for the "fame" he would get from that. There just is no relevance and even if there were they eliminate that by saying that Lee did not know you were not a virgin. So that could not have had any meaning to him.

What I am saying is that none of this makes sense.

And that it does seem almost to ^{be} enticing a lawsuit over it.

Which I am not suggesting.

At the same time you ~~may~~ want to inquiry ^{it} into it.

You may not even want to learn if as a matter of law you have a basis for a ~~suit~~ suit as I think you do.

I am going to ¹ raise it ¹ entirely independently with a lawyer friend who is one of my executors and whose practise is general, not specialized. When I get his opinion I may want to include it in what I'm writing.

If you give this any ~~thought~~ thought I call to your attention ^{to} what I believe is ^{truth} true, that any conference you have with any lawyer is required to be kept confidential. Also, if Random House "does business" in ¹ Texas you can sue them there and not in New York. That is a technical thing but would not be difficult to learn. If they can have a legal paper served on them in Texas they "do business" there, as ¹ understand it. You may not need a lawyer or go ^{to} to any expense to learn that. That will mean much to them as it can to you. It will greatly increase their costs whether they win or lose. Perhaps there is a basis other than libel for suing them. Perhaps a different kind of suing for defamation. And in Maryland the law has a provision that makes it a felony to charge any person with "an indictable offense" that has not been charged by the government. That makes ¹ it a criminal offense. ¹ *It used to be and may still be that the alleged damage was more than \$10,000 federal rather than state court could be used.*

I do not pretend to ¹ understand this and ¹ do not, not at all.

And while as a matter of law, meaning my very limited understanding of the law, it would seem that any suit would not clear Lee, I do think that if this went to trial that could easily become a relevant matter in what the lawyer could argue.

that is because the stated basis for Mailer's writing is that ~~Lee~~^{Lee} was guilty and his book is to explore and report on how it all came to pass.

I am not yet at my writing on that part of his book but I assure you that ~~if~~^{if} his life depended on making such a case Mailer would lose his life.

Let me tell you a little more not related to the above.

My wife has lost her skill in typing but she has offered to retype this part of what I have written. I think I have a student who has a computer who can rewrite all of it after the college years ends, as it will shortly. It will be quite some time if she does the retyping, or if anyone else does, before she reaches this part. I want a fairly clear version in the event that may be a bit remote, that NEVER AGAIN gets any attention. If that happens there may be some interest in other of my ^{Mailer} writing. In that event I'll want something ~~Not~~^{Not} as difficult to read as what ~~it~~^{it} turn out.

This may have the chance that writing on the assassination itself does not have.

I build no real hopes on this but I want to be ready in case it does happen.

And for that reason, as I told Deborah in the interview she will use instead of a review, which she asked of me and for which I do not want to ~~take~~^{take} the time from this writing, I do not want any of this used in any way that ~~discourage~~^{discourage} any use of it where more people might be reached.

My wife, who at 83 has a year on me, will ~~Not~~^{Not} be able to work on the retyping steadily. But absent anything that requires her immediate attention she'll ~~keep~~^{keep} at it until it is finished. If you would like to read it then I'll be glad to send you a copy.

Deborah also told me you had found some errors, I believe factual errors in that atrocity of a book. As you'll see I need nothing more to have a very powerful case against Mailer and his book but an indictment cannot be too powerful and I might want to add it and I would, of course, also like to know.

But I also repeat, I just can make no sense out of Mailer's writing this or of Random House's publication of it. And they are not crazy and they do have excellent counsel. Their assistant ^(Leslie Oelsner) general counsel used to be a New York Times reporter. She has to be a very good ~~re~~ lawyer for them to even consider making her next to their top lawyer. And they do hire the most expensive outside counsel for litigating such cases.

I'll let this wait a day in the hope I'll perceive more of my inevitable mistakes.

I repeat saying something I said in a different way: think if you decide to explore any possibilities of how else they may be able to hurt you. When people like them get into court they try very hard and in any way they can. I emphasize this because it makes no sense at all that they published these irrevalent and intendedly harmful defamations. Which to the best of my knowledge have not been mentioned in any review.

NEVER AGAIN! Has been sent to you. If the index, which by accident is not in the book, was not included I can send you a copy.

Sincerely,

Harold

24-4356 Delta Brush Mfg Corp
26-2512 1275 Round Table-631-1360
48-4531 Delta Chi Frat 6117 Airline Rd---363-1428
Delta Coml Cement Contractors
8383 N Stemmons Frwy-638-0263
36-7466 Delta Delta Delta Sorority House
91-4665 3100 Univesty Blvd-363-3907
30-1880 Delta Engcon Inc 10848 Luna Rd--241-2121
64-1717 Delta Engineering & Sales mfrs rep
24-0182 724 N Great Southwest Parkway-261-3241
58-6188 Delta Fish & Oyster Co
24-8277 2441 Valwd Pkwy-241-6653
48-0054 Delta Gamma House 3120 Daniels--363-2219
24-4860 Delta Inc Of Ark
Stemms Twr South Blvd-638-6883
69-2697 Delta Industl Supply Co Inc 2313 Cold
69-7781 Springs Rd Ft Worth Texas-827-0656
69-7702 DELTA LIGHTING AGENCY
85-2131 4300 N Cntrl Expressway-823-9300
38-1499 DELTA MFG & ENGRNG CORP---
30-1205 General Ofc 401 Exposition---826-6400
24-2788 Parts & Service 417 1st Av---826-6371
27-1008 Delta Metalforming Co
48-2589 10848 Luna Rd-241-2713
71-2180 Delta P Inc Div Burgess Industries Inc
71-9375 1776 Conveyor-631-2330
23-7257 DELTA P INCORPORATED
28-6543 SUBSIDIARY OF BURGESS
50-3151 INDUSTRIES INCORPORATED
21-3577 8101 John W Carpntr Frwy-631-1410
37-5558 Delta Paving Co 2121 Irving Blvd--741-3531
33-5334 Delta Quality Products
127 Manufacturing-748-5900
68-1848 Delta Sigma Phi 6201 Airline---368-9135
31-3374 DELTA SOLVENTS & CHEM CO
35-4644 OF DALLAS 11344 Plano Rd-341-0510
27-2978 Delta Spring Corporation
91-0380 9884 Monroe-358-3491
363-2686 Delta Steel Bldgs Co gen ofc
91-3767 10848 Luna Rd-241-2121
91-6837 Delta Switchboard Agency
363-2686 5538 Dyer-361-6531
239-9914 Delta Systs Inc 2905 Greenville Av-821-4930
363-1307 DELTA TIRES OF DALLAS INC
88-1910 2608 Irving Blvd-631-3810
376-8342 Delta Upsilon 719 W Abram
DelToro Isabel 1016 McBroom---747-7148
21-0754 DelToro Peggy 2906 Hillglenn---279-4377
328-5847 De Luca Donald P 10729 Villager--369-2425
43-8964 DeLuca Frank 3606 Prescott---522-0210
42-2887 DeLuna Americo 4417 Munger Av--823-4912
526-7055 DeLuna Antonio 615 N Bagley---339-0230
241-0621 DeLuna Aurora Dora
3217 Sharon St-339-1671
261-5054 DeLuna Daniel 621 Melba---946-8326
321-5135 DeLuna Hipolito 825 N Maddison---942-1092
948-1289 DeLuna Isaac 3207 Cole---747-3395
261-6049 De Luna M 548 Kirkwood---328-8680
261-5054 Deluna R 7310 Thurston---357-9665
261-5054 Delutis Alfred 9923 Milltrail---341-2793
241-3409 Delutis Thos G
3112 Valley Meadow Dr-358-5087
823-7250 Deluxe Barber Shop 3107 Knox St--526-9019
538-6195 Deluxe Barber Shop
2923 Thomas Av-823-0087
948-6376 Deluxe Carpet Cng Serv
119 N Montclair-942-6912
327-5636 DELUXE CHECK PRINTERS INC
747-3610 9125 Viscount-631-7780
363-0447 Deluxe Diner---
No 1 315 S Ervay---741-0769
No 3 1937 Comrc---741-0341
339-6835 Deluxe Enterprises 2628 Forest Av-421-0980
Deluxe Motel 6534 2 Av---391-9046
331-4466 Deluxe Recreation Club
824-3113 2923 Thomas Av-823-0087
341-5357 Del Valle L E Jr 6505 Laramanda---348-2915
826-9858 DelValle S 3916 W NW Hwy---350-2639
824-3113 del Valle Stan 3654 Norcross---358-5010
521-5064 Delzell G W 2207 Barbry---946-9663
357-5273 Delzell Helen Mrs 6131 Bandera---368-5189
368-3771 Delzell Larry McElvaney Hall SMU-369-5066
368-0102 Delzell Max 3164 Rockmoor---352-6221
368-3771 Delzer Dennis R 15518 El Estado---239-4348
Delzer LaVern D 1618 Five Mile Ct-337-1974
368-3771 Delzer LeRoy 12016 High Valley---247-0469
235-9191 Demag Material Handling Corp
1905 New Castle Ct-265-2912
De Maine Chas W 6155 Trailgren---391-2343
150-4676 Demairs Sally 1840 Josey Lne---242-3105
264-3555 Demand Joni 3110 Daniels---691-5748
DeMar Cleo 3716 S Fitzhugh---428-0213
239-6094 DeMar R E 4230 Northcrst---351-4950
337-0044 Children's Teleph
4230 Northcrest-351-1049
298-2301 Demarais Lewie
948-7894 2409 E Brookshire St-265-2568
DeMarais Raymond J
2835 Villa Creek-241-5960
de Marchin Philippe
15615 Terrace Lwn-239-4627
DeMarco Carlo G 5748 Lindshire-239-4000
Demarco Linda 4603 Swiss Av---826-9245
De Marco Lock & Key
747-4464 624 Belt Line Rd-235-7794
-341-1430 Demarco Michael 716 Hurst Dr---268-0444
-241-2734 De Marco Stanley 624 Belt Line Rd-235-7794

Demarco Victor F 3964 Cedarbrush-357-9616
Demaree Bonnie 6095 LandsEndCir-691-4572
Demarest Albert A 10811 Beauty---352-6117
Demarest C M 6561 Cliffbrk---239-3555
Demarest C Thos 517 Shirley Ct---235-3655
Demarest F C Jr 3241 Camelot---358-5985
Demarest Richard E
614 Twilight Trail-231-6962
Demarest Terry A 835 StevensHills-946-8261
DeMaret A N 3606 Edgewater---528-1624
Demaret M C 6520 Kenwood---821-4051
DeMarines John T 4311 Bowser---521-6968
DeMars Wm F 101 S Bowser---231-9691
de Martelly Edward B
6524 St Moritz-826-4359
DeMasters Edwin 100 BrunswickLn-285-4784
Demasters Maryetta 2719 E Illinois-374-5719
DeMatteo Frank 636 N Franklin Av-942-2881
DeMatteo Frank
3131 W Pentagon Pkwy-337-3244
De Mauro Randy 8651 Diceman Dr-327-8968
DeMay J H 13765 Pyramid---247-4582
Dembach Russell J Jr
2620 Community-350-3421
Dembinski Thos 3925 Simpson St--821-5940
Dembinski Thos H II 1607 Sherry St-261-3739
Dembinsky Sharon 5737 McCommas-826-0468
Dembski Fred 3818 Anthony Dr---279-8449
Dembski Fritz 3724 Flamingo Way-279-0909
Demby Elloine O 1717 Southrlnd---946-3383
Demby J P 1717 Southrlnd---942-3527
Demby Jerry 3208 Holmes St---421-9345
Demco Mfg 722 W Davis---942-9184
De Mello Nivaldo 3032 Crest Rdge-279-7168
De Melo Durval T
1212 N Norwood Dr-268-0038
Dement Esther S Mrs 4816 Terry---826-3482
Dement Hollis E 3807 Rockbluff---381-1791
DeMent J C Mrs 2729 San Jose Dr-330-1224
Dement J L 8237 Rayville---391-0572
Dement Jas L 8530 Old Homestd---398-8027
Dement Omer C 8718 Greenmound--381-2725
de Mercado Bob 6033 Spring Glen--371-9090
de Mercado Robt 6033 Spring Glen-371-7306
Demerjian Andrew G 4215 Boca Bay-241-0229
Demers Robt 1506 Pratt---948-9013
Demers Wm P 922 Green Hill---375-3461
Demers William P Jr 4542 W Kiest-331-8108
Demery Arleatha 3524 Spring---428-2017
Demetra Apts 12717 Pepperwood--247-6829
Demetri Edw David Jr 12833Jupiter-341-3645
Demetri Leslie Robt
900 W Spring Valley Rd-235-7059
Demik James 15930 Club Crest---233-2330
Deming A C 3631 Galgher---631-9422
Deming Herman 4630 Utah---374-4028
Deming-McDavid Motors Inc
1313 Ft Worth
Weatherford Tex- Dallas No 261-6231
Deming-McDavid Oldsmobile Inc
1313 Ft Worth
Weatherford Tex- Dallas No 261-6231
Deming Pumps Sales Co
10715 Harry Hines-357-4035
Deming Rex E 1606 West Shore---235-2896
Deming Richard 3627 Utah---375-6437
Deming Robt O K 4719 Cole Av---528-5783
Demings F E 2425 Caddo---826-8553
Demings Holland 3635 Pueblo---637-4464
Demings Marvin 10417 E NW Hwy-348-1403
Demings Sherman
3305 N Westmrlnd-631-7228
DeMint Frank K 1226 Laurel Nw--231-8917
De Mint Mary Jones
1519 SanSaba Dr-324-4538
Demitz Chas H Jr 3825 Marquet---361-5588
Demler Russ 2806 Reagan---526-3265
Demlow Paul L 9835 County Cork--327-4144
Demmin Richard 10520 FerndaleRd-341-4670
Democratic Executive Committee Of
Dallas County Adolphus Hotel-748-8848
Democratic Party Hdqtrs
Adolphus Hotel-748-8848
de Mohrenschildt Geo
3607 Charming-521-1309
DeMond Frances
3436 Monte Carlo St-331-1073
De Montreville Gene
7626 Pebblestone-363-9026
DeMoore Bert Mrs 2305 Balycastle-327-5023
Demore Donald M 7928 Royal Ln--368-6845
Demory Robt G 708 Williams Way--235-2280
Demoss Anna 7711 Antoinette---391-2829
De Moss & Associates Real Estate &
Insurance 3727 Dillido-327-9326
DeMoss Donald J 4927 Milam---823-2149
DeMoss E E 1848 Oates Dr---327-0441
DeMoss Evelyn 2946 Reservoir---337-4131
DeMoss Frank Martin
6822 Vivian Av-328-8845
De Moss H W 661 Braden---285-5932
DeMoss Harold R
6722 Pemberton Dr-361-1940
De Moss Homer W constable
823 N Galloway-285-5429
Demoss Jas W 6006 Worth---826-4269
DeMoss Jerry B 2708 Westvw---279-5424

Deloach--Dendy 277

70164 ©Southwestern Bell Telephone Company 1971
De Moss L H 6245 Revere---827-1762
Demoss Lanny V 1930 Balla Way---264-7725
De Moss Lyle 8249 San Cristobal--327-6459
De Moss M D 6318 Fisher---691-5679
DeMoss Susie D 10851 Caprock---348-8667
De Mott Kenneth E
400 Sunset Ct Arlington-261-9033
De Mott Norma Martin Hall S M U-691-6697
DeMott Vincent A 7903 MillstoneDr-328-0362
DeMouville Zema Mrs
3452 Monte Carlo St-331-8929
DeMoye R J pest contrl
50 Hghlnd Pk Shop Vlge-521-7722
De Moye R Jimmie 4409 Colgate---361-7722
Dempsey Alan C 1239 Hartsdale---337-1329
Dempsey D J Jack 505 Alcalde---821-5759
Dempsey E E 2245 Royal Ln---247-7579
Dempsey Edwin A 555 Oriole Blvd--298-1227
Dempsey Elmer 2245 Royal Ln---247-7579
Dempsey Gordon H
714 Winchestr Dr-235-0452
Dempsey Herman B 414 NE 32---262-7846
Dempsey I M 4422 McKinney Av---528-9680
Dempsey J E 14301 Carla---286-5574
Dempsey J E Jack 107 W Davis---298-2524
Dempsey J L 10535 Channel Dr---352-6422
Dempsey J T 3270 Darvany---357-3720
Dempsey Jack 700 Waggoner Dr---261-4008
Dempsey Joe H 1915 Hope---824-3491
Dempsey John 1526 Ash---262-7741
Dempsey Jos 14429 Heartside---247-0440
Dempsey Jos M 6622 Day St---381-2774
Dempsey Joyce E 3933 Buena Vista-521-2027
Dempsey Kenneth H
1311 Hillcrest St-285-2356
Dempsey L H 6258 Sudbury Dr---827-1093
Dempsey L J 6602 Lake Circle---826-3599
Dempsey Mary T 4824 Coles Manor-826-2309
Dempsey Maynard 606 Devnshre---235-7523
Dempsey Michael 8419 Blossom Ln-381-7891
Dempsey Robt E 2330 SantaCruz---381-5829
Dempsey Suney O Della
4303 Swiss Av-823-4733
Dempsey Ted R ins
Amer Bk & Trust Bldg-948-3545
Res 707 N Oak Cliff Blvd---941-4775
Dempsey Thos A 14633 Reforma---239-5465
Dempsey Tom 14621 Cherry Hls---247-3366
Dempsey W B CPA Meadows Bldg--363-4349
Res 2933 E Binkley---368-0726
Dempsey Walter B 3245 Dothan---352-5602
Dempster Brothers Inc
1820 Concord Lane Denton-387-0041
Dempster Gene 3525 Casaverde---241-1153
Dempster Industries Inc
2269 Vantage-638-1311
Dempster John R 2905 Gladiolus---337-2359
Dempster R E 4154 Dunhaven Rd---352-8234
Dempster W H 4156 Newtn---521-3522
DeMunbrun David 3303 Knight---522-4679
Demund Martha Mrs
908 W Pembroke-943-4094
Demus Brenda 2415 Leath---638-6696
Demus Doyle 2135 E Illinois---376-1885
Demus Harold Edward
3348 Southern Oaks-371-0312
Demus Josephine 2903 Ann Arbor-371-2023
Demus Lloyd David 430 Av J---946-7208
Demus Marion W 9427 Lnnngrove-348-0059
Demus Melvin E 2903 Ann Arbor--371-9805
Demus Milton 1303 Waweenoc---376-2374
Demus Rachel 4802 Beulah---421-3916
Demus Sammy 4802 Beulah---421-3916
Demus Shirley 1507 Milam Way---242-2975
DeMuth W R 9950 Edgeclf Cir---348-3741
Teenager's Teleph
9950 Edgeclf Cir-348-3307
Demyan John R 2105 Austin Dr---242-5536
Den-Tal-Ez Inc 1st Bk & TrustBldg-238-0981
Den The 5116 Greenvle Av---368-9496
Dena Wills 1817 Stevens Forest--943-8982
DenBleyker Jacob 13124 Kerr Tr--241-0495
Denbow Billy D 9649 Crownfield---286-7205
Denbow Johnny C 931 Edgelfd---224-1737
Denbow M L 370 S St Augstne---286-4610
Denbow Ted 5924 Birchbrook---368-1287
Denbow Ted 3706 Wheeler---526-6620
Denbow W C 634 Turner Av---942-3282
Denby Ealon 631 Jonelle---391-5457
Denby Novis Hunter-Ferrell---264-3553
Denby Robt L 4214 S Fitzhugh---426-1882
Denby Sammy L 7016 Moondle---391-0010
Denby W K 222 S Edgelfd---942-1232
Denby Wallace L 11325 Newkirk--241-1216
Denby's Barber Shop
147-D Plsnt Grove Shop Vlge-391-9000
Denco Security Systs
2929 Cedar Springs-526-1290
Dendinger Arch G 2314WLOversLn--352-2767
Dendy Bill F 5924 Birchbrk---369-5617
Dendy C R 9875 Audelia---341-2569
Dendy C S 109 S Ellis St---227-1210
Dendy J L 1819 Appletree Ln---242-1647
Dendy Mike 2727 Hood St---528-1509

Given the huge discrepancy in other places between his manuscript and his testimony, it is obvious that De Mohrenschildt was working from one agenda in 1964 and another in 1977. Yet, on this specific point concerning the value of Oswald's manuscript, his reactions are close to identical: It is the only place where there is agreement between testimony and manuscript. Even in 1977, De Mohrenschildt is still doing his best to shift attention away from the thought that he had any interest in Oswald's manuscript. Evidence of interest, after all, could suggest the possibility that he had had a task to perform, and one part of it was, precisely, to obtain Oswald's fifty pages long enough to have a copy made and passed on to the proper people. So, he was still debating in 1977—out of fear, presumably, of how much he had to tell—whether to reveal his covert connections. Yet, a few weeks later, most desperate for money, he was ready to be interviewed in depth by Edward Epstein, although not wholly ready—his suicide interrupted his confession. Most of what he had to tell was now lost.

It has to be understood that the Warren Commission in their own decorous fashion had been suspicious of George, and pursued the details of his biography with exceptional attention. There was so much, after all, to check up on.

Having arrived in New York just before the Second World War began, De Mohrenschildt soon went to work for his cousin, Baron Konstantine Von Maydell, on a documentary about the Polish resistance. Yet, not too long after the partition of Poland in 1939 between the Soviet Union and Germany, Maydell became a Nazi agent, or so he was later identified by the FBI. De Mohrenschildt, on his own declaration, was "collecting facts on people involved in pro-German activity" for another friend, Pierre Freyss, who was head of the Deuxième Bureau for French counterintelligence. De Mohrenschildt was almost certainly serving as a double agent in that period, but whether his primary allegiance was to the French or the Germans is another matter.

By the following year he tried to join the OSS, and his name pops up in the intelligence files of various countries over the next fifteen years, culminating finally in some serious connections with the CIA, most notably on geological surveys he did in Yugoslavia and West Africa to provide an overview of their oil resources. (Needless to say, it also involved much mapping of sensitive areas.) On his return from Yugoslavia in 1957, he was debriefed by J. Walton Moore of the Domestic Contacts Division of the CIA in Dallas.

The Well-born Friend

If there is any place where a narrative of Oswald's life is bound to take on the seductive ambiguity of a spy novel, it is with the entrance into Lee's affairs of Baron George De Mohrenschildt,¹ a tall, well-educated, powerful, handsome fifty-one-year-old with an incomparable biography.

McMillan: . . . born in Mozyr, Belorussia, in 1911 . . . he was . . . fond of pointing out [that] he was . . . a mixture of Russian, Polish, Swedish, German, and Hungarian blood . . . the Mohrenschildts traced their ancestry back to the Baltic nobility at the time of Sweden's Queen Christina—the proudest nobility in all Russia. The men of the family had a right to be called "Baron," but such were their liberal opinions that neither George's father, Sergei von Mohrenschildt, nor his Uncle Ferdinand (first secretary of the czarist embassy in Washington, who married the daughter of William Gibbs McAdoo, Woodrow Wilson's son-in-law and Secretary of the Treasury), nor George himself, nor his older brother Dmitry, ever made use of the title.²

Gary Taylor, who had been married to De Mohrenschildt's daughter, Alexandra, offers a good description of the Baron:

MR. TAYLOR. Uh—he is a rather overbearing personality; somewhat boisterous in nature and easily changeable moods—anywhere from extreme friendliness to downright dislike—just like turning on and off a light.

MR. JENNER. What about his physical characteristics? . . .

MR. TAYLOR. He's a large man, in height only about 6'2" but he's a very powerfully built man, like a boxer . . . And he has a very big chest which makes him appear to be very much bigger than he actually is . . .

MR. JENNER. All right. Give me a little more about the personality of George De Mohrenschildt . . .

MR. TAYLOR. I would say that he has an inflammable personality. And he's very likable, when he wants to be . . .

MR. JENNER. Is he . . .

MR. TAYLOR. Yes; or things like this, the 52—is a little un- married to his da- of a position for w as a result, why, h which is tennis. A bathing shorts I n have always owned all kinds of weathe door sort of peopl

MR. JENNER. Is [his the respects you h

MR. TAYLOR. Yes; ve

MR. JENNER. She, li does she?

MR. TAYLOR. Yes, q

Inasmuch as Jeanr overweight, she too Commission was, na nated with De Mohr of close print. Virtu devoted to his biogr his life that it was dif

MR. JENNER. . . . the naturalized Nove New Haven, whic those facts square

MR. DE MOHRENSCHI remember he wen mates.⁴

When it came to dentials. He was the Jacqueline Kennedy when she was a wife

Not in a Million Years

There is one place where De Mohrenschildt's reactions in 1964 and in 1977 do not conflict. It gives a clue.

Oswald had his own manuscript, a fifty-page work in longhand (the first ten pages of which were typed by Pauline Bates a couple of days after he came back to America). It is an ungainly text, dense in its material, but does offer a closely seen view of existence in the Soviet Union; at that time it would have been of some value to American intelligence: Oswald was offering a working-day perspective of life in Minsk that was percipient. (Indeed, a large part of his manuscript is printed in the Appendix.)

Soon enough, he was induced to show these pages to his new friend George.

Here is De Mohrenschildt's account in 1977 of how he spoke to Oswald about the manuscript in 1962:

"Your story is simple and honest but it is very poorly written. It is deprived of any sensational revelations and it's really pointless. Personally I like it because I know Minsk, but how many people know where Minsk is? And why should they have interest in your experiences? Tell me!"

"Not many," Lee agreed mildly.

I did not say, not to offend him, that his grammar was poor and his syntax was abominable. And those long, pompous words . . .¹

His remarks to the Warren Commission in 1964 give much the same estimate:

MR. DE MOHRENSCHILDT. . . It was just a description of life in a factory in Minsk. Not terribly badly written, not particularly well . . . I just glanced through. I realized that it is not fit for publication. You can see it right away . . .

MR. JENNER. It is horrible grammar?

MR. DE MOHRENSCHILDT. Horrible grammar.

MR. JENNER. And horrible spelling.

MR. DE MOHRENSCHILDT. Yes.²

Given the huge manuscript and his testimony working from one this specific point his reactions are clearly an agreement between De Mohrenschildt from the thought that Evidence of interest had had a task to obtain Oswald's file passed on to the pro out of fear, presumed reveal his covert create for money, he was Epstein, although confession. Most of

It has to be understood own decorous fashion sued the details of Lee was so much, after :

Having arrived in began, De Mohrenschildt Konstantine Von M resistance. Yet, not between the Soviet agent, or so he was on his own declaration pro-German activities head of the Deuxième Mohrenschildt was that period, but whether the Germans is a

By the following pops up in the inter fifteen years, culminating the CIA, most notably and West Africa to (Needless to say, it a On his return from ton Moore of the D

Herman Graf
Carroll & Graf
260 Fifth Ave.,
New York, NY 10001

5/4/95

Dear Herman,

I have just finished the rough draft of an excoriation of Norman Mailer like you cannot imagine. It is for a book tentatively titled Mailer's Tales with the subtitle Of the JFK Assassination. It runs about 5-6,000 words as best I can guess. I was motivated to do it out of sequence in this writing by a combination of Finder's so-called review in Book World and two de Mohrenschildt chapters of Mailer's. Like most of his second Volume in Oswald's Tales it is fictional. But in this case he assassinated a ~~a~~ much-abused dead man who could not respond. I tell you about it in the event you may want to try to place it where if accepted it can appear rapidly, like The Village Voice of New York magazine. Neither of which I have seen in years. That would, if used, attract attention to NEVER AGAIN!.

While everybody seems to be going nuts ~~off~~ over what is a real monstrosity is a time that would be more likely to get a real controversy going once it appeared almost anywhere at all.

Of the other publications that ~~are~~ appear fairly rapidly of which I know I think the New York Review is out.

What I have done albeit in haste is a solidly factual denunciation that few writers, especially any who have gotten two Pulitzers, have ever faced.

If I do not hear from you promptly I will assume that you have no interest and if any other opportunity suggests or presents itself I'll explore it.

I do appreciate your phoning to tell me that the index was omitted by accident. By a different kind of accident that happened at the printer's with my second book in 1966. As soon as I heard from you I wrote a dozen and a half letters to those with whom I work or who have helped me telling them of this accident and that I'll in time supply xeroxes I'll ask some of them in turn to distribute further. In thinking of this I wondered what the cost would be if the printer were to reprint a small number of them say 100. If you will, please try to learn this and let me know it may save me much work. I'd rather use that time on Mailer. I guess ~~like~~ I have maybe 35,000-40,000 words on paper already.

Aside from his disgrace of a book it is already quite a story on him and on that Schiller "associate" of his it would defame hyenas and vultures to refer to as what he has spent a lifetime being, a "Scavenger," the title of his first book he paid someone else to write while referring to himself as a "journalist."

Best
Herald

with her unconscious daughter. She writes of her own Chilean childhood, the violent death of her uncle, Salvador Allende, and the family's flight to Venezuela from the oppressive Pinochet regime. Allende explores her relationship with her own mother, documented in the hundreds of letters they exchanged since she left home. Allende later married—and divorced—an undemanding and loyal man and became a fierce feminist, rebelling against the constraints of traditional Latin American society. Eventually, hope waning, Allende and her son-in-law take the comatose Paula to California, where the author lives with her second husband. The climactic scenes of Paula's death in the rambling old house by the Pacific Ocean seem to take place in another time and space. Only a writer of Allende's passion and skill could share her tragedy with her readers and leave them exhilarated and grateful. *QPB selection.* (May)

FYI: Paula will launch the HarperLibras Spanish imprint. *3/20/95 - PCW*

OSWALD'S TALE: An American Mystery

Norman Mailer. Random, \$30 (896p)
ISBN 0-679-42535-7

Mailer opines that Lee Harvey Oswald was a sincere Marxist, a nihilist and an inveterate liar who was motivated to assassinate John F. Kennedy in order to shake up the world, to create the conditions for a new kind of society superior to American capitalism or Soviet-style communism. Oswald, he suggests, was quite possibly the lone gunman, or at least may have thought he was—in Mailer's scenario, there may have been other assassins present, unbeknownst to Oswald, conspirators working for some other group. His (unconvincing) analysis emerges from a labyrinthine pastiche of KGB and FBI transcripts, recorded dialogues, speculations, Oswald's letters and diary excerpts, and government memos. Mailer interviewed Oswald's widow, Marina, and also spent months in Minsk interviewing Oswald's Russian acquaintances and co-workers as well as KGB officers. Pretentiously applying the novelistic techniques used to better effect in *The Executioner's Song*, Mailer (ploddingly) recreates Oswald's day-to-day existence in the Soviet Union, then in New Orleans and Dallas in the months leading up to Kennedy's assassination. He hypothesizes that Oswald was a provocateur playing a double-edged game with the U.S. and Russian intelligence communities to further his own self-styled mission. *Author tour.* (May)

☆ HIDDEN TREASURES REVEALED: Impressionist Masterpieces and Other Important French Paintings Preserved by the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg

Albert Kostenevich. Abrams, \$49.50
(272p) ISBN 0-8109-3432-9

An astonishing feast of unknown masterpieces, this glorious album is a historic event that deepens our understanding of modern art. It documents an exhibition at Russia's Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg, unveiling a large trove of French impressionist and post-impressionist paintings—by Monet, Renoir, Matisse, Pissarro, Degas, Gauguin, Van Gogh, Manet, Toulouse-Lautrec, Picasso, etc.—whose existence had been a carefully guarded secret for half a century. The paintings were seized from German private collections during WW II and transferred to the Hermitage's storage rooms. Many of these works have never been exhibited before, even in prewar times. Among the 74 full-page color plates are Van Gogh's psychologically charged *White House at Night*, painted six weeks before his death; Degas's *Interior with Two Figures*, a symbolic drama of alienation between the sexes; vibrant pictures made in Tahiti by Gauguin; and canvases by Daumier, Delacroix, Edouard Vuillard, André Derain. Kostenevich, a Hermitage curator, has provided an extensive commentary on each picture. *BOMC main selection.* (May)

THE HITE REPORT ON THE FAMILY: Growing Up Under Patriarchy

Sherie Hite. Grove/Atlantic, \$22 (448p)
ISBN 0-8021-1570-5

Hite's latest sex report, based on some 3000 questionnaires completed by children and adults in 16 countries (50% from the U.S.), focuses on the child's developing psychosexual identity and the impact of this process on adulthood. Her guiding theme is that the patriarchal family is outmoded, sexist and authoritarian and suppresses openness between children and parents about the body. Unlike critics who decry a breakdown of the traditional nuclear family, Hite argues that the rise of diverse new family structures signals a democratizing of the family and a growing concern for women's and children's rights. Her respondents' testimonies, organized around specific themes, touch on all manner of taboo subjects (e.g., the link between childhood spankings and adult sadomasochistic fantasies; parents' erotic feelings for their children; sexual play between boys). For most children, Hite claims, growing up in single-parent families is beneficial, par-

ticularly for boys raised by their mothers. A manifesto masquerading as a scientific report, her in-depth, unusually frank survey gives voice to some of the most closely guarded secrets and feelings of women, men, girls and boys struggling to define themselves sexually. *50,000 first printing; first serial to Ms. (March-April cover story); author tour.* (May)

IN THE TIME OF THE AMERICANS: FDR, Truman, Eisenhower, Marshall, MacArthur—The Generation That Changed America's Role in the World

David Fromkin. Knopf, \$30 (640p)
ISBN 0-394-58901-7

Inspired by President Woodrow Wilson's idealistic internationalism, three subsequent U.S. presidents—Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower—steered Americans away from isolationism to support an active, major role for the U.S. on the world stage. Under their leadership, America helped defeat Hitler, waged a Cold War against Soviet aggression in Korea. Fromkin's dramatic, engaging political, military and diplomatic history yokes FDR, Truman and Ike in a group portrait with George Marshall, architect of America's postwar financial program to reconstruct Western Europe, and General Douglas MacArthur, WW II hero and commander of U.S. and U.N. forces in Korea. In a panoramic canvas peopled by George Kennan, Joseph Kennedy, John Foster Dulles, Felix Frankfurter, William Randolph Hearst and many others, Fromkin (*A Peace to End All Peace*) argues that America, acting with mixed motives but without imperial designs, opposed Europe's imperialisms, whether British, German, French or Soviet, and played a key role in destroying them. Fromkin is a Boston University professor of international relations, history and law. (May)

''SPOTTED DICK, S'IL VOUS PLAIT'':

An English Restaurant in France

Tom Higgins. Soho (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, dist.), \$22 (256p) ISBN 1-56947-032-4

The idea of a restaurant specializing in English food was a joke to the people of Lyons, gastronomic center of France. Typified by overcooked meats and vegetables, soggy puddings and revolting jellies, English food was not dignified as a cuisine at all by the Lyonnais. But Higgins and his wife, Sue, loved the city and, having always wanted to run a restaurant, ignored all warnings and found a house in a low-rent section of town, where they lived