

XV *How The Mighty Have Fallen!*

part <sup>Volume</sup> Part II of this chapter is titled, Charisty in Forth Worth, <sup>MIT</sup> Mailer rehashes the Warren Commission testimony of the utterly irrelevant White Russian community. Obviously Mailer did not believe <sup>the</sup> and excerpt he uses of George de Mohrenschildt's testimony, that they were not really friends of the Oswald, "we were just too <sup>UK</sup> busy to be with them - period...they were very lost, penniless, mixed-up." Both Oswald's annoyed me." (Page 439) In his chapter 4 of his Part II "ailer has ~~to~~ 22 sources notes. Only one of them is not from the Warren Commission or House assassins published volumes. That one source is <sup>M.M.</sup> Millan. This is not a rehash of what was well known? Not a cut-and-paste job, a <sup>Y</sup> description Random House was quoted as objecting <sup>to</sup> to?

If <sup>might</sup> by any chance Mailer imparted new information to this, that would be understandable. But he does not. He just repeats what had been so well and so publicly known for so many years, What else does it ~~to~~ require to get rave reviews from hack reviewers, or fat contracts from such publishing ~~empire~~ empires as Random ~~House~~ House?

Part III is titled "Dark Days in Dallas." The real dark is in Mailer's mind. He even attributes to Oswald's reading on <sup>Mein</sup> ~~Vien~~ Kampf some of the overflowing sickness of his own mind in his endless mindreading of the dead and shrinking of them to. Thus his ~~own~~ Chapter 2 in it is of all things (for an anti-fascist whose favorite book was The Animal Farm, and Mailer cannot slick-talk himself around that) Oswald "was more than ready to read Mein Kampf and feel some identity with Hitler... working at a low-paying job while feeling within himself every presentiment that he was a man destined for ~~greatness~~ greatness." (page 457)

Never in his life did Oswald have other than "a low-paying job" other perhaps than in Minsk, where he did get more than others working at the same job, given to him by the Soviet Red Cross. But Mein Kampf? When as Mailer admits, among other books <sup>Orwell's</sup> he read at the same time were Shirer's Rise and Fall of the Third Reich and 1984 and The

end 325

Animal Farm  
2MA/B

this is one of the more ~~dis~~ disreputable points in Mailer's total <sup>his</sup> disreputable work of gross and indecent fiction he says is nonfiction <sup>by</sup> where ~~Mailer~~ <sup>he</sup> builds

By (Mailer's) what he likes to call "logic" should Oswald not have had twice the "presentiment" drawing him more to Orwell's thinking when he at the same time read ~~it~~ twice as much of Orwell as he did of Hitler? To say nothing of ~~his~~ his extensive reading before and after this brief interval?

And with Oswald's well-known political beliefs how can even Mailer-type "logic" have Oswald "Identify" with Hitler more than with Shirer, Orwell or both?

Mailer's invention of any Oswald thinking like Hitler<sup>y</sup> invented with not even a dubious basis for suspecting it, while essential to his book in fact is baseless,

and if ~~it~~ ~~it~~

2148 fols

214 B Feb 2014

Maller is long on his "presentiment" <sup>silliness</sup> excuse for using Mein Kampf as a source  
 so he can attribute Hitler-like ambitions to Oswald but it is Maller himself who  
~~he~~ proves this is, ~~that~~ <sup>his</sup> sometime favorite of ~~Maller's~~, bullshit. If we skip ahead to  
 page 561 we find no less a ~~pr~~ "presentiment" that Oswald's real ambition, Maller attrib-  
 buting ~~pr~~ great ambition to him, was really to become President of the United States  
 because there we find Maller reporting that Oswald read <sup>JFK biography</sup> "anchester's ~~Portrait~~ Portrait of a  
President. But, again using what Maller' palms off as reason or logic, a word he also  
 likes if not its ~~rational~~ <sup>practise</sup>, if Oswald were somehow <sup>d n/</sup> rive to assassination, does  
 his not taking from the library at the same time Solzhenitsyn's A Day in the Life of  
Ivan ~~Den~~sv Denisovich mean that what Oswald really longed for was to knock Khrushchev off?

Put into 214  
 bottom

And, as in time we see, even then ~~was possible~~ <sup>could</sup> be ~~made~~ <sup>done</sup> with all of his trick <sup>to</sup>  
~~made to~~ <sup>only</sup> seem ~~to be~~ possible by Mailer's absolutely unconscionable ~~or~~ <sup>suppression</sup> of what was so  
publicly available <sup>of the official website</sup> that he had to know about or, if he did not, <sup>with</sup> such abysmal ig-  
norance he had no business even thinking of writing any work of even pretended nonfiction.

*a phony and*  
~~his~~ <sup>is</sup> nonexisting basis for saving himself from ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> bankruptcy with which he and Schiller return <sup>ed</sup> from getting creamed by the Minsk KGB. From the sickness of his own mind, his own self-concept and overweening ego and most of all from desperate need Mailer here gets into his irrational case for Oswald killing Kennedy because he felt that ~~he~~ would make him a great man and a world leader- as Mailer does not say and as would have been inevitable, <sup>either</sup> from the jail where he'd spend the rest of his life, ~~or~~ or from the grave if not that lucky. <sup>it really</sup> Only a sick, unconscionable and desperate man would be capable of this kind of worse than nonsense that all of his effort in this ~~his~~ book is intended to make <sup>seem</sup> real ~~was~~ when it was not, could not have been, and is as crazy an idea as Shrink Mailer could make up to save himself. 215A

end 326

215A - <sup>mail</sup> When he says that Oswald was "feeling within himself every presentiment that ~~Oswald~~ he <sup>was</sup> as a man destined for greatness against all odds," that <sup>obviously</sup> is total fabrication, without even a reasonable <sup>suspe</sup> suspicion to give it any semblance <sup>any</sup> of any possibility at all. But to make it appear to have some basis Mailer invokes of all authorities, words he <sup>selects</sup> elicits from Hitler's Mein Kampf- about his own life and imaginings! <sup>mixed</sup> Mixed in with irrelevant additional selections from other <sup>published</sup> (testimony by those White Russian emigres Mailer has additional quotations from Mein Kampf!

And this is the <sup>a</sup> <sup>in</sup> basis from Mailer's whole "solution" through his ~~work~~ "biography" of Oswald!

With this and other insanities Mailer continues to rehash that testimony, relieved now and again with selections from other such eminent <sup>in important and second and third-hand</sup> experts as Priscilla McMillan. end 327

No less insane is Mailer's statement that in saying he did not believe Oswald was the assassin deMohrenshildt used that as his <sup>way</sup> ~~way of serving~~ <sup>entirely</sup> ~~entirely~~ imagined, by Mailer, <sup>way</sup> of serving notice on the CIA." (Page 474)

Despite this, <sup>writes</sup> Shrinking away with no thought of even minimal reasonable rationality, Mailer, that despite this ~~Mailer~~-imagined "serving notice on the CIA," "George maintained his covert stance," still another figment of the Mailer mind or conscious expression of his desperate need. (page 474)

215B job

If any <sup>w</sup>riter other than a Mailer ~~piece~~ produced such awful slop of the mind he would be laughed at for the rest of his life. And ~~it~~ should be. But craziness like ~~it~~ this ~~common~~ coming ~~for~~ from Mailer gets him rave notices and people standing in line to hear ~~it~~ him.

When we come to the ~~thing~~ <sup>y</sup> truth - meaning the official truth in evidence, not the overflowing of <sup>other</sup> intellectual sewers - ~~that~~ <sup>it</sup> will then seem to be more impossible <sup>this</sup> that ~~it~~ could be published and that he could be adored for making it all up.

216 fols

Here Mailer is his usual generous self: he does not claim an exclusive patent on making our history up. Thus when ~~Her~~ Eostein, knowing that de Mohrenschildt was <sup>re</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>Epstein's</sup> ~~psychotic~~, believes every word he says and has no independent confirmation, that <sup>making</sup> ~~of our history arbitrary~~ <sup>for his own purpose</sup> becomes, in Mailer's words, "Exploring the matter further."

That is like those beautiful clothes on the emperor of the fable, those clothes that did not exist. There was no such matter to "explore." But saying it surely helps <sup>OK</sup> sell books. Continuing, nothing omitted in quotation,

Sick as this is, obviously insane without any question at all, utterly sourceless as the result, it is what the "intelligence" experts like the Post's Finder revealed in and waxed rhapsodic about. Mailer next devotes this rare talents of his to a young young Japanese woman named Yaeko Okui who was at a Christmas party with most of the "White Russian" community. (pages 477-80) She was a musician, playing with the Dallas symphony and was from a very fine Japanese family. ... wealthy." (page 477) But that does not fool Mailer one bit. No, sir, not the littlest little bit! No siree, not the Harlot's most expert on speaking that he is. And neither did Oswald's talking Japanese to her.

*That was*  
*all cover that Mailer sees through, of course.*  
*On this*  
 Mailer says of him: *de Mohrenschildt's* *end 328*

*indent single space*

To all appearances he was busy chasing a couple of girls, but his antennae were out and he remarked to Marina: "That Japanese girl—I don't trust her. I think she works for some government or other, but which one, I don't know."<sup>11</sup>

We can take it for granted that De Mohrenschildt, in the course of debriefing Oswald, would have had many conversations with him about sex and would have known of his considerable regard for Japanese women. In *Legend*, Edward Epstein explores the matter further:

*216A* →

*indent single space*

George De Mohrenschildt subsequently testified that ... [Oswald] had made some "contacts with Communists in Japan" and that these "contacts" had induced him to go to the Soviet Union. At least this was what Oswald had confided to him. Now, as he watched them talk across the room, he wondered whether [Yaeko] might be trying to find out about this earlier period in Oswald's life. In any case, [George] didn't trust her.

Yaeko herself never fully divulged the contents of this long conversation with Oswald ... She would later say when questioned by the FBI in 1964 that she and Oswald had discussed "flower arrangements."

At about midnight, De Mohrenschildt suggested to Oswald that they leave ... Oswald wrote down a number that Yaeko gave him, as Marina observed; then he followed De Mohrenschildt out the door.<sup>12</sup>



end 329

Harlot's Ghosting he way merrily along Mailer gives us much to consider so I break the quotation at this point to note that his footnote 11 referring to that "Japanese girl" is to McMillan's book. For deMohrenschildt's "debriefing of Oswald," what Mailer says "we can take it for granted," because Mailer says we can take it for granted we have no choice. He has no source, there being none other than cozes from his mind and he struggles to meet his need, <sup>on recognizing he had nothing at all in Oswald in Minsk,</sup>

For all the rest Mailer has but that footnote 12. It reads, <sup>one source</sup> "Epstein, ~~xxxxx~~ op. cit. pp. 481-2" (page xxix) Although <sup>Mailer's</sup> Mailer says "Epstein" he refers to McMillan. Epstein's book is not that long. Yet <sup>he</sup> the text says what Mailer says ~~is what~~ that it is in Legend that Epstein "explores further" that I quote above, "We can take it for granted that De Mohrenschildt, in the course of debriefing Oswald, would have had many conversations with him about sex." That is "debriefing" <sup>every</sup> of Harlot's Ghost variety, for intelligence purposes?

"Many" <sup>reports</sup> conversations? How many is that many? By most concepts de Mohrenschildt and ~~Oswald~~ Oswald did not have than "many" <sup>- if any - really</sup> private meetings <sup>for any</sup> "debriefing" <sup>possible</sup> to be possible.

Mailer's reference to de Mohrenschildt's "subsequent" testimony, which does not even suggest where he testified or to what it was "subsequent," has no source note unless ~~that~~ too, comes from McMillan. But then Mailer has all the printed testimony of both the Warren Commission and the House assassins as the two leading items in his bibliography, <sup>should</sup> <sup>(quoting Epstein)</sup> so why ~~she~~ he use <sup>his</sup> McMillan as a source for <sup>his</sup> own sources? <sup>that is just in his bibliography as</sup> odd?

Remember, Mailer actually says in this monumental book of his that de Mohrenschildt killed himself to avoid meeting with the House investigator because <sup>he feared</sup> de Mohrenschildt was ~~f~~ afraid that testimony before it would ruin him. So it cannot be <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>which</sup> testimony he never gave. end 330

Mailer does says his book, by its subtitle, is "An American Mystery." This, then, must remain part of that mystery.

Whatever <sup>Mailer's</sup> the alleged source, what is quoted is entirely unreal, although Epstein did fabricate a ridiculous case of Oswald as a Communist agent in Japan.

*of the monstrosity* *of what does*  
 It is all <sup>of the monstrosity</sup> based on assumptions that do not exist and have no reason to exist.

Ⓐ There is no reason even to suspect that the Japanese ~~was~~ musician from her wealthy family <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ working for Japanese intelligence. Or for the CIA. Or that deMohrenschildt has any kind of "operation" in the CIA. Or that it needed him for one. Or that he had been given any instructions. Or that the meeting with Okui was arranged. Or that there has been any assignment to her to "debrief" <sup>Oswald</sup> (how Mailer loves that word without any understanding of what it is and means <sup>or could have</sup> ~~to magnify his love of it!~~) Or that Oswald had any intelligence information at all that was not well known to all the world's spookeries that could use it other than the radar codes that had been changed and thus no longer had any meaning. Or that intelligence contacts are made in public places. Or that for Okui to see Oswald it had to be at a party <sup>she</sup> had worked for the Japanese intelligence. *Or for the CIA.*

end  
331

None of this is even sensible fiction for readers past high-school freshman.

And what kind of "intelligence" could Oswald obtain working as a shipping clerk on school text books for which that imagined <sup>see</sup> "deeper use can be made of him?"

"Deeper use" of a stock clerk on school texts?

"Deeper use," of course, implies an existing use not as <sup>4/</sup> "deep," whatever that may be intended to mean and is not spook tradecraft other than in the nit-tiness of such authorities as Harlot's Ghost. Which was entirely ~~not~~ fabricated anyway.

This is not even, reviewer's word, "brilliant" as fabrication. It would disgrace the writing of a reasonably intelligent teenager. It reflects the "deepest" ignorance of what intelligence is, real intelligence or the dirty works some of it has degenerated into. The best that can be said for this juvenility by a septegenarian is that it is more of his Harlot's Ghosting with our history and with what people can know ~~and believe~~, <sup>he is</sup> what if they believe any of it at all will confuse them even more.

end  
332

Not a word of this is true, not a single word. Not a word of it is even possible. It is not even rational for a novel. No matter how ~~as~~ much the hack ~~reviewers~~ reviewers rival ~~as~~ each other in their praises of it and of Mailer for making it all up when <sup>he is</sup> so out of contact with ~~any~~ any reality at all.

218B jls

pls 218A

"Intelligence experts" like the Post's Finder and the Sunday Times' Powers, who wrote a ~~to~~ biography of the CIA's Richard Helms could ~~not~~ recognize this as the most awful kind of childish trash? Did not puke on reading it?

On the <sup>a</sup> basis of ~~com-m~~ common sense <sup>they and</sup> alone all other reviewers had no question about this stuff? It is incredible but as we see this is far from the <sup>such</sup> only illustration of it.

Incredible! Absolutely incredible!

The quotation from Page 479 that <sup>I</sup> interrupted, continues, nothing omitted:

*urgent  
single  
space*

As happens over and over in attempting to find a credible route through Oswald's adventures, the trail forks, then divides again: 1) It is all as it seems on the surface; Oswald has found an attractive girl who likes him. 2) De Mohrenschildt is not, in fact, prepared for Miss Okui, since she is working for Japanese intelligence. 3) As Marina believes, Yaeko Okui is connected to the CIA, only it is for a section that is not connected to George's operation. Or, 4) De Mohrenschildt has been given instructions, and the meeting with the young lady has been arranged in advance—Miss Okui is there to become friends with Oswald and debrief him in depth to see whether deeper use can be made of him. Indeed, Miss Okui is exactly the reason that George brought the Oswalds to the party; he and Jeanne are only pretending to be distrustful. *pp 479-50*

Perhaps ~~not~~ before he dies, perhaps after a nice long rest in the booby-hatch that this kind of writing indicates Mailer <sup>really</sup> does need, he may see that <sup>there was no</sup> the ~~only~~ "trails" route " to be followed <sup>in his absolutely</sup> ~~absolute~~ crazy series of "trails" that do not exist, that there was no reason for them to <sup>be</sup> exist, that there was not even a rational basis for even suspecting any one of them— that it is all entirely ~~crazy~~ <sup>le</sup> no matter how much the Finders of hack reviewing adore him for his scholarship and ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> brilliance.

*218A*

~~This is not even brilliant fabrication. It is more ghosting harlotry with out history and with the people can known and believe.~~

~~Not a word of this, not a single word of it is true. Every word of it is of Mailer's fabrication.~~ *218A*

But I do note that again <sup>Mailer</sup> he infers that ~~de~~ <sup>ed</sup> Mohrenschildt works for the CIA <sup>although</sup> but not as an employee.

Mailer carries this fiction he says is nonfiction forward in his next chapter, which refers to the CIA in its title, "Grubs for the Organization." Its first words are:

*urgent  
single  
space*

If one would ask why the CIA would now be interested to this degree in Lee Harvey Oswald, it may be worth offering one insight on the complex nature of the Agency. (page 482) ~~it is too sick~~

~~The <sup>more of</sup> ~~long~~ Harlot's Ghosting of the CIA is a too sick, too childish to <sup>but it is really</sup> quote, it all being Mailer's juvenile <sup>concept</sup> ~~concept~~ of the CIA, penny dreadful-dreadful-style, of an ignorant novelist who is so ignorant he cannot get real even by accident.~~ *permy*

And ~~ga agqi~~ again neither of those "intelligence experts, Finder of Powers, perceived this, any of it, especially Powers who researched and wrote his Helms biography. "Expert" is hardly the right word for their not spotting any of this!





above-board, legal and proper and nonsecret.

There was absolutely no reason for the Domestic <sup>of</sup>Contact Service, the only ones to speak to Mohrenschilf, or any other part of the CIA to have any interest in Oswald that if one had existed the Domestic Contact Service could have spoken to him about openly, not clandestinely.

But in all this imitation penny-dreadful writing Mailer has yet to even hint at any knowledge of interest to the CIA Oswald had or could have had.

*Other than DCS's after his return*

But if the CIA had had any interest in Oswald, as only an intelligence ignoramus like Mailer would not know, it would use its own experienced and trusted employees to obtain the information about him it wanted in the usual and normal ways in such matters, not through a geologist who had had slight social contact only with him.

*Mailer* And this does assume what there is no reason to assume, that the CIA <sup>then</sup> had ~~any~~ *such an* interest in Oswald.

Or, and this is Mailer's childish conception of how intelligence agencies work, if by any chance <sup>the</sup> the CIA had had any interest in <sup>one</sup> any "desperate enough to do anything," they would have been specialists in the "Vanythings" the CIA might want, not kids with no skills ~~of~~ of any kind. And for what Mailer implies, killing Kennedy, *end 336* it would ~~certainly~~ certainly have been a ~~superb~~ superb shooter with a weapon in which he was skilled and a record of being an excellent shot. One not by any means with Oswald's public reputation.

"Few things?" Mailer? what kind of things besides assassination for which no <sup>one</sup> *like* Oswald would ever be considered? What kind of "things" did the CIA need done that it had to go outside its ~~staff~~ staff to get done?

Other than in the ignorant and irrational mind of a self-import subject-matter ignoramus who believes that whatever childish nonsense suggests itself is real only because it occurred to him and ~~his~~ he is the genius of all geniuses on intelligence and anything related to it.

*not* <sup>z</sup> But all this childishness he makes up he has no reason to believe, even that for



those that "things" he is careful not to <sup>identify</sup> mention, which disturbed not a single reviewer, the CIA preferred "desperate" people.

~~It gets sicker and sicker.~~ There is more of this imagined and theoretical piffle. ~~One was various page~~ Mailer ~~conjectures~~ <sup>we</sup> if ~~presume~~ that Oswald ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> being paid by someone, including an imagined <sup>and non-existing</sup> boyfriend for special services, but he at no point quotes Marina on their <sup>i men</sup> ~~once~~ <sup>as they never did. Mather</sup> having enough to live decently on, he does conjecture that Oswald used some of that imagined money to repay the State Department for the money it advance to bring the Oswalds here but the <sup>venture</sup> ~~net~~ sum was small and he had repaid ~~it~~ some of it. The total ~~loan~~ loan was for only \$345.71. Unable to prove a thing Mailer literally invokes his novel about the CIA that it laughed at as authority to say ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> hooking someone is easily done by paying off a debt of his.

Mailer ends this chapter with the frank admission, " We have ~~crossed~~ <sup>crossed</sup> over wholly into speculation (how pleasant <sup>a</sup> an honest statement and <sup>a</sup> admission truly ~~is~~ in this <sup>end 337</sup> ~~ever though it did not last long!~~ ~~terrible~~ ~~book~~ but the question remains vital: was Oswald being groomed to become ~~a~~ <sup>(page 484)</sup> some sort of ~~prova~~ <sup>prova</sup> provocateur in left-wing organizations?" ~~(It did not last long!)~~

The question is vital in Mailer's mind only, not in fact or reality. ~~Provo-~~ ~~cateurs~~ in domestic organizations was outside the CIA permitted activities or interests. <sup>In</sup> part because that was the turf of the FBI and they had enough problems over what made a difference to them without ~~making a mockery of this silliness.~~ <sup>adding to them with Mather's invented</sup> No matter how that <sup>ack</sup> Sennett of intelligence agencies, Mailer, may regard it. Or essential ~~as~~ he regards it in his rescue of Oswald in Minsk.

~~To~~ To put it simply, the "question" that Mailer says is "vital" is a question that in ~~reality~~ <sup>reality</sup> does not exist.

Mailer meanders ~~a~~ ~~round~~ <sup>and</sup> around with ~~it~~ even a dip back to Minsk with more imaginings that mean nothing at all <sup>fe</sup> except as part of an amateurish plot of a bad ~~novel~~ <sup>movie,</sup>. But in the course of it he is building up to call Oswald the assassin based on no evidence at all. <sup>conjecture</sup> ~~Building~~ ~~conjecture~~ on imagined ~~subject~~ <sup>conjecture</sup> that has no basis at all and, of course has no source note, none being possible for the inside of Mailer's mind,

This is "logic?" *end 398*

Even as entirely imagined, which is what it is, ~~it~~ is simply crazy!

"Unfinished business" from when he was a boy? What "~~is~~" unfinished business?"

Mailer does not say so again if the reader wants to know the reader will have to become Mailer and do as Mailer does, just ~~make~~ it up.

But my,

these are the first words of his Chapter 9, "AStoicism, Majestic in Purpose.":

*indent  
single  
space*

In the depths of Oswald's logic lies an equation: Any man who is possessed of enough political passion to reach murderous intensity in his deeds is entitled to a seat at the high table of world leaders. Such may have been Oswald's measure. The route to becoming a great political leader—given his own poor beginnings—might have to pass through acts of assassination. (page 505)

To paraphrase "arina, Socrates it isn't.

Nor is it even reasonable.

223A

*Mailer*

But he plants his notion as a substitute for evidence and builds on it as he does on his ~~no~~ *with all irrational* conjectures. *No matter how much so many reviewers loved it.*

Part IV is "The Big Easy." (pages 2529 ff.) Mailer likes ~~that~~ *this* old and rarely-used reference to it better than New Orleans, this being a work of nonfiction. His style of nonfiction is that of a novelist when he ~~sees~~ *sees* the ~~chance~~ *h* chance to work little local stories in ~~each~~ as he does at the beginning of his Chapter 2. It has the provocative title, within quotes, "He Walks and Talks "like ~~a~~ *Mailer* Man." He begins ~~its~~ *his* second paragraph with what is indispensable to ~~Mailer~~ *him: conjecture,* if he is to have a word to say but not his more usual form of ~~baseless conjecturing,~~ "It could ~~have~~ *also* also be said." What is it that "could also be said?"

*indent  
single  
space*

It could also be said that Lee had unfinished business in New Orleans, having spent part of his adolescence (once Marguerite could no longer afford the rent at Myrtle Evans' apartment) living in an apartment over a pool hall on a street on the edge of the French Quarter, Exchange Alley, which had its share of whores, small-time hoods, and petty gamblers. Rare is the adolescent who listens to such nocturnal action from a second-story window without expectations building up in him of a dramatic street life to come. (page 533)

223B

My Norman, what you do miss here!

If Mailer knew ~~nothing~~ *and later was called "place, what he says of it he* about that no-longer-existing narrow ~~street~~ street that was an alley to begin with could have been said ~~ab~~

about much of New Orleans. When Mailer says of the French Quarter that it "had its share of whores" *he* he did something to which he is not prone: he understated. But in making up his nonexistent case ~~of~~ of Oswald as a homosexual here is where he missed a real trick, *end 339*

Earlier I quote what that former friend of Oswald's in the "arines told me that

~~in~~ included what <sup>u</sup> later proved to be fact, of Oswald's very high security clear-  
ances when he was a Marine. He also told me that Oswald <sup>u</sup> as a pool shark, that he loved to  
shoot pool, <sup>and</sup> that they did ~~in~~ it often together, ~~and that Oswald was good at it.~~

In the course of checking ~~that~~ out although the narrow alley did still exist,  
and the back door of Orest <sup>u</sup> ~~Bas~~ <sup>into that sidewalk</sup> ~~Exchange~~ Exchange Alley, what  
had been on the other side of that alley had been torn down when I was there. In fact  
whenever I was there in 1967 and 1968, I was there fairly often to ~~see~~ Orest and speak  
to some of his employees. ~~And~~ <sup>u</sup> checking Oswald as a kid pool shark took me back there,  
although the pool hall and that building ~~is~~ no longer were.

~~the edge~~ of the French quarter. <sup>u</sup> It was on  
<sup>Massachusetts</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>up</sup> ~~edge~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>two</sup> ~~edges~~ of the <sup>French</sup> Quarter,  
the edge toward the <sup>Mississippi</sup> River and the edge toward Canal Street, the main street in that area  
and the dividing street between uptown and downtown, which are reversed <sup>up</sup> in <sup>Orleans,</sup> New Orleans.

It is not surprising that Mailer has only sources he cut and pasted <sup>up</sup> for this

chapter. Nothing local, nothing from anyone who knew anything about what he writes  
Only the hearings, McMillan and Posner, <sup>(not was)</sup>  
~~and~~ about. And nothing about that building at 126 and other buildings near it.  
His sources include ~~McMillan nor Posner~~  
He draws on McMillan and Pozner, neither one of whom did any checking there, either.

And thus it was that Mailer did not know that the apartment next to that of the Oswald's  
was tenanted by <sup>a son of</sup> Mr and Mrs. Sawyer. <sup>Sawyer</sup> He owned the nearby Society Page bar, which <sup>he</sup> called  
itself a cocktail lounge. His wife was so well known as "Mom" I've forgotten her <sup>real</sup>

end  
340

<sup>buildings</sup> name but I think it is ~~named~~ Mildred. They had had to relocate ~~the bar~~ when those  
buildings were torn down. They <sup>see</sup> relocated only a short walk away, at 819 St. Louis.

St. Louis Street <sup>St. Louis Street</sup> If Exchange had gone that far, as it did not.  
It runs from the nearby river at right angles to Exchange. When I found Mom there a few  
blocks

<sup>she</sup> lives from the river. ~~She~~ told me that she had had the apartment next to her son's.  
She remembered that the boy was alone much too often and for too long.

With the possible exception of San Francisco New Orleans had what may have  
been the largest percentage of homosexuals in its population. Most of the time it was <sup>the city</sup>  
quite tolerant of them. <sup>mom was also the man fun far from change with the assassination</sup> (Clay Shaw was well and publicly known as a homosexual and was

widely respected socially and in business. The French Quarter held quite a few homo-  
and restaurants <sup>Some were</sup>  
sexual bars, that catering to homosexuals and those owned by them. The Society Page <sup>always</sup>



And what Mailer eliminated is Abner Andrews' separating Oswald and his Mexican companion from the homosexuals. Who in fact were of a special kind. What Mailer does is doctor the testimony to make it lie. He does quote the testimony. But he eliminates what says and means the opposite of what Mailer is corrupted it to mean. For example:

Mailer's first line on page 538 is:

end 342

Mr. Andrews. About 50....I ~~was~~ went down for the ones I represented. ..."

Not those three little dots Mailer uses to eliminate what disproves his fabrication.

In the course of this he eliminates another question a another answer. ~~xxxxxx~~ What Mailer eliminated separated Oswald w from h those homosexuals.

so homosexuals who  
The 50 Andrews referred to were mostly transvestites who had been scopped up in a police sweep. way From the Mailer Mailer alters the testimony there is no way of knowing the truth he eliminated. ~~Not much space when he goes on with prejudicial misrepresentations for all this space.~~ Here is what he eliminated that made it clear Oswald was not with or associated with the homosexuals:

question, answer, which begins  
~~Mr.~~ Liebeler. ~~They weren't~~ with Oswald, ere they?" And Andrews ~~response~~ begins with "no."

To give this more credibility Honest Norman, honest in the way hood-shop operators called themselves "honest", more of this ~~pilled the same kind of cutie~~ on the preceding page.

There Mailer has this sentence, referring to Oswald going to Andrews' office:

"Mr. Liebeler. The first time he came in he was with these ... gay kids."

single space indent  
~~How~~ what few words did Mailer eliminate, ~~to~~ not for space consideration in his tome of more than 800 pages? Exactly what Andrews had told me, that Oswald and ~~the~~ the mailer mexican ~~was~~ just happened to be there when the others were. Before Mailer altered the testimony and questioning to make them lie in support of his own fabrication about Oswald, what the transcripts says and Mailer eliminated I'll underscore:

"Mr. Liebeler. The first time he came in he was with these Mexicans, and there were also some gay kids"

end 343

Nighty Norman makes the clear statement that Oswald was not with ~~the~~ those gays read, as he altered it on page 537, "Mr. Liebeler. The first time he came in he was with

these ...gay kid kids." Which he was not!

Ma~~il~~er M~~ai~~ler then quotes part of a <sup>g</sup>line of an Andrews response and then has his ~~truth~~ three dots again what he eliminates is that he never again saw those "gay kids" and Oswald together again but that although they did not come back with Oswald the Mexican did. <sup>a</sup>Those three little dots M<sup>a</sup>iler repl<sup>a</sup>ced testi<sup>a</sup>mony with repl<sup>a</sup>ced 10 lines as the commission published it. (11H 326)

To make it appear more reasonable, to eliminate what Oswald clearly was not, a transvestite when those "gay kids" in question all were, M<sup>a</sup>iler makes more "improvements" in the supposedly verbatim uses he makes of the official testimony. On page 538 he has Lieber asking <sup>e</sup>Andrews, "You say that some of the gay kids [that] the police arrested...were the ones that had been with Oswald?" Andrews' response also has M<sup>a</sup>iler's three-dotting of truth. he has Andrews respond only, "Yes..." What M<sup>a</sup>iler's used of "[that]" and those three dots eliminate <sup>e</sup>is the time of all of this, M<sup>a</sup>iler's ~~changes~~ making it appear that the ~~transvestite~~ arrests were before the joint appearance in us office of those people and Oswald when they were not together and the arrests were later and that they were transvestites. M<sup>a</sup>iler was not about to add to his making an homosexual of Oswald also making him a transvestite. The words he ~~has~~ three-dotted out of his trusting <sup>e</sup>readers's minds are "that you saw at the time" which belong in place of [that] and to "the police arrested" and after "the police arrested, "this large group of them wearing clothes of the opposite sex."

The follows immediately after Lieber's asking Andrews what M<sup>a</sup>iler eliminated, "They weren't with Oswald, were they?" and Andrews' response of "No." <sup>e</sup>end 344

M<sup>a</sup>iler also made changes that altered the testimony/so he could make it appear to support his <sup>a</sup>false story of Oswald as a <sup>hom</sup>homosexual, which is an indispensable part of his creating a false biography of Oswald as part is his falsification of <sup>history</sup>history by ~~making Oswald's~~ pretending this this false character he makes up for

Oswald makes him the assassin. Thus on page 538 he has Lieber Lieleber asking, "Let me try to pin down how ~~it~~ it was after the first time <sup>Oswald</sup>Oswald came in with these kids that got arrested...Was it a <sup>month?</sup> month?" <sup>Frank David and Mark</sup> Andrews eliminated, and he made the elimination



total- ~~the~~ Mailer's reader has no way of knowing why Oswald went to see Andrews- and it had nothing to do with sex or any sexual preference. As Mailer presents it this is after ~~then~~ those three dots eliminated those "gay kids" as ~~transvestites~~ <sup>it was</sup> and to make it appear that they were with Oswald <sup>when</sup> what Mailer ~~three-dotted~~ to make it appear that they were with Oswald <sup>when</sup> it was merely coincidence, they they happened to be in Andrews' office "at the same time." The n Mailer eliminated Andrews volunteering that Oswald "had come back with this Mexicano one more time," not with the gay kids. Referring to that <sup>second</sup> time that Mailer three-dotted entirely out Andrews started to tell Liebeler that "the second time he came back, we talked about the yellow-paper discharge, about his status as a citizen, and about his wife's status." Along with eliminating this with three dots Mailer also eliminated without any three dots what Liebeler said before "Let me try and pin down..." These are Liebelere's words Mailer memory-holed: "Now before we get into that," and then after a comma comes, <sup>let</sup> "let me <sup>try</sup> to pin down...."

Mailer corrupted entirely, one hundred percent, Andrews' testimony to make it appear falsely that Oswald was homosexual and was with those "gay kids" when he was not with them then or ever, when he was always with a Mexican, and that <sup>his</sup> sole and exclusive purpose in ~~going~~ going to see Andrews was about his <sup>or</sup> Marine's discharge, his citizenship and his wife's status in this country.

end  
345

~~There is~~ more of this Mailerizing of truth and fact at this point but I think the foregoing is sufficient. Except for how Mailer winds it all up after his deliberate corruption of it to make Oswald appear to be what he was not and never had been but what is important to Mailer's making him into something other than he was for his book's dishonest purposes. Here are two excerpts from his two concluding paragraphs of his Chapter 2 of his Part IV:

invalent  
single  
space

The enigma of Oswald's homosexuality might now be clarified to a degree, except that we are being told all this by a man whose word, according to Posner, is not considered reliable. We have, then, no more than another question to add to our understanding of Lee's relation to Marina now that she is arriving and his vacation from marriage is over. [A n a]

Evidence  
single  
page

... can be enriched by its reverberation. If he is homosexual at all, if the inner drama of his marriage is that he is only half connected to Marina and the other half of him is drawn toward having sex with men, and if this need has been intermittently expressed in his adolescence, his Marine Corps years and, covertly, in Russia and perhaps in Dallas, then the picture offered by Dean Adams Andrews takes on credibility. It certainly helps to explain those periods of desire for Marina that alternate in him with a lack of interest in Marina so complete that she complains aloud about it to people she does not even know well. In the sexual sense, it could be said that he seems married to her no more than fifteen weeks in the year. (p. 539)

Mailer's corrupting of the official testimony to make it lie in support of his lies that is essential to his false portrait of Oswald could not be more deliberate. It could hardly have been more dishonest. Mailer altered Liddbeler's questions and comments and Andrews' responses to have <sup>it</sup> <sup>that</sup> all mean ~~that~~ Oswald as in open associations with homosexuals who ~~were~~ were arrested when he was not.

<sup>then</sup> Mailer eliminates any other reason for Oswald having been in Andrews office ~~than~~ homosexuality. Mailer ~~altered~~ altered the testimony to have it lie and say that Oswald was to see Andrews with those homosexuals when <sup>in</sup> fact he was not with them, then or ever, was with a Mexican, and with the specific purpose of <sup>is</sup> seeking information and perhaps help over his discharge, which had been changed from ~~an~~ honorable to less than honorable; about his citizenship after having given the appearance of changing it to Russian and living there for two years; and about his wife's legal situation as a foreign national. All of this Mailer knowingly, deliberately, changed so he can treat it as "the enigma of Oswald's homosexuality."

end  
346

His chapter title, referring to Oswald, is "He Walks and Talks Like a N@."

The question Mailer poses after this or many such chapters, but this one in particular, is can this chapter title be applied to himself? Does he in the foregoing "talk like a man," an honored writer twice-Pulitzered?

In fairness to the reviewers, they ~~did~~ <sup>deliberately</sup> did not have the familiarity with the actual evidence to be able to suspect that Mailer <sup>my</sup> perpetrated such ~~gross~~ gross corruption of the official evidence to help him <sup>my</sup> make his phony case for his phony solution in his

phony books. If they had read ~~Whiteaway~~<sup>Whiteaway</sup>, of which there is little possibility, there is even less possibility that they would have remembered the truth about all of this as I, of course did, more so because Andrews, with whom I ~~do~~<sup>did</sup> developed a friendly relationship, had ~~discussed~~<sup>discussed</sup> it with me ~~in~~<sup>at</sup> some length.

However, this does illustrate the importance for an honest publisher intending honest publication having an authentic ~~peer~~<sup>peer</sup> review, the former tradition that Random House ~~dispensed~~<sup>dispensed</sup> with for its lusty and enormously-promoted books is dishonest support of the official assassination mythology. Mailer's piddling revision of our history and he making an ~~entirely~~<sup>entirely</sup> different person of Oswald than he was would not have survived competent peer review.

His nastiness of ~~Mailer's~~<sup>Mailer's</sup> making Oswald into a homosexual in pursuit of Mailer's own ~~self~~<sup>self</sup> salvaging of his Minsk failures is, as it was with de ~~Mohrenschildt~~<sup>Mohrenschildt</sup> and Marina and his character-assassination of them, possible only by Mailer's total departure ~~from~~<sup>from</sup> what we all expect and have every right to expect, all recognized standards and ~~traditions~~<sup>traditions</sup> of nonfiction writing.

The totality of his intent to be dishonest, of his actual corrupting of official evidence to make a knowingly false case, is clear and without question. <sup>2/10</sup>

He did it as to a degree we have just seen.

Oh, how the mighty have fallen! <sup>end 349.</sup>

end  
347

133A

If those reviewing Mailer's monstrosity had paid <sup>the</sup> ~~any~~ attention ~~to~~ reviewers should they <sup>would</sup> ~~should~~ have remembered that 400 pages <sup>earlier</sup> Mailer printed what should have been definitive proof that Oswald was not homosexual. He got it from the KGB. It, <sup>Remember,</sup> had watched Oswald <sup>all the long time he was in Munich =</sup> around the clock <sup>Parks</sup> onto and off trolleys, into and out of stores, movies, theaters, <sup>Parks</sup> concerts, dances—everywhere he went. It had no reason even to suspect that he <sup>was</sup> homosexual.

One of Mailer's KGB sources gave <sup>him</sup> an ambiguous response on this. Mailer was trying to cook it up that far back. But <sup>the</sup> other, the one Mailer refers to as Stepan, told him, as Mailer ended a chapter with it on page 133,

Oswald didn't exhibit any deviations. That was Stepan's forthright statement. Before his marriage to Marina, they had observed that Oswald would "meet with a girl sometimes and take her home, and God knows what they did there. Sometimes he took her only to the nearest tram stop." In that respect he led a normal, ordinary life, at least as they understood it by Soviet ways. If he was attracted to a lot of girls, that just meant he had what it takes—he was a guy. Otherwise, girls would have rejected him. "Besides, a homosexual reveals himself in his behavior," said Stepan, "and in his interests, in his voice. Usually a homosexual has a thin voice, something feminine to it, and then, such a fellow is only interested in women in a formal way, but his eyes start blazing when he sees a man, especially—excuse me for saying it—when his butt is big. He is constantly showing up at public toilets, and often they perform their acts there. So a homosexual has certain constant, distinctive traits which can be used to flush him out, and we didn't observe such traits in Oswald. I spent all this time thinking about traits because, before this, I had a case involving a homosexual and I knew a thing or two about such matters."

end  
348