

XU 11 The "Big Easy" is not ^{so} Easy For Mailer

Mailer is not long on consistency, any more than he is on ^{an} accuracy, when he continues to build prejudice against Oswald and persuade the trusting reader to the total ~~lies~~ ^{or takes from news} insanities Mailer makes up about him. He is leading to Oswald's picketing in New Orleans in which, as Mailer does not bother to tell the reader, ^{if he knew that} Oswald himself arranged for the TV coverage it got. Knowing better, knowing it is not true, Mailer says that what Oswald was doing "distribut(ing) ~~pan~~ pamphlets on Canal Street for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee." (page 535) It is minor in the ~~size~~ simply enormous catalogue of Mailer's mistakes and displays of factual ignorance to note that Oswald did this not only on Canal Street but elsewhere in that area. ^{He} was obviously, except ^{of} the geniuses like Mailer and his ~~so~~ second-hand sources, intent on provoking Carls Binguier, on whom Mailer soon draws. What Oswald distributed was not "pamphlets" but handbills, to which Mailer also gets in his own convoluted and ignorant way in a few pages. The more serious offense here is Mailer's saying that Oswald represented the national Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the obvious meaning of Mailer's know lie in saying that what Oswald was doing it was doing for the FPCC. Mailer himself reports that that Committee told Oswald not to do what he ~~do~~ reported planning to do but with his perpetual skipping around few readers would note it. It is not until pages 553-4 that Mailer includes that committee's discouraging of Oswald. If we make another Mailer skip to page 568 we find that he used the sworn testimony of the head of that committee, Mailer's quotation of it beginning, "....he had gone ahead and acted on his own without any authorization." But as we have seen Mailer formed his readers' mind by the ^{of} false first statement 60 pages prior to his belated ^{to} getting around the truth he uses for other purposes.

In his ^{to} Chapter 5 of this Part, titled Fair Play for Cuba, ^{by mailer} mumbles a ~~little~~ about Oswald having that handbill printed at the Jones Printing Company. (page 553) Seeking to add detail when he knows almost none, Mailer does say it was on Biograd Street. But what Mailer does not say is that it was just down that street from where Oswald was the ^{is} working, at the Reilly Coffee Company whose best known brand was Lusiana. ^{Mailer says} After that mention and ~~briefly~~ saying nothing more other than to report the



words on that handbill. Now if he had read, as he boast in the book and ^{to} even more people in the nationwide ^{TV} Parade article that just about all Sunday ^{of May 14} newspapers carried, ^{that} he read all there was on all sides, my Oswald in New Orleans, he would have known that the FBI's reports on ^{that} business ^{held} a rather broad hint that it was not Oswald who picked that small print job up. And this is the ^{Mailer who sometimes} Andrews that pretends Oswald was not alone, worked for the CIA or the FBI or some private outfit, whatever he ^{sees as} ~~sees~~ sees the need of his writing to be at various points,

If when he got to his writing of his ~~post~~ post-Oswald in Minsk mishmash Mailer ^{access to all the records} accepted my invitation to ~~do any thing~~ ^I have he would have found first of all, that the only two people other than the man who picked that job up were both firm in stating that the man who picked it up was not Oswald. Naturally the FBI did not like that ~~to~~ so its report is in the special lingo it uses to obscure that in the course of time those ^{those} reading its records get to understand. ~~That~~ FBI reports, by the way, were

printed in facsimile by the Commission whose published record Mailer claims was one of his sources. When ^{at} I interviewed Douglas Jones the summer of 1967 his office assistant, Myra Silver was not there. After the area ^{he sold printing for another printer.} was torn down for redevelopment I arranged to interview Jones again, ^{this time with} when ~~he~~ was then selling printing for another printer, and his ~~former office assistant,~~ Myra Silver at her home in the New Orleans suburb of Metairie. I then taped both of them. end 351

I had asked Jones not to make a positive identification if he had any uncertainty ~~at~~ all after four years but to ^{select} ~~select~~ from about a hundred miscellaneous pictures including several of Oswald, including when arrested in New Orleans, the man who most closely resembled the man who picked that job up. Jones was unequivocal: he made positive ^{identification} ~~identification~~ of one man to the exclusion of all others in those hundred or so ^{pictures} ~~pictures~~, and that man was not Oswald.

At the Silver's home each examined the same pictures, ^{separately} each said it was not Oswald, and each said it was the same man Jones had picked to the exclusion of all others.

Neither was in a position to see what pictures the other was identifying and rejecting.

Bith selected a man who for a short period ~~of~~ of time was in the ^{the} marines with ~~Oswald~~ Oswald. Not overseas but when Oswald had been returned to the United States and they were at Santa Ana. I had special reason for being unwilling to believe that was the man. In my efforts to prove that he could not have been ^{several of} those whose lives with the assassination's aftermath have been of ^{on} self-promoting and devious and misleading commercialization grossly misrepresented what I was doing and that brought those efforts to an end. By the mendacities by which one of them got to be wealthy and famous there was a short-lived but great scandal based on his lies about it, his claim ^{that man} ~~I was from military~~

I still have difficulty ~~in~~ accepting their identifications, which could not have been firmer or more positive. I did ~~not~~ discuss my uneasiness about it with them after the interviews had been taped but they did not budge.

That former ^{whose testimony} Marine is one of these ^{with Mailer this means} Mailer uses ~~from his testimony~~, ~~meaning~~ selections from it angled to argue what ^{Mailer wants} believed no matter how unreal it is. What I regarded as important in that ^{Mailer's} Marine's testimony is that he is one of those who were quoted by Mailer who swore to Oswald having at least a ^b secret security clearance as a ^{Mailer's} Marine. As was true of ^{his source} Jean Davison, who quoted the same testimony, Mailer suppressed that ~~and~~ and all other mentions of Oswald's high security clearance. This also in is in Oswald in New Orleans, which supposedly from his boasting Mailer ~~read~~ ~~(pages 90-2, 124)~~

What gave me misgivings about that man and Oswald working together is that he testified to the Commission that after he red-baited Oswald ~~and~~ Oswald did not talk to ~~him~~ him again.

Because despite the Jones and Silver certainty of their identification I was uncertain I did not ^{use} that man's name. However, with the ^{passing} ~~side~~ of time and the qualifications above there should be ~~no~~ no harm to him if this gets attention.

He was in man ways a a wierd one, too.

I had a collection of his strange/writings in some strange small and offbeat

publications from when he lived in California where strange groups abounded. That was after he'd left New Orleans, where he was working as a waiter, in a fine French restaurant before ~~and after~~ the ~~assassination~~ ^{assassination} and at the time in question. My files on him were burglarized by a ^{man} who had free access to them and who was also working, unknown to me for David Lifton. It is Lifton who ~~invest~~ made up the story that ended any chance I had of carrying what Jones and Silver ~~had~~ told me forward.

That man is Kerry Wendell Thornley. His odd writings were pseudo-libertarian and cultist.

Whether or not it was Thornley who picked that handbill printing ~~it~~ up it was not Oswald. This is but one ~~of~~ of a number of proofs that Oswald was not alone in whatever he was up to there, what supposedly Mailer writes about sublime in his ignorance, including of what was in the Commission's unpublished evidence he would have found in my files

end 353

This is also to say, as is true throughout the book, that Mailer's claim to be telling the story of Oswald's life is a fraudulent claim. He made no effort at all to learn anything more than his few no less prejudiced sources ^{had} ^{what he used,} that published. If he had been serious, he would have been very interested in what the Commission had and did not use and even more interested in what the FBI had and did not give to the Commission.

This matter of that handbill is only part of Mailer's flaunting of ignorance about the fact and of his total disinterest in what was quite relevant to his alleged book and his objectives in it that he ignored studiously and with complete success.

The first reported use of that handbill, as Mailer does not say, undoubtedly because he did not know, Mailer just sticks ~~it~~ it in without explanation of any kind.

In fact ^{it proves that} ~~it identifies~~ another man working with Oswald, ^{his} whose identity is not known. Because without question the man then distributing those handbills was not Oswald Mailer's typical claim to remarkable, ^{ed} unprecedented ESP extending to the grave after more than 30 years and his shrinkery from ancient and incomplete records is his own self-ridicule. Totally ⁿ ~~concerned~~ ^{concerned} about his ~~own~~ monumental ignorance of the subject matter, a state of bliss he preserved all those years, and firm in the belief that

that whatever popped into his mind ~~was~~ became real with the popping, what ~~the~~ Mailer adds following his quotation is also a remarkable e self-indictment:

There were a few consequences to handing out the leaflets. From a report by a Special Agent of the FBI on July 21, 1963:

Patrolman Ray stated that late in the afternoon, possibly between 3:00 pm and 5:00 pm, he was approached by an unknown enlisted man from the "USS Wasp" who told him that the Officer of the Deck of the "USS Wasp" desired Patrolman Ray to seek out the individual who was passing out leaflets regarding Cuba and to request the individual to stop passing out these leaflets. Patrolman Ray . . . immediately went to the Dumaine Street Wharf where he saw an unknown white male . . . age late 20's, 5'9" tall, 150 pounds and slender build. He said this individual was distributing these leaflets to U.S. Naval personnel in the area and also to civilians who were leaving the USS Wasp. Patrolman Ray stated that he approached this person and asked if he had permission to distribute the leaflets. This person replied that he . . . was within his rights to distribute leaflets in any area he desired to do so. Patrolman Ray stated that he told this individual that the wharves and buildings along the Mississippi River . . . are operated by the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans, and that if this individual received permission from the Board of Commissioners, he could distribute these leaflets. Patrolman Ray stated that . . . this person kept insisting that he did not see why he would need anyone's permission and thereafter, Patrolman Ray informed this individual that if he did not leave the Dumaine Street Wharf, Patrolman Ray would arrest him. Upon hearing this, this person left the Dumaine Street Wharf. . . .

Patrolman Ray stated that he feels this unknown individual who was distributing the leaflets was Lee Harvey Oswald.¹³

It is not hard to feel the suppressed intensity of that confrontation! He may be frequently hysterical at home, but is a model of emotional austerity on the street: calm, firm, quiet-voiced, formal, unbending. He is even—his own favorite word—stoic. We can only guess how much it costs him to conceal his emotions. . . .

As Mailer uses this ~~it~~ is connected with nothing. He has only a black space before it and what follows it is still more amateur shrinkery having nothing to do with and quoting some of McMillan's shrinkery.

With the benefit of total ignorance and a ~~little~~ little more of his three-dotting specialty he makes a farce of himself to those who ~~know~~ know what he pretends to know and knows nothing about. The ~~farther~~ farther one with ~~simply~~ ^{subject - knowledge} ~~matter~~ gets into this

*any
- open
indict*

(page 557)

~~the~~ combination of ~~face~~ and ~~fraud~~ the more obvious it is that despite his talking as though for all the world he knows what all there is to know the more obvious it is that on this subject Mailer is an incredible ignorant ^B. Moreover, in this instance, he cannot even read straight. Or if he did he preferred how he introduced what he uses. #

end
356

A Mailer says, "From the report by a Special Agent of the FBI on June 21, 1963:"

It is not that.

Mailer's source note on page xxxi reads, "CE 1412, pp. 805-6." ^{exhibit} That exhibit begins before page 805 and continues after page 806. It includes several other documents

What Mailer ~~is~~ says is ~~the~~ "the report of by a Special Agent of the FBI" is in fact what the FBI substituted for its report or reports to keep out of distribution what it did not want to distribute. It is, that is this part ^{of it} that Mailer represents as the entire exhibit when it is not that, what the FBI refers to as a Letterhead Memorandum, in FBI abbreviation an LHM. It ordinarily does not distribute its reports and it ordinarily uses the ^{them} selections from it includes in LHMs in substitution for the reports. Mailer even has its date wrong. He says the date is July 24. It is July 22.

As Mailer uses it on page 557 the record he uses begins with the first words he used. He shows no elision before it. In fact where Mailer starts it is well into the ^{eight} ~~eight~~ paragraph of the LHM, at the bottom of its second, single-spaced page. And it is not the beginning of that paragraph, either.

Three-dotting ~~him~~ himself all over again- and does it pay to check ^{out} these phonies who do not enough to make even a correct citation ~~out~~ - in what he eliminates.

In each of the paragraphs before the one from which he quotes there is important information. If Mailer had been looking for important information, as clearly he ~~was~~ neither ^{was} nor was in a position to recognize. You'd not know it from Mailer, but the person being quoted in this LHM is not ^{as he says,} Patrolman Ray. It is his superior, Lieutenant Roy Alleman. In part of what Mailer eliminated Alleman says that Ray "obtained two leaflets" being handed out and that they were given to the FBI.

end
356

The ^{rest} ~~rest~~ of what Mailer eliminated gives the lie to his mindreading/shrinkery

about what here refers to as a "confrontation" of "suppressed intensity" that the reader can feel, with the suggestion of hysteria.

So, Not only ~~was~~ it not the kind of dramatic, exciting and intense confrontation Oswald had with Ray - it was not even Oswald!

Mailer simply made that up because it ~~helps~~ helps ^{him} ~~to~~ perpetrate the fraud he is putting together about Oswald.

And the LHM makes it clear that the man was "unknown" to Ray.

Mailer is even more ignorant of the agencies ^b about which he holds forth as an expert and at ~~a~~ great length than I'd believed. Or he is more dishonest in this than I suspect. I do not believe the greater than usual Mailer dishonesty that permeates ~~this book~~ ^{are all intended} this book, because I am convinced he is that ignorant.

The LHM is quite explicit in saying that those handbills were saved ^{off} and it was a handbill, not a pamphlet, the word also used in the LHM, which reflects what the FBI was told. Those handbills were kept in file by the Harbor police ^{and found when} until Oswald was arrested in Dallas. Then, as what ~~the~~ ^{of this exhibit} one of the parts Mailer saw fit to eliminate without so indicating says, they were retrieved and given to the FBI.

On those records I got from the FBI and Mailer found not worth his time even when he was offered ^{offered} access to them I got the report of the FBI on the fingerprints. The FBI ^{quite} is quite explicit, there is no Oswald print on the handbill. That means it was not Oswald who handed it to Ray! ^{end 357}

I did try to get the FBI ^{of the man who prints were on that handbill.} to disclose the correct name but it refused to and one cannot possibly sue the FBI over each of its hundreds of thousands of withholdings.

So far we have Mailer identifying Oswald when it was not Oswald the two times he says it as Oswald because that was more important to him than learning and reporting the ~~to~~ truth. But then the ~~trust~~ truth, as we see all over again in the immediately foregoing, ~~pre~~ prevents Mailer's ~~the~~ manufacture of ^{his Oswald} ~~the~~ persona and personality he needs ^{that} Oswald to be for his fraud and his fiction. So, he prefers what ^{is not true that} he can misues, as again in the immediately forgoing he does still again.

Jumping back and forth still again Mailer works himself up into more of what he apparently intends as scholarship and is still more of what he himself offers to

as bullshit. He introduces that by a correct quotation from Eric Priscilla McMillan to cite her interpretation of what Oswald did as "uncanny." (page 569) "This ~~is~~ "Lee starting to bring [into being some of] the events he had just described in a letter to FPCC headquarters in New York. The letter is dated August 1 and postmarked August 4. The date on which McMillan says he started this ~~bringing into~~ "bringing into being" is August 5. The date is a correct reference to one of the Commission's datings but it is factually incorrect. The Commission was like Mailer. It preferred what it ~~was~~ wanted to be rather than what was. Mailer follows this with:

indefinite
single
space

"The essence of magic is to exist in a state of consciousness where past and future seem interchangeable. ~~As~~ Classic Hebrew, for example, has only two tenses: There is present and there is another tense which barely distinguishes between past and future."

Harry Houdini is no longer around for the "magic" to be checked with him and the "classical Hebrew" is no less irrelevant. (page 569) end 358

Immersed in all of this fantast Mailer overlooks the first name of the strange character he introduces at the top of the next page with quotation from his Commission testimony.

(DRE)
Carlos Bringuier was the sole member of the Cuban Student Directorate in New Orleans. He called himself its "delegate." He was sometimes ~~scary~~ so wild other anti-Castro cubans there referred to him as "el estupidos." One of the pair of them who ~~say~~ do so told me Bill Martin, Garrison's staff, an assistant district attorney, Manuel Gil, was well-known in anti-Castro activities, ~~worked~~ He worked at the Ochsner Hospital. Bill Martin, the lawyer layer, told me it does not mean "stupid," ~~that~~ it means "the stupidity."

The way Mailer begins it Bringuier is apparently ~~as~~ answering a question related to when he first saw Oswald. Bringuier ~~said~~ ^{said} it was on August 5, 1963 but first he'd better explain "my feelings at the moment." Liebleler told him to go ahead. Bringuier goes into what is not relevant and also volunteers that a boy Philip Geraci was ~~also~~ also there having offered to fight Castro. About five minutes later Oswald entered ~~and~~ ^{he} wanted to help train the anti-Castros. Bringuier said he declined that offer.

That was ~~supposedly~~ ^{alleged} Graci's first trip to Bringuier's. The date Bringuier gave just ah happened to give him a convenient explanation for his distrust of Oswald and for his pyhsical assault on Oswald three days later. Bringuier' story is that he was

I knew ~~that was not true~~ ^{volumes} from a Secret Service report published in those 26

comes Mailer used, he says, as a major basis for his Volume Two. In the course of promoting his book Mailer got a little more loosey ~~gets~~ goosey and, as Alan Cheuse (right) wrote in the Dallas Morning News of May 7, he represented his "was an exhaustive reading of all 26 volumes...."

Well, by the time he got to the Secret Service report, if he ever did, the words exhausted is more likely ~~exhausted~~ than exhaustive for what Mailer was and did.

led not to trust Oswald because of an FBI raid on a supposed Cuban anti-Castro camp near ^{Slidell,} Lake Pontchartrain ^{across} from New Orleans, on July 29. I investigated that an other related matters and Oswald had nothing to do with that ~~raid~~. The ~~cause, cause, was~~ was publicly know ^{it} was that those crazy Cuban has brought a load of explosives and stored them in a house in broad daylight and then, the clean the place up, were ~~burning~~ ^{ed/} the trash when the grass caught fire. ^{man} The ~~next door~~ ^{tenant}, who was my source, fear the whole are ^a would be blown up so he called the sheriff and that got things going. Or, Bringuier "explained" nothing other than that he was not ~~telling~~ the truth.

Several of the investigations I was working on had coinciding aspects. I do not go into all of this here but a longer and ^detailed account is in my manuscript Inside the JFK Assassination Industry.

I knew that Bringuier's account of that being the first time ^{"Geraci"} Phillip was at his store ^{was a lie.}

There were, as will not be apparent from the nutty stories supposedly on the assassinations, three Philip Geracis in that area. This bou was Phillip III. His father was Philip II. ^{By} the time I was working on this Philip III was in the infantry in Viet Nam. His father and mother were quite cooperative. The mother had a ~~lea-ce~~ clear recollection of when she drove Philip and his friend Vance Blalock ~~drove them~~ into ^{down} ~~town~~ New Orleans to get part so ^{their} ~~the~~ Civil Air Patrol uniforms. ^{Yes,} the same

end 359

Got himself a job in New Orleans and was living there, not at the family home in Jefferson Parish. Garrison had charged Ferrie, along with Clay Shaw and Lee Harvey Oswald, with conspiring to assassinate JFK. Philip

It was that source who led me to the proofs of Bringuier's untruthfulnesses and who first gave me an understanding of what Bringuier's and young Philip Geraci's actual relations were. They were not what Bringuier testified to.

Mrs. Louis Trent, who practised law under her maiden name, Lillian Cohen - her ~~the~~ husband was ~~a~~ a judge - invited us to her home for the interview, where it was quiet and there would be no interruptions. Her home was in "uptown" New Orleans, ~~off~~ on Broadway, and in it Philip was more relaxed. I placed the tape recorder where she could turn it off when ~~never~~ ^{she} might feel Philip's interests might be in danger. That assured them all that I was not interested in hurting him. Only his mother was not astounded by what Philip told me. His lawyer was flabbergasted. Not only is she a witness, + have the tapes.

^{here}
I do not attempt to give what Philip said meaning but what he said ~~the~~
¹ ~~the~~ ^{my nervous David}
is that the evening of the day Ferrie was found dead, ~~the~~ Philip then having graduated high school, ~~he~~ ^{240A1} was in effect kidnapped, with family ~~se~~ assent and participation, by the Jefferson Parish sheriff's ~~ss~~ ^{sw} sergeant named Bourne who had handled a juvenile ^{end} case when ~~the~~ Philip was briefly a runaway, and a member of the New Orleans city police vice squad, Frederick O'Sullivan, said they ~~were~~ were acting for Garrison and had to question Philip in private. That was ^a arranged for the home of a member of the family in Jefferson Parish, where Garrison had no jurisdiction. It lasted about two weeks and by the time it was over Philip did ~~w~~ not understand what they were questioning him about. ³⁶¹

I understood part of what Philip did not. They were trying to learn what they could ^{of} about a source of mine and to undermine the credibility of ~~that~~ source. ^{240A2}

What is without question is that ^{this kidnapping} it was not and could not have been for Garrison.

Now it happens that O'Sullivan and Oswald ^{were} ~~are~~ classmates in high school. Records I got from the FBI seem to reflect that it was O'Sullivan who recruited ~~ed~~ Oswald into the CAP. There ~~they~~ the both knew Ferrie. And O'Sullivan was handling the city police case against Ferrie for sexual offenses involving juveniles.

O'Sullivan was ^a witness before the Warren Commission. When his testimony was published two paragraphs were censored out. Those paragraphs related to the offenses with which Ferrie was charged.

evd
362

Privacy should be protected. But on what Sullivan testified to Ferrie had no privacy to protect. His^c arrest and the charges had been published in the New Orleans newspapers. Ferrie

Ferrie as still alive when those transcript ~~were~~ ^{to} withholding those paragraphs relating to him ^{seemed} ~~was~~ ^{to be} not ~~improper~~ ^{improper}. He had ~~not~~ ^g been tried. ~~He~~ ^{240 B1} died during the time after Garrison had announced his case and before Garrison filed any charges. Despite the seeming mystery about his death, it seems to have been from natural causes.

With all of this and much more readily available how much of an investigator ~~Mailer~~ ^{Mailer} was and how interested he was in anything except what he began believing and intending to write without regard for what was not already in his head is apparent.

I have not only first-person testimony to Bringuier having known ~~the~~ Philip ^{much earlier than he testified and to me} before the JFK assassination and ~~of~~ ^{Added} the trust Philip placed in him, I have official documentation of it not from federal records. ^{Added} Details of this are on the tapes of my interview of him in the presence of his mother and his lawyer. Who was simply statounder by what she heard.

So, Bringuier, a virtual hero ~~to~~ ^{to} Gerald Posner, who interviewed him without learning any of this, and who is used, selectively, as usual, by Mailer, as an unquestionable dependable source, was not truthful in his representations under oath to the Commission or in much of what ~~he~~ ^{he} said to get the ^{public} attention he yearned for and was clever in getting.

Mailer, as usual, was ~~ignorant~~ ^{ignorant} of what he wrote about. Thus he repeats from Bringuier's testimony what ~~was~~ ^{is} at best misleading ^{about} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ his ~~own~~ ^{own} contact with Oswald he says was first on August 5. Mailer quotes it (on page 571) as Oswald having offered to contribute to the DRE. Bringuier said he declined to take money from Oswald because "I did not have the permit from the city hall here in New Orleans to collect money in the city." ^{That} not only was less than the ~~truth~~ ^{truth}, it is added proof that Philip was there much earlier from ^{Bringuier's} ~~the~~ ^{the} dates on the receipts I have that Bringuier gave Philip for the ~~money~~ ^{money} he did collect. ^{end p 263}

What Bringuier needed a permit for was not for accepting voluntary contributions but for selling those 50-cent "bonds." He had been doing that without the permit. And from sources ^{inside} the city government I learned their belief that it was Oswald who

Oswald who had reported Bringuier for selling those "B-I-N-B" bonds" without a license.

Or, there was this added aspect to the character of the man ^{of whom} Mailer's tome is supposed to be his definitive biography.

As Mailer tells this story, which is to say the fragment of it he liked from what the Commission decided to limit itself to, Philip was all alone that day. In fact ^{his} friend and fellow student was with him. Not only was this Philip's testimony, Vance Blalock was also a Commission witness whose testimony was published in those volumes Mailer told Cheuse (right) he studied so "exhaustively."

There is more for which there is no need here, but how much more does it require to provoke wonder about how much lying is required to become a dependable ~~source~~ source for be-Pulitzered Mailer?

And how much of what he ~~studied~~ ^{studied} so "exhaustively" did he elect to suppress in his supposedly definitive biography of Oswald that persuades ~~him~~ ^{him}, without regard to the existing evidence, that Oswald ~~as~~ ^{was} the assassin?

CAP unit Oswald had been in years earlier. It was just after school ended for the summer and she was driving into New Orleans anyway for a dentist's appointment. *end 360*

Corroborating the mother Philip's father left and returned with a shoe box of various of his son's items. In it were receipts Bringuier had written out to Phillips III for the sales of Cuban bonds at 50 cents each. They began more than two months before that Bringuier said was their first meeting. August 5 date. So, the Secret Service report was accurate, I had copies of the documentary proof and Bringuier was not truthful.

What I also do not go into here Bringuier dissembled even more. He knew Philip III from before then, and I have that on tape when I interviewed him when he returned from Viet Nam after his father was killed by accident. The mother was present and confirmed much of what Phillips III told me and to protect him, because he had ignored three grand jury subpoenas from Garrison, I arranged for the family lawyer to be there also. *present. present also?*

There is no "exhaustive" reading "ailer can give anything that can discourage him on his self-appointed rounds of phonying up his case.

Not does his ignorance of what he writes about give him any problem.

In any event, and with great difficulty, difficult because Oswald was doing all he could for Bringuier to find him giving out pro-Castro literature, one of Bringuier's cronies finally saw Oswald and the two of them with another went there and picked the fight that got them arrested. *end 364*

Mailer has a sort of account of parts of this rehashed, including what I also first brought to attention in Oswald in New Orleans, that Oswald had asked to be interviewed by the FBI. Omitting much of what then happened perhaps from ignorance, perhaps not to endanger the fairy tale he was getting on paper, Mailer says that among other things Oswald made the request "because of his thirst for conversation." (page 576 576) "He had obviously enjoyed talking to "atello," the New Orleans police lieutenant who had questioned Oswald and who had without success sought to interest both the FBI and the secret Service in an odd slip of paper found in Oswald's pocket when he was searched. As Mailer, without mention of this, says, Oswald asked to be seen by an FBI agent that could try request was "to test wits with an FBI man." (page 575 576.) *so he*

At this point also Mailer has one of his innumerable pontifications that he gives

no meaning to:

*indent
single
space*

"...Since ~~we~~ have yet to steal up to the questionx of whether he was doing ~~this~~ this entirely ~~on his own~~ for himself ~~or~~ or was receiving a stipen^d/from some official, semiofficial, or impromptu group, a few sinister possibilities have to be kept in mind." (page (page 576)

imagined
These "sinister possibilities" did not stay in Mailer's mind long enough *for him* to include them in his book.

The rest of this chapter is still more rehash with cutting and pasting and an occasional Mailer comment reflecting his lack of understanding of the whole thing. As an example of this he reports without any question what was well known, that Oswald pled guilty to 'disturbing the peace,' paid a \$10 dollar fine, and left." (page 578) But the fact is that Oseald was innocent. He was engaged in the ~~act~~ perfectly lawful pursuit of handing out his handbill when he was assaulted by those three Cubans led by Bringuier. Mailer has no question about why Oswald pled guilty when he ~~was innocent~~ was innocent. Which it ~~was~~ happens ~~to~~ did get him in the papers with what he sought to use shortly thereafter when he went to Mexico City ostensibly seeking a visa to get into Cuba allegedly en route the the Soviet Union.

*end
365*

Mailer's next chapter, 8, is titled "Fair Play." (579-93) It consists of almost 15 pages of rehash from the ^{public and attention} debate ^{Mailer says} this Oswald operation led to on what Mailer does not bother to identify, WDSU radio. The moderator of that program was William Stuckey. Mailer begins with rehashing ~~Stu~~ Stuckey's Commission testimony and then switches to the transcript of that debate published by the Commission. This again gets us to Mailer's specialty of three-dor dotting the evidence, to three-dotting our history.

On page
In ~~page~~ 590 the first three-dotting should be enough for this long and pointless rehash of what is so well known and widely published- other than the liberties ~~Mail~~ Mailer takes with it.

Stuckey said that he was "curious to know just how you supported yourself in the Soviet Union," ~~implying~~ something sinister. Mailer then quotes Oswald's response:

indent single space

"Well, as I, er, well - I will answer your question directly the^N, as you will not rest until you get your answer, I worked in Russia...At no time ~~did~~ I renounce my citizenship ~~and~~ or attempt to renounce my citizenship, and at no time was I out of contact with the American embassy."

Remembering this well-reported business led to a check of the Commission's "Stuckey Exhibit No. 3" in Volume ~~21~~ at the top of page 640, Mailer's cited source. (page xxxi)

Mailer ~~has~~ has one source's note to cover three pages of his text. On page xxxi he gives this ~~source~~ source, "Stuckey Exhibit No. 3, Vol. XXI, pp.634;637-42." Some of what I quote above is at the top of page 639. Mailer has it correctly until he get to those three dots. What he eliminated at that point with them is

end 366

indent single space

"I was not under the ~~protection~~ ^{protection} of the- that is to say I was not under the protection of the american [sic] government, but I was at all ~~the~~ times considered an American citizen I did not lose my American citizenship."

What Mailer resumes with is in response to ~~an added~~ ^{another} question ~~by~~ he was ~~asked~~ ^{asked}.

The first problem with this again raises questions about whether ~~not~~ Mailer used his own work of that of ~~others~~ ^{others} because on page 579 he says that what he quotes from is Stuckey's WDSU program "called 'Latin Listening Post.'" But his citation is to WDSU's "Conversations Carte Blanche," which begins on page 633 of that volume. It is Stuckey Exhibit No. 3. But the Stuckey interview is Stuckey Exhibit No. 2. It begins on page 621 and is limited entirely to Latin America.

This is ^{at the very least} to say that Mailer is so unfamiliar with his alleged sources he cannot keep them straight.

The second question is why Mailer eliminated what he did, Oswald's ~~days~~ ^{saying} twice that he was "not under the protection of the American government" in a context that does suggest he was correcting himself the second time he said it. My recollection from having listened to the tape is that the first time he said he was under the protection of the American government. My recollection, of course, can be wrong after all these years.

This reminded me of what I wrote in ^{my} first book, which I repeat dates to

1965. This is t/say it was available ^{able} to Mailer for about 30 years. On page 125, recounting Oswald letter to the man he thought ^{incorrectly} was still secretary of the Navy, as John B. Connally, ^{he} ~~then no longer~~ was complaining ^{about} of the change in his discharge from the Marines from honorable to less than honorable ^W Oswald rote and ~~that Commission published~~ in of his life in the USSR, "I have and always had the full sanction of the U.S. end 367
 Government." At that point I list the three ^{palces} places the Commission published that Oswald letter in full and in facsimile in its ~~appended~~ 26 volumes and even in the Report, where it is printed in type on Page 710.

I know of no official denial of what Oswald wrote about having that full government "sanction" for what he did.

This claim to "full sanction" is consistent with Oswald having first said that he was under ~~large~~ government's "protect" protection when he was in the USSR and then changing that to saying he was not.

In any event, this is ^y ~~but~~ another illustration of the fact that even Mailer's citation of his alleged sources cannot be trusted.

And so Mailer has ^{70 more pages to} padded his overly-padded ~~pretending~~ pretended biography of Oswald that is to ~~prove~~ ^{" as "} ~~proof~~ through biography ~~and~~ interpreted by Mailer that Oswald was the assassin when all it does is add to Mailer's case that Mailer is a ~~self-~~ self-important subject-matter ignoramus who is so overwhelmed by his belief in his own brilliance and his having the ^{under} standing and perception denied mere mortals and in the course of his virtuoso displaying of it portays himself a fool ^{who} ~~and~~ lacks the ~~em~~ common sense to be aware of it. In this what ^{he} adds to "ailer's "ales is that he cannot end 368

be trusted to quote his sources either accurately or fairly, and when it suits his purposes and serves the preconceptions with which he began ^{he} and spends all the silly words ^{he can} trying to make them ~~app~~ appear to be real, distorts and misrepresents what he quotes, whether what he quotes be his original work or what is no more a tribute to him, the

work of ~~toht~~ others who began and persisted in those ^{same} ~~pre~~ prejudices, he would not have any book in me ^{if all he did was} ~~ely~~ repeating. So, with no more than what he neither understands nor is faithful to, Mailer invents ^{and} ~~end~~ end 368
 The new Oswald the invention of whom any pretense of a book, requires end 369
 of this,