

XXIV No Matter How High It Is Piled (Expletive) Is Still (Expletive)

Mailer has gotten to and past, rapidly past the assassination itself. Except for the fact that it is Mailer, it would be surprizing that he said what little he said about the assassination itself without addressing the ^{actual} evidence. He does, ^{was so slightly,} more less, get to that in his chapter titled "Eidence" in this Part. En route he indulges himself a bit in what appears for him to be a saddistic joy, attacking ^{again} Marina. No matter how much it is no more than a ^{nasty} contrivance. ^{This he does in} ~~she has~~ an aside in which he makes her out to be a greedy mercenary, ^{and} ~~he~~ ^{available} does that with his omnipresent ignorance of the simple and established fact of the ~~fact~~ ^{and its investigations, not until later does he mention the name} assassination, ~~without mentioning, if he knew, the man's name he refers to~~ James ² Martin, in saying that "the business manager Marina took on was looking at a cash-cow in her future" (page 769). He adds to this that "By the end of 1964, Marina would break relations with her business manager, Jim Martin, she grew suspicious of everyone who had commercial relations with her...." (page 771).

The truth is that because she did need someone to look out for her affairs, which ranged from handling the contributions to her by generous Americans who were moved by her plight to ^{any} ~~the~~ ^e literary rights, the Secret Service got her to accept Martin as her manager. It was not even her idea. and by doing that the government was out from under, among other things, responsibility for handling those contributions. Moreover, Marina was then in virtual house arrest. She was not free from it ^{months later when she} until ~~she~~ complained ^{That was the first time she saw anyone who could get her relief.} to Warren about it when she testified the following February, 1964. Until then she was controlled by the Secret Service.

For Mailer he is pretty close when he refers to that "cash-cow" bit but, typically, Mailer has that twisted. He says that Martin was looking out for her interest "in her future." It was the actuality Mailer never mentions but was readily accessible to him in a Secret Service report on the scandal it had created. That was the major reason Marina ended that relationship with Martin.

"her interest was in his ^{present} not her present or her future"

end
490

She was the cow being milked and Martin did the milking.

He did not have a thing to do with those voluntary contributions to her.

But he got her to sign a contract in which she gave up ~~that~~ thirtyfive percent of all moneys that came to her!

He took fifteen percent off the top. There was another ten percent for ^{his} the lawyer ~~his~~ friend of his he engaged to represent her. And then there was an added ten percent to her brother-in-law Robert Oswald for doing nothing but, apparently, keep her satisfied while being ~~it~~ milked so thoroughly.

It is with his usual corruption of the known and ~~the~~ readily-available fact, the official/^{ly} established ~~the~~ fact, that Mailer finally, after seven hundred and eventy-five pages, gets to what he calls the "evidence." And that, he makes clear at the outset is what is worthless, what cannot be trusted.

This is to say, in ~~stark~~ stark and disgraceful truth, that Mailer's corruption is total. He uses the fiction of his invention as his feeble, dishonest ^{to explanation} ~~writer, ignorant-writer explanation~~ ~~OF HIS DISREGARD FOR THE ACTUAL, OFFICIAL*~~ ~~OF HIS DISREGARD FOR THE ACTUAL OFFIC~~ of his disregard for and abysmal ignorance of the actual, established official evidence; as his cockamamie substitution for the ~~the~~ actual and established evidence of all that sizzled in mind that ^{was} uncontaminated by any truth or any interest in or quest for truth; ^{as} ~~for~~ his substitutions for what was true and official/^{ly} established as without question ~~the~~ true with what he could ^u alchemize into this literary monstrosity, this atrocity that disgraces him and our history.

Truth and fact are to Mailer as in the fable holy water is to the vampire.

Rich Which is what he is on this subject and in this book. end 491

This is the slime of his own creation with which he slides into his self- and book-justification that was so "shrewd" to Lance Morrow and TIME magazine; so "definitive" the Newsday's Liz Smith; so "brilliant" to the Washington Post exalter/expert on "intellogence," Pinder:

undert-
gung
ped

Did Oswald do it?

If one's answer is to come out of anything larger than an opinion, it is necessary to contend with questions of evidence. In that direction, however, one encounters a jungle of conflicting expert estimates as to whether Oswald could fire the shots in time, was a good enough marksman, was the only gunman in Dealey Plaza, and on one can go, trying to explore into every last reach of possibility, only to encounter a disheartening truth: Evidence, by itself, will never provide the answer to a mystery. For it is in the nature of evidence to produce, sooner or later, a counterinterpretation to itself in the form of a contending expert in a court of law.

It will be obvious to the reader that one does not (and should not) respect evidence with the religious intensity that others bring to it: *(page 775)*

For the first time in seven hundred and seventy-five *Mailer does admit* pages ~~even~~ the possibility that Oswald may not have been the assassin, ~~Mailer admits~~, if only as a literary device.

He then says that "opinion" is an ^{'answer'} ~~answer~~, a substitute for truth, for officially established evidence of which he kept himself totally ignorant for more than three decades. He says that even to be able to consider that there may be anything superior to opinion, by ~~which~~ ^{which} he means his own opinion, "it is necessary to contend with questions of evidence." From the superiority of his ^d ~~st~~eatfast ignorance he limits this to "whether Oswald ^{could fire the} ~~shots~~ in time" and then to whether he "was a good enough marksman." To this statement that there is no reason for nations to have courts of law, which is what ^{is} ~~is~~ Mailer is really arguing, he adds a very big lie, that with regard to the evidence, he did try "to explore into every last reach of possibility" with ~~re~~ ^{regard} to the assassination evidence. Otherwise there is no purpose in this big a lie as this accomplished and well-^{had} ~~practised~~ ^{practised} ~~to~~ ^{liar} in his book ~~he is~~.

It is not as he says "the nature of evidence to produce, sooner or later, a counterinterpretation in the form of a ^{contending expert...} ~~counterinterpretation...~~" with lies. Evidence remains evidence regardless of lies.

Thus he tells the reader that it is "obvious" that ~~one~~ "one does not (and should not) respect evidence..." ^{He says this because he knows he lies and because he knows he and his book cannot survive the evidence.}

In ^{the} ~~a~~ shallow and incompetent ~~an~~ illustration ~~as~~ he came up with Mailer argues that his "expert" and the one used by the Commission established that the assassination shooting was possible for Oswald, ^{was "easy" for him.} To ^{say} ~~do~~ this, among many other glaring omissions, Mailer

end
992

omits, which is to ~~say~~ suppresses, the official evaluation of the commandante of the United States Marines Corps; ~~the~~ time permitted for the shooting, which is not in the "testimony" of his "expert;" and, ~~and~~ this is the ultimate in his dishonesty and his deliberate corruptions so he can have his pathetic trash of a book, the officially established fact ~~and~~ ^{from} in the official tests to ~~to~~ determine not whether the ~~diff~~ ^{er} Oswald was capable of the shooting) but whether very best professional shooters in the country were.] ^(I know Oswald)

All of this, all with specific citations to the specific evidence, was available to him and to all others with the very first book on the Warren Commission, my 1965 Whitewash.

Whether or not Oswald could have fired those shots with such devastating accuracy and within the time allowed by the time-clo^cking Zapruder film for the assassination, less than ^{six} ~~ten~~ seconds the Commission ^{itself} ~~says~~, is ^a ~~hardly~~ the only question relating to the shooting, which is what Mailer here represents. On his presentation on the the ^{end} noncom Marine who was obvious out of ~~the~~ his depth and testified without regard to ⁴⁹³ all the other controlling facts, of which ~~a~~ time is only one, this shooting was a snap, "easy" as Mailer correctly quotes him on page 777. That it was so easy is no doubt the explanation for the fact that nobody in the entire world has been able to ^{could the marine in fact said was "a real poor shot" (Whitewash page 32)} duplicate the shooting attributed to the ~~best~~ ^{best} shot, Oswald.

In a ^{is} fairness of Mailer let ^{us} begin with what he says following what I quote above, ~~that~~ that one should not respect evidence, ^{omit} ~~with~~ nothing omitted in quotation: [?]

*will not
single
space*

MR. SPECTER. Would the use of a four-power scope be a real advantage . . . ?

SERGEANT ZAHM. . . . particularly at the range of 100 yards . . . It allows you to see your target clearly, and it is still of a minimum .

incorrect
single
scope

amount of power that it doesn't exaggerate your own body movements . . .

MR. SPECTER. . . . would a man with Oswald's marksmanship capabilities be able to complete such a shot and strike the target on the white mark there?

SERGEANT ZAHM. Very definitely . . . With the equipment he had and with his ability, I consider it a very easy shot.

MR. SPECTER. . . . would a marksman of Mr. Oswald's capabilities using such a rifle with a 4-power scope be able to strike the President in the back of the head? . . .

SERGEANT ZAHM. . . . This would have been a little more difficult and probably be to the top of his ability, aiming and striking the President in the head. But assuming that he aimed at the mass of the center portion of the President's body, he would have hit him very definitely someplace . . .¹

One can envision the scene in court if Oswald had lived. The defense would have brought in their expert to testify to the opposite of Sergeant Zahm's opinion, and much would have been made of the dubious setting of the scope on the Mannlicher-Carcano, since the first riflemen who did tests with that gun for the Warren Commission had to correct the alignment before their shots could even hit a stationary target.

MR. FRAZIER. . . . I think I must say here that this mount was loose on this rifle when we received it. And apparently the scope had even been taken off of the rifle, in searching for fingerprints on the rifle. So that actually the way it was sighted-in when we got it does not necessarily mean it was sighted-in that way when it was abandoned. (A 775-6)

~~He~~ Were it not for Mailer's astounding dishonesty in this it would in fact have been ludicrous "in court" if Zahm had been as ignorant or as unconcerned about his ~~reput~~ reputation if he had testified. ^{It} In fact, ~~if~~ any prosecutor would have dared call him as a witness. I know from having discussed this shooting with my friend Henry Waden who would have been the prosecutor, that he knows more and better about the shooting. Henry was an FBI agent as a ^{was} young man and a proficient hunter at the time of the assassination.

But at the top, what about that ⁴four-power scope" being "A real advantage?" to which Zahm replied, as he did to all impossibility, ^{is} that it would have been?

That rifle was not designed for use of a telescopic sight. In order to reload

it without the rifleman putting his eye out he had to take the rifle away from his eye. That means that after ejecting the empty shell bullet by pulling the bolt back, with the rifle away from the eye and thus away from the target, and then push the bolt forward again to place another bullet in the chamber to be there to be fired, the rifleman had to again pick his target up through the very narrow field of vision permitted by the scope and then sight in all over again.

Mailer ^{quotes} quotes no testimony on this. His reader has no way to know it is the reality.

Then there is the ^{additional} very real question Mailer suppresses, and as a former Marine he had to know it existed, was it an "advantage" to have to shoot less rapidly, which is what using a telescopic sight means? Or is it an advantage of have used open sights at a range common in hunting, not not have to take the rifle away from the eye, to do all that was then required and then get it up to the eye and then sight the target all over again?

Mailer then quotes Specter's getting to Oswald's "marksmanship capabilities." Here Mailer pretends there were real Oswald "marksmanship capabilities" that had earlier been established because he makes no ^{other} references to those "capabilities." All of this testimony and Mailer's misuses of it ignore what cannot be ignored. One is ^{and} that shooting is a mechanical skill that requires constant practise. Another is the the official fact, the official Marine Corps evaluation of Oswald's rifle capabilities-with a much different and infinitely better rifle - several years earlier, with no practise since then as quoted above the official evaluation is that he then ~~was that he was as lousy a shot as he could be and still~~ remain in the Marines!

In Whitewash I had some ^{and} common sense testimony on this we'll come to.

Mailer does quote FBI SA Robert Frazier, who was a firearms expert, but he uses much less of Frazier's testimony than the "respect" for "evidence" requires.

Here is how I handled the shooting and Zahm's fairy tales in Whitewash beginning with quotation from the official Marines evaluation that I printed in facsimile on page

Besides this not one came close to the time Oswald would have had for all *the*
~~the off f ofi~~ officially-admitted shooting, only thre shots. As Mailer later admits
there may have been more than three shots fired and as the actual~~l~~ official evidence
leaves without question, there had to have been more than these three shots.

30. "which is to say that Mailer did not have to take my word for it. This is also to say that because of his boasted-off "thorough" study of the Commission's printed evidence, he suppressed what is uncongenial to his preconception of Oswald's guilt:

What single phrase

To become qualified as a sharpshooter, the Marine Corps is of the opinion that most Marines with a reasonable amount of adaptability to weapons firing so become qualified. Consequently a low marksman qualification indicates a rather poor 'shot' and a sharpshooter qualification is a fairly good 'shot'."

end 496

So, Oswald at his military best was only "fairly good" and at the end of his service was a "poor shot".

To offset this destruction of its sand castle, the Commission compared Oswald with a number of men who have spent their lives firing and studying weapons, men of the highest competence, firing weapons regularly as part of their livelihoods for all or most of their adult years, men who had had scientific weapons training. Then on July 24, 1964, the Commission called James A. Zahm, a Marine non-commissioned officer in weapons training (11H306ff.). Zahm was willing to call Oswald a good shot. But even he specified a minimum of ten practice shots as prerequisite in the use of the telescopic sight (R192). And this, of course, assumed a good telescopic sight.

After deliberation, the Report concludes that Oswald's Marine experience, "his other rifle experience (a bad performance with a .22 rifle) and his established familiarity with this particular weapon (totally non-existent) show that he possessed ample capability to commit the assassination" (R195).

Just how easy were these assassination shots? Could the performance be regarded as within the "capability" of a man who was at the time less practiced than when the Marine Corps several years earlier had evaluated him as a "poor shot"?

The Commission arranged what it presumably considered a fair test, with its three genuine marksmen, "rated as master by the National Rifle Association" (R193). "The marksmen took as much time as they wanted for the first target and all hit the target. For the first four attempts, ... missed the second shot. ... Five of the six shots hit the third target ..." (R193). And they were firing at still targets, not moving, living things!

These three really were "masters". Two were civilians in the Small Arms Division of the Army's Development and Proof Services, and the third man was in the Army and had "a considerable background as a rifleman" (3H445). Yet even they were not able to do what the Report says Lee Harvey Oswald, the poor shot in the Marines, when out of practice, "had ample capacity to commit". (P44C26)

339A

The Commission, which began with the determination to conclude that Oswald was the assassin and the lone assassin ~~took~~ sought no testimony from any authentic expert on how "easy" the shot Zahm said was when ~~to~~ nobody in the ~~entire~~ world has ever been able to duplicate it. But it has that information volunteered to it. It was, to anyone knowing anything at all about shooting, as Mailer, a former Marine, did, the most probative testimony. ~~And~~ And it is without question that Mailer knew of this testimony and suppressed it ~~for~~ from his book, ~~and readers knowing it as he did~~ ^{know of it} from having quoted from it while suppressing this part of it! As we have seen, Mailer's use of Dean Andrews' Commission testimony contorted and misrepresented it and ^{when} he sought ^{to} ~~to~~ ^{contribute} ~~con-~~tribute a case of Oswald homosexuality in part on it. So he did ~~a~~ know of Andrews testimony, having quoted from it. Here is what I had in Whitewash (pages 24-5) that Mailer suppressed:

end 497

340

incident
rings
space

Entirely by surprise the Commission received and the Report neglects the most reasonable and probative testimony on marksmanship from one of the witnesses heard with least enthusiasm. New Orleans attorney Dean Andrews was called by phone, with connections [redacted] by phone, with [redacted] [redacted]. He caught the Commission entirely by surprise by saying Oswald had not and could not have killed President Kennedy. He emphasized the point that the Commission had never asked all the experts quoted: Marksmanship is a skill that requires a high degree of coordination and practice (11H330-1).

"I am basing my opinion on five years as an ordnanceman in the Navy. You can lean into those things, and with throwing the bolts - if I couldn't do it myself, 8 hours a day, doing this for a living, constantly on the range, I know this civilian couldn't do it. He might have been a sharp marksman at one time, but if you don't lean into that rifle and don't squeeze and control consistently, your brain can tell you how

to do it, but you don't have the capability ... to fire three shots controlled with accuracy, this boy couldn't do it."

Commission Assistant Counsel Wesley J. Liebeler asked, "You base that judgment on the fact that, in your own experience, it is difficult to do that sort of thing?"

"Mr. Andrews: You just don't pick up a rifle or a pistol or whatever weapon you are using and stay proficient with it. You have to know what you are doing.... Somebody else pulled the trigger ... It's just taking the 5 years (experience) and thinking about it a bit. I have fired as much as 40,000 rounds of ammo a day for 7 days a week. You get pretty good with it as long as you keep firing. Then I have gone back after 2 weeks. I used to be able to take a shotgun, go on a skeet, and pop 100 out of 100. After 2 weeks, I could only pop 60 of them. I would have to start again, same way with the rifle and machineguns. Every other person I knew, same thing happened to them. You just have to stay in it."

end
498

What Andrews testified to it a truism not peculiar to shooting. Professional musicians at the height of their skills and success still practise virtually daily and they need to to retain their skills.

It is after this that I go into the official Marine Corps evaluation of Oswald as a rifleman quoted in part above. The rest of what I used at that point in Whitewash (pages 26 -7) I return to for the purpose of adding to the certainty that in his lying about why he ignored all the evidence that made a shabby pretense of his book Hailer was fully knowing. We saw the little he quoted from Frazier's testimony. ^{Just with} By comparing not all of Frazier's testimony but merely what was publicly available for three decades prior to Hailer's "thorough" study of those records. This mean, of course, that it was no less readily available to Random House or what it avoided/like the plague, any authentic and once-traditional peer review.

incident
scope
space

There is no reason to doubt that the ten-dollar rifle could be fired accurately. The improbability of an assassin ordering his weapon by mail when the same weapon was readily available locally (26H63) is not referred to in the Report, nor is his getting such a cheap weapon for such serious shooting. But the testimony of the experts is clear and unequivocal. The rifle could be fired accurately. (3H390ff.) Only not at the time of the assassination, and not when received at the FBI laboratories in Washington, for initial testing, or at Edgewood Arsenal for further tests.

Robert A. Frazier, the FBI's expert, said, "When we attempted to sight this rifle at Quantico we found that the elevation adjustment in the telescopic sight was not sufficient to bring the point of impact to the aiming point. ... every time we changed the adjusting screws to move the crosshairs in the telescopic sight in one direction it also affected the movement of the ... point of impact in the other direction." The defect in the sight was structural (3H405). So, "... we left the rifle (alone) as soon as it became stabilized and fired all of our shots with the point of impact actually high and to the right". Frazier did not know the nature of "the defect in the scope" but he had noticed a damage from which "the scope tube could have been bent or damaged" (3H406). After some experimentation, they learned that "you could take an aiming point low and to the left" and fire accurately (3H407). Such experimentation and adjustment were

end
499

unreported from the assassination scene or anywhere else in Dallas.

By the time Frazier got it, "apparently the scope had been taken off the rifle", hence, there is no way of knowing how it was set in Dallas (3H411). And when the rifle was first received, there were no shims under the sight. Shims had subsequently been added. This mystery is cleared up in Volume 17 where the table of contents refers to "Three shims inserted under the mount of the G2766 rifle during tests performed on the rifle". One can only wonder what else was done to it before it got to the masters who even then failed to duplicate the feat. The same source prompts limitless conjectures in describing Exhibit 542 as a "replica" of the "G2766 rifle" (17H-241). All of the expert testimony establishes beyond cavil there is no such thing as a replica of a rifle. This is the basis of identification of used shells and bullets. Both are marked unmistakably by each weapon, like fingerprints, characteristically and uniquely, a point the Commission belabored and with which it unnecessarily cluttered its record. Other experts found the sight adjusted for a left-handed man, which Oswald was not. This information is buried among the exhibits (25H799).

Even in his quotation of Frazier, which he did not dare suppress entirely,

Mailer could not be honest. Contrary to what he wrote the FBI did not make all the repairs and adjustments necessary even to use the sight. The shims Mailer says the FBI added under the sight we not placed there by the FBI. They were placed under the sight for the Army tests at its top arsenal where the best shots in the country were to use it.

And even then, under vastly improved conditions and with the twice-overhauled rifle and sight, not one of those "masters" was able to duplicate the shooting Mailer's "expert" the noncom Zahm wa said was "easy."

It is only by such disgraceful "expert" testimony ^{that there} is ~~there~~ any question at all about the evidence Mailer lied in saying "by itself, will never provide the ~~same~~ answer." Thus he said there would have been a problem in the court. There would not have been if Zahm had ~~not~~ ^e appeared to be thoroughly disgraced and discredited.

end
500

And thus Mailer's wisdom ^d that "one does not (and should not) respect evidence...."

The lie that is ^y absolutely essential to his daring to publish this book that

defames him as no one my could.

Next, as is also necessary for him, for him to cover his deliberate dishonesty, *and*
his bunk theory
for him to have a book, he lies about forensic experts and what is essential to the
report, that single bullet theory that was not even a ~~theory~~ *theory* it was a deliberate fabri-
cation by ~~Mr~~ Arlen Specter and the Commission.

*incident
single
bullet*

Arguments in court about that scope would have produced a classic dispute between experts.

These are, however, relatively simple matters. But when we come to the Warren Commission's theory of the magic bullet, we are entering the technology of ballistics, and that is a wasteland

for those who are not forensic experts, and the best people in forensics—it is a foregone conclusion—will also disagree.

So this work is not going to concern itself with ballistics. If one were a lawyer, one would wish to demonstrate that the odds against a single bullet passing through both Kennedy's and Connally's bodies (~~thereupon to emerge long enough to smash Con-~~

(pages 776-7)

the shooting that
This in his literary shell-game Mailer reduced the entire matter of the shooting, which was impossible for the best shots in the ~~entire~~ *and* country, to what he ~~disrepresents~~ *pretends evidence*
relating to the scope is limited to
~~to be limited to~~ about only the scope, *and* about that, with his ~~dependable~~ *standard substitution* ~~satndby~~
of conjecture ~~as a substitittue~~ *Reality he* for truth or fact or ~~ality~~ conjectures it would have
produce~~d~~ not merely a "dispute" in court but a "classic dispute." When nobody in the
~~word~~ world could state with expertise and honesty what Mailer here argues, that the *end*
defect in the scope would have been of no consequence with less~~er~~ *501* than six seconds for
all that shooting?

It simply is not possible, world-class as is Mailer's ignorance of and ~~conna~~
~~cont~~empt for the established fact, officially established fact, that he is ignorant en-
ough to believe there would be no other issues to go to a jury and that they would
have been exculpatory. Some of these relate to what he refers to as "ballistics" and
thus he has to have some excuse for not addressing them, as he cannot. So, airily,
he says his book, already past where they should ~~xxx~~ have been ddressed, says it
"is not going to concern ^c itself with ~~them~~."

Then there is what in all that pages ^{and muck} of ~~uck~~ Mailer found no space for, the fragment of bullet in Connally's chest, It is another ~~of~~ the innumerable Mailer characterizations of Mailer ~~and~~ a phony and a fraud that he makes no mention of it.

Each of these slivvers of metal, the one Mailer keeps secret from his book in Connally's chest and the ^{other} one that also remained in Connally's body ^{in his thigh,} and was also buried with him, was X-rayed. Each X-ray could be measured. Each of ~~these~~ these separate slivvers was too long to have come from the base of the magic bullet, No. 399!

That either one could is Mailer's self-indictment ~~enough~~ as it was of the government. Together they are more than double that indictment for deliberate dishonesty, for lying to the people and to the world about the assassination of President.

If Mailer had "tried to explore" the evidence, without, in his purposeful exaggeration, going "into every last reach of possibility" which clearly was not necessary, that would have been "only to encounter a disheartening truth" only for those those who have his record for abhorring truth, which ^{he and} they cannot exploit and commercialize.

The ^{real} truth "that is so disheartening to him is the absolutely irrefutable ^{evidence} proof, the only actual ^{evidence there} proof ~~there~~ is, all else being conjecture and fabrication of the impossible, about that made-up career on that bullet ^{he and} he can address only in ~~which~~ what he stretches enormously to say is "opinion." *It is not "opinion." It is knowing lies.*

If he were not a hotshot huckster with a load of snake-oil and an interest in selling that and nothing else he would have known that two

The plain and simple reason is that he cannot.

They are addressed in detail and in terms of the established official evidence-- the evidence that any prosecution would have used and all it could have used - in my books, Particularly in Whitewash, the chapters "The Number of Shots" and "the Doctors and the Autopsy" and in NEVER AGAIN! extensively and in too many places to indicate them all.

In ~~this~~ these quotations from him we have Mailer as The Faker, which is what he is throughout his book.

He follows this with his dismissal of the career of that magical bullet said to have inflicted all seven nonfatal wounds to and to have emerged from this career unequalled in ~~any~~ science or mythology by saying that it also can be and is ignored in his book because it, too, would be mere merely arguments between opposing lawyers. What he pretends in this is absolutely false because there is no "evidence" at all in support of that ^a ~~made-up-out-of-nothing-but-need~~ fabrication by Arlen Specter.

One of the many reasons no prosecutor would have dared argue that concoction as "evidence" and make a public spectacle of himself is that the actual evidence is that no bullet entered Governor Connally's thigh. *to sneeze out of it and be found at the hospital.* This is one of the several reasons Dr. ~~Malcolm~~ Malcolm Perry avoided the press conference announced for the day after the assassination.

end 502

I go into this in considerable detail in Post Mortem - and in twenty years without any complaint from any of those I name and to whom I attribute knowledge. Here two of the *solid, ir-* *reputable* evidentiary points, not mere "arguments," are that the Dallas doctors who examined the wound in the front of the President's neck said it ^{was} from the front and those who examined and X-rayed and read the X-rays of his thigh wound said it was from a sliver of metal, not a bullet--that the hole made was too tiny for any bullet.

343A

~~The~~ Members of the Commission absolutely refused to agree with this so-called theory ^{which} ~~that~~ is not even that ^{member, Hate Boggs,} and a third had some disagreements with it. This was not a secret, except to Mailer's trusting and deceived readers.

^{note again} I ~~have delayed~~ ^{noting} that in a book of eight hundred and twenty eight pages on so complicated a subject and with the ^{of} sources he does credit ^{Mailer} ~~he~~ fails to have any

^{real} bibliography. Obviously, that satisfied Random Hoyle. Mailer dared not include any ^{real} bibliography. If he had he would on the one hand have had to confess ignoring all of the factual books on the subject or on the other hand have had to confess knowledge of them and their contents and then to have avoided the evidence they hold ^{because} ~~that~~ his book cannot coexist with.

In Whitewash IV I reported for the first time a relationship I had with the Commission Member Richard B. Russell and how Rankin and Warren violated the Commission's agreement to record and preserve for posterity all their executive sessions. They then manufactured a phony transcript of that session Russell forced, on September 18, 1964. When I put the official proof of this in Russell's hands he broke his long friendship with Lyndon Johnson and never spoke to him again. ~~Until~~ Until friends were able to examine the records Russell and Senator John Sgerman Cooper left and are deposited in archives at their state universities, to a degree this rested on my word, on what I wrote that Russell told me. Gerard "Chip" Selby provided me with the actual documents that could not be firmer or more specific on this from ^{Russell's} ~~his~~ Archive at the University of Georgia at Athens and William Neichter provided me with the equally firm proofs from the Cooper archive at the University of Kentucky ^{at} ~~and~~ Lexington. EMC 504

Both Members went to their graves inflexibly refusing to agree with that absolute basis of the Report. They were tricked into agreeing to what was represented to them as a compromised that, as it was published in the Report (on page 19) is the ~~the~~ same fabrication that was ^{carefully} reworded.

I went into this in a lengthy article I wrote in 1992 that follows in this book. The third Member Russell told me ^{Boggs} was a somewhat opposed to it ^{Cooper confirms Russell.} ~~was~~ Hale Boggs.

By coincidence, just as I reached this point in this writing I was written to by Donald E. Wilkes, Jr., professor of law at the University of Georgia at Athens. Under date of June 23 he sent me copies of several articles he had published in Georgia newspapers based on documents in the Russell archive in which he said what I say above. He also included Hale Boggs as one not willing ^{accept} to accept that phony fabrication of the supermagical bullet. He concluded his letter with a fine compliment, "Please keep up the good work,

and remember that there are millions of Americans who have had their eyes opened because of your important work."

It is Mailer's bald a deliberate lie that there is any "evidence" at all that can support this first of the ~~big~~ major assassination mythologies ^{These myths} that are usually attributed to only those who do not agree with the official mythology. ^{But} if Mailer doesn't lie about this he can have no book at all because with his concept of scholarship he began with the conviction that Oswald was guilty. "He therefore cannot admit there there is exculpatory evidence. So, blandly, he merely dismisses all that ~~irref-~~ ~~it~~ irrefutable proof by saying he is not going to "concern" himself with it. ^{end 505}

At the same ^{point} ~~point~~ and in the next paragraph Mailer seeks to dismiss the fact that the shooting attributed to Oswald was impossible (page 777). Here is how this literary and intellectual ~~book~~ bankruptcy does that:

*indent
single
space*

It is the same with Oswald's marksmanship. He is judged by various people, depending on the needs of the ax they grind, to be a poor rifleman, a fair one, a good one, or virtually an expert. Much the same has been stated about the difficulty of the shot itself. It has been estimated to be everything from as easy as Sergeant Zahm has testified to nearly impossible.

Such a debate is, however, moot. A rifleman can fire with accuracy one day and be far off target on another. Why should we ascribe any more consistency to a man with a gun (in the equivalent of combat conditions) than we would expect from a professional basketball player whose accuracy often varies dramatically from night to night?

Moreover, we are dealing with Oswald. We have seen him become hysterical on one occasion and, on another, be the coolest man in the room. If we have come through the turnings of this book without comprehending that the distance between his best and worst performance is enacted over a wide spectrum, then we have not gained much. The point is that Oswald, at his best, was certainly capable of hitting a moving target at eighty-eight yards on two out of three shots over five and a half seconds even if in Russia he could not drop a rabbit with a shotgun from ten feet

mailer
Not a word of this is true and he knows it.

The only actual, official evidence is that the shooting attributed to Oswald was an absolute impossibility. Whatever that miserable verbosity and falsehood from Sergeant Zahm can be called it is not evidence! It is an incompetent and baseless opinion that no prosecutor would dare have offered because he would have lost on that alone and would have been a laughingstock ^{to boot.}

That specious ^{nonsense} nonsense of Mailer's in the third paragraph above ~~is~~ is as ridiculous as it is irrelevant. But pretending ^d that oranges are apples on the very next page Mailer carries ^{on with} (this ludicrous and proposterous rubbish in saying that, end 506

"We need only compare his [Oswald's] performance in New Orleans on the radio," where he had ^{gl} glared himself well in a debate.

Thus we have the itellect and the intellectual honesty of what two pulitzer ~~pr~~ prizes represent, because ^{when} a man can debate he becomes under ~~times~~ emotional stimulation a better ^{rifle} shooter than the best ^{rifle} shooter who ever lived!

Those words "definitive," "brilliant" and "shrewd eye" fall short, ^{except} as self-characterizations by reviewers!

With total ~~indifference~~ indifference to the clear and unquestionable fact Mailer continues to arge the impossible, "it is still difficult not to believe that he pulled the trigger," and then he follows this with no less specious argument, that for the rifle to have been in the TSVD Oswald would have had to lend it to another (page 778).

He follows this by actually saying that "Lee had the character to kill Kennedy, and that he probably did it alone." This ^s slosses out of Mailer's mind and need ^{it} and has nothing other than that slossing slime to support it. (Page 778)

^{with} ~~with~~ not less shamelessness he then actually says in pretending to address whether or not ~~there~~ there was a conspiracy- and in this ^{as in} all those pages brimming with the irrational and un^ereasonable he could not bring himself to be irrational enough or un^ereasonable enough to address a single item of fact or of evidence ^v that bears on whether or not there was a conspiracy, that "The odds in favor of one's personal conclusion ~~can~~ can not ^{be} better than, let us say, 3 out of 4 that he is definitively guilty and the sole actor in the assassination," (page 778).

Here we see another reason why Mailer had to dismiss all fact, all evidence: his concept of fact and of evidence in the crime of the century is no more than what ^{he} ~~one~~ wants to "believe"! And even then the dybbyk in him drove him to admit that maybe end 507 Oswald did not do it!

What "wholly ^{note} separate purpose" could there be in firing at the President other than to kill him? That is a "separate purpose?"

And if nobody would "trust him to hit the target," how did he then fire the fatal shot?

If all of this is not crazy enough, here is how Mailer got into this claptrap:

"So, the real question is not whether Oswald had the skills to bring off the deed but whether he had the soul of a killer" (page 788)

indent
single
space

What Mailer is saying here is, literally, that even if Oswald did not "have the skills" to kill the President, ^{could not have killed him, complete} even if that was a physical impossibility for him, he was ^{Mailer's} the killer anyway because of his various kinds of hokus-pokus, including mind-reading and ESP from the grave, Oswald "had the soul of a killer."

ew
508

That imagined killer's "soul" that Mailer has used all these pages for inventing made it possible for Oswald to do what Mailer himself says would have been impossible for him- without that soul that could overcome all obstacles, all impossibilities.

Is there a book on Oswald if he ^was not the assassin?

As ^{Mailer} he rambles along shaming himself more and more, getting sillier and sillier

with all the nonsense he ^{puts} spots onto paper, he admits that:

another gun belonging to "another ^{lone} killer" could have been used;

"It is not inconceivable that two gunmen with wholly separate purposes both fired ⁱⁿ the ^{few} same/lacerated/seconds of time";

"Who would trust him [Oswald] to hit the target";

"Any concerted plan that ~~placed~~ ^{placed} Oswald in the gunman's ^{next} ~~shots~~ [sic] would have been built on the calculation that he would miss. That, indeed, was the thesis of the CIA memo in Don DeLillo's fine novel, "Libra. Libra." (page 779)

Nobody at Random House appears to have dared asked how many "lone killers" can there be in a single murder? Or, to not waste words on such intellectual rubbish in a book that has no reason to have been written or to exist if Oswald is not the assassin in it, how could he have been with two different gunmen firing away with only one causing death.

347A

There is ^{still} another unintended Mailer confession here. He had time to read novels for his writing of nonfiction but he had no time for books on the assassination that are limited to fact, what officialdom designated as fact, (page 779).

Mailer then tries to slide past what he dare not totally ignore, why did Oswald "pick Kennedy" when he liked him? Mailer's answer is that "He would not be shooting at Kennedy ^{because} because he liked him or disliked him - that would be irrelevant to the depth of his deed." (page 780). ^{kind of inevitable} ^{be relevant} ^{It is, nothing that is relevant is relevant when Mailer wants it not to}

It is ^{of} this (that the Mayo psychologist said that the supposed psychiatric evidence Liebler sent asking for his ~~professional~~ professional opinion told him more about Liebler than that mumbojumbo told him about Oswald.)

Here ~~now~~ we have ~~what~~ [≡] what Mailer says about "Evidence." [≡] It also says more about Mailer than about anything else, for there is no ^{real at all} evidence (in what he says). It is what he has instead of the ^{real} evidence with which he cannot coexist.

~~And~~ his very last words in this chapter are still another confession of complete intellectual bankruptcy:

end 509

What has "shifted" ^{is} what Mailer refers to as the "focus?"

All ~~the~~ Mailer has ^{added} to that irrational gobbledegook about the imagined Oswald ^{which} ~~could~~ ^{made} the absolutely impossible possible for ~~him~~ ^{Mailer,} is that of all the people he ^{sup Oswald} could have killed he killed the man he saw as "a good President." (page 799).

And all of this rot is what "shifted" at ^{least} Mailer's "focus" from the actual, the real, the existing and the very official evidence.

~~"Evidence."~~ ~~"Character."~~
Mailer titled this chapter "Evidence." It is really "hogwash."

As though a gremlin ^{invaded} Mailer's mind, he has in addition to his three citations of testimony only two source notes for all this rabid insanity. One has not a thing to do with anything Mailer is writing about, part of his vapid argument about evidence being valueless because there is always a "counter argument." In that he quotes Dr. Robert Artwohl as telling him that there is a case of a bullet circumventing a skull between the skull and the scalp. Mailer actually uses this to argue that the single-bullet mythology is possible, even if the odds are fantastically long. I know Bob Artwohl as a man who can find some way of seeming to justify any argument in support of the official assassination mythology. But I do not believe that he would argue that what Mailer quotes him as saying makes the single-bullet myth other than myth. He has found other ways of thinking he proved that impossibility ^{to be} ~~et~~ possible.

If this is not hogwash enough, there is Mailer's other note. He has this note to explain his conjecture about someone else using Oswald's rifle and what he "perceives" to be the "character" he ^{actually} invented for Oswald:

5. One is, of course, assuming that it was Oswald's Mannlicher-Carcano that was used in the assassination.

For, if it was not, then what did happen to his gun, and what was in the package he brought with him that morning to the Texas School Book Depository? Why indeed would he carry his gun to work if it was not going to be used? Would he take it there in order to allow others to implicate him? There are many arguments that would attempt to disprove the use of the Mannlicher-Carcano, but they all seem weak in the light of Ockham's Razor: The simplest explanation that covers all the facts is likely to be the correct explanation. (Page xxv)

end
510

Mailer waits until he get to the end of his book and then on the very last page before his sham of a bibliography he raises a question of that rifle not having been used in the assassination at all.

On page 778, in the paragraph for which this is the end note, he ~~had~~ argued that Oswald would not have "allowed" someone else to use that rifle. Not realizing that for once he is edging ^{toward} ~~to realize~~ reality, he then asks in this note if that rifle was not used in the assassination, what "happened to his gun, and what was in the package" that morning.

is that Oswald full the truth. There is also the possibility if not the probability that

end 511

The one possibility Mailer avoids is that the rifle was stolen, and that some time before the assassination.

The actual evidence Mailer says should be entirely ignored is that Oswald did not have that rifle with him that morning.

The actual evidence is that he was not on that sixth floor to fire it when it allegedly as fired.

The actual evidence is that the Commission's own time reconstructions, as we have seen, proved that Oswald could not have hidden that rifle and still be on the second floor when Officer Harrison Baker saw him there.

The Commission's ^{own} ~~own~~ testimony and the actual, police photographs that are the Commission's- that word Mailer detests - "evidence" show that the rifle when found was ^{beneath} below the point where two boxes overlap. Place ^{ing} it there, ^{behind a barricade of cartons,} would have taken additional time Oswald did not have in his alleged flight.

What Oswald actually had with him that morning may well have been what he said, curtain rods, because I have Black Star's pictures of curtains being put in place after Oswald's ^{arrest} ~~arrest~~.

Asking if Oswald took the rifle that morning "to allow others to implicate him," Mailer could not think that perhaps someone else took the rifle there "to implicate him"?

He is that dumb and was still admitted to Harvard?

from his wording of his note

Ockham's Razor is a novel, as perhaps Mailer did not learn at Harvard. That

That novel is based on the philosophy of William of Occam, the English scholastic philosopher who died in ~~1400~~ 1349. His name is also spelled as Mairer has it. His philosophy was to seek the simplest solutions. end 512

And that is the one thing Mairer does not do here.

He cannot do that and have this book because all the- again that word he detests, and this is a solid reason for his detesting it - actual, official "evidence" is that Oswald did not carry that rifle that morning; was not in ^a position to fire at the President; could not have hidden that rifle as it was hidden; and so the Occam simplest solution, or as Mairer prefers "explanation" is that Oswald was not the assassin.

Or, inflating his book learning, if that is what it is, and not something he heard about and liked, Mairer has Occamed himself and his book.

To ~~can~~ coin a word.

incident
single
space

The focus has then shifted. Recognizing that one only argues this point in the likelihood that Oswald is guilty rather than as a found conclusion, what then happened to be the real intent of his deed? (Page 1780)

With his book based on the certainty of Oswald's ~~had~~ guilt ~~he~~ get Mailer gets this close to it ends to confess what was clear to all who were not blind from the beginning, none not blind including nobody at Random House, Mailer admits that there is no more than what he admits after ignoring all the evidence he knew existed is no more than "the likelihood that Oswald in guilty rather than as a ~~blind~~ found [sic] conclusion [sic]" page 780).

See why Mailer began this chapter saying that evidence had to be discarded

discarded, not considered at all? *It is because it ruins him and his assassination work - 348A*

Coalition and reputation
Mailer's next chapter is part of his argument that Oswald was the killer, argument for Mailer being *not* and *will* is not, is that because of his "character," the title of the ^{his} chapter than is less than worthless.

Except to note that he found Hitler's Mein Kampf a ^{paper} ~~proper~~ source (page 781).

Emerson, too.

Along with McMillan.

"Character" is worth four pages to Mailer. It has no worth at all.

His ^{next to the} last chapter is "The Widow's Elegy." (pages 784 ff). He has this use for it:

to knife Marina again: "the past is filled with guilt...under such a mass of guilt." That, certainly, is an emotion ^{strange to} ~~with which~~ Mailer ~~has no connection!~~ ⁱⁿ this book which should arouse it.

His last two an a half pages are on Marguerite ~~the~~ Oswald. He calls that a chapter, too.

Oh, his book just poops out ^{at} its end.

END 513

"which is what Mailer would have done if he had any concern for his reputation, if he had any self-respect, if he had not been overwhelmed by his belief that whatever he decided is true is true, that ^{what} ~~whatever~~ he wanted to be true had to be true. If he had not got ^{ten} addicted to the Schillerization of literature by buying ~~right~~ exclusive rights, and perhaps, if he had not just burned out.

Life can be harsh to those who make it harsh, harsh for themselves and as

is ^{his ugly} ~~also does~~, from ^{his} beginning to the ugly end, to Marina.

And withall he complains and of all things, about reviews, about the attention to his book which, if not more than any other book in no memory got, much more than most writers a dare even dream of ^{getting} and as I write this he was still getting coast-to-coast TV attention for it and for himself, the week of this writing on CNN again, several months after his book was out.

The international attention from and in that lengthy New Yorker condensation was nothing to him.

Not ^{was} the cover article in Parade that so many Sunday newspapers carry.

Not the flattering reviews of which we have used a few only.

Not all that network and cable TV attention and all the local TV appearances as he barnstormed with the book, ^{and also made the local papers,}

The Associated Press gave national attention to his complaint when he appeared in Albany, New York on May 16. It slugged its ^{May 18 story} ~~story caption~~ with this caption:

"Mailer Perplexed Over Book Criticism." Following this was the caution to editors:

"Contents in final graf may be offensive to some readers." The AP wire copy I was given recites that.

end 514

The story begins, "Author Norman Mailer says he's puzzled over some of the criticism he's received over his latest book, 'Oswald's Tale.'"

"There's been a certain animosity to the majority of the reviews that I don't understand," Mailer said in Chief Thursday's Times Union of Albany. ...

"I wasn't interested in going over every shred of evidence. That's been done to death, I approached Oswald as a novelist and I wanted to get inside him, ~~how~~ to understand him as a character with motives, which brings you closer to the truth than a list of facts," he explained. ...

"He also told the Times Union that he has calmed down somewhat in his 72 years-- to a certain extent. 'Maybe I've mellowed a bit. But I'm angrier at certain things, especially politics. There's so much (expletive) going on in politics right now.'"

In some books, too, as we have seen.

inlet
single
page

Mailer was truthful in saying he "wasn't interest" in the "evidence." His book reflects that. He had no interest in the ~~sexual~~ ^{actual} evidence at all.

And that, as we have seen, is the only way he could have imagined that he had a book.

It is not only Oswald that Mailer ~~so~~ "approached" as a "novelist." That is his approach to the assassination itself and to its official investigations.

In saying he wanted to "get inside him" what he was really confessing is that he wanted to make of Oswald what he ~~was~~ ^{was} not, another essential if he was to have the pretense of the book he has.

He "got inside" Oswald by ignoring his security clearances and by making of ~~him~~ ^{him} the homosexual he ~~asn't~~ ^{asn't}?

This is Mailer's way of explaining that Oswald ~~was~~ ^{was} the assassin, what was "inside" Mailer from the very ^e beginning.

It is the only way he could make Oswald the assassin - which the evidence proves he was not and could not have been - and make of him what he was not, "a character with motives" again what was ~~inde~~ ^{inde}spensible to that "(expletive)" of his book. end 3/15

And he is still saying in self-justification what he began his propoganda for his book with, here what he made up, what he imagined, what he ~~had~~ ^{had to} say to have any book at all, what is totally without any evidence, "brings you closer to the truth than a list of facts."

In a different way this is the "(expletive)" he dumped on that history-majors at the University of Pennsylvania, where he said that history and fiction are the same thing and that history lies. Perhaps it was that dybbyk in him that ~~prevented~~ ^{prevented} had him plead for understanding of his book and of him ~~since~~ ^{because} he recognized that in his writing of this history he lied and that makes all history lies.

His complaint against those reviewers who did not fawn over him is that when ~~they~~ ^{they} saw and smelled that bullshit he piled so high they ~~do~~ ^{the} did not hail it as a beautiful mountain he imagined it to be.

But no matter how high it is piled, (expletive) is still (expletive). end 5/6