
From: paul krassner [paulkrassner@roadrunner.com]
Sent: 1/16/2019 7:50:41 PM
To: Nancy Cain [REDACTED]; Tom [REDACTED]; Marie Moneysmith [REDACTED]
Steven Gaydos [REDACTED]; George Krassner [REDACTED]; Linda W. Grossman
[REDACTED]; Holly Krassner Dawson [REDACTED]; Daniel Dawson
[REDACTED]; Danny Goldberg [REDACTED]; Caryl Ratner [REDACTED]; Kevin
Bright [REDACTED]; Michael Simmons [REDACTED]; Samuel Leff
[REDACTED]; Bob Fass [REDACTED]; Lynn Tofte Fass [REDACTED]; Lee
Quarnstrom [REDACTED]; Barb Cowles [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Manson Girls / Acid Trip Agreement

Importance: High

From: Lonnie Martin <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Manson Girls / Acid Trip Agreement
Date: January 16, 2019 at 6:50:44 AM PST
To: paul krassner <[REDACTED]>

Hi Paul.

Thanks so much for sharing both your note to Steven and your latest Manson essay with me. It's always wild to read that piece. I have parts of it memorized at this point.

After reading your comment about vibes from the movie, I feel like I have some explaining to do. This is all stream of consciousness writing so take it on merit, I guess. No harm is meant.

As 'The Last of the Manson Girls' got closer to completion, I was insanely nervous about showing it to you. I knew it there was very little in it that was "Truth" in terms of minute details. What I did was take the broad strokes of your essay and make it into the "beats" of my story.

For example, Sandy's invitation to take a bath formed the spine of the "mermaid" scene. Squeaky's line, "Manson never took anybody who wasn't already discarded by the society" formed the spin of the animated fever dream where she talks about her father. The visit to Merrick was a good place to get into some of my views about conspiracy and the human mind's ability to latch on to anything to avoid unpleasant facts. Squeaky's line "Well what do you expect from me. I'm crazy" was obviously later than this meeting, but it was just too good a line to let go.

I didn't use elements of your essay that made actual filming and production tougher. For example, the interlude in your essay where you went to a home of friend of the family and smoked weed for example became "you" smoking weed at their pad.

I added in beats, character traits and dialogue that helped form that "dramatic arc" that works in movies so well. You and the Manson Women must have talked about far more than you mentioned in your essay, but I took liberties with what was said and how it was presented. Maybe I should have reached out to you about these conversations. I guess I was afraid of the Truth getting in the way of a good story.

All the Mae Brussel stuff is there because it seemed a simple (Ha!) way to explain to the audience “Why is Paul going there?” Squeaky asking for the LSD rather than you bringing it was, again, an easy and short way to explain to the audience why LSD was involved.

There’s a lot of my personal experience in the film. I *did* have a panic attack while on LSD and passed out hugging a toilet. (I didn’t however go to a desert/beach and talk to futuristic Squeaky Fromme, though I was in the desert when it happened.) I once had a very contentious creative friendship with one of my best friends who is a friend no longer. That seemed to mirror some of your relationship with Lenny Bruce. I also felt like your relationship with Lenny had so much to do with your evolution as a writer, satirist, and comedian that it seemed proper to put that in there. I wrestled a *long* time over even mentioning your daughter because it seemed more of a personal invasion than you had bargained for. However, based on your memoir, it was obvious how important that relationship and aspect of your life was to you.

The smooching with Squeaky isn’t meant to be any kind of bawdy Enquirer scandal. It’s tied to the idea that by the end of the movie this “Paul” isn’t scared of her. The kiss is mentioned as being symbolic of acceptance and despite all their philosophical differences, “Paul” and Squeaky in the film find a way to “accept” each other. “We’ve got to find a way to love the people we hate.” is the statement I always say at talkbacks when people ask me what the ending of the movie means.

The movie was conceived and made as a response to my own feelings of doubt about myself, and my growing social irrelevance as I age. (I turned 40 while making it.) It’s about coming to terms with the mistakes I’ve made and the hubris that caused them.

It’s also about resistance fatigue. It asks (in a roundabout way), “What happens if the good guys *do* lose the war?” I saw similarities between how the protest wing of the counterculture may have felt in the wake of RFK, the Weathermen and the SLA, and having the whole movement for something bigger start to go sour as it mainstreamed. The similarities between Nixon and Trump are so obvious, I feel like I don’t even need to mention them. I saw similarities in your spiritual journey to mine. “Paul Krassner” in my script was in some ways a vessel to project all my own hang-ups onto. I suppose that’s an unfair burden to put on you.

I don’t know if this all sounds like excuse-making, but it’s my way of saying that I certainly don’t want to “break a legacy.” I think the work you did with “The Realist” is important and paved the way for the Onion, The Daily Show, and society’s general acceptance of raw, cutting satire in the world of politics and journalism. The last thing I would ever want to do is have that be tainted. Film has that power of course. The medium by its nature hypnotizes, and has a funny way of clouding up the truth. Fiction becomes history and vice versa.

More than anything, I don’t want you to feel taken advantage of or disrespected.

I probably should have explained this to you earlier. I probably should have called and had a conversation with you about it, and I'm happy to still do that.

Thank you again for allowing me to tell this story, even through my own distorted lens.

All the best,

Lonnie